

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0055052		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	03/30/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/08/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/01/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/12/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/23/2015

### HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:

State(s) of Licensure: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive Medicine

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The injured worker is a 56 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 06/08/2010. He reported falling backwards while using a blow torch that subsequently burned the right foot. Diagnoses include status post second degree and third degree burns, right foot, and chronic metatarsalgia secondary to burn scar and fibrosis to inter-metatarsal spaces and digits, resulting in loss of motion and pain with weight bearing activities. Treatments to date include medication therapy, activity modification, orthotics, cortisone injection and home exercise. Currently, he complained of persistent pain in the foot with numbness and tingling. On 2/24/15, the physical examination documented tenderness along the plantar fascia and retro-Achilles. The plan of care included continuation of medication therapy.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

**Nalfon 400mg #60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Nsaids.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-72. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Fenoprofen (Nalfon).

**Decision rationale:** MTUS recommends the use of NSAIDs for the acute exacerbation of back pain at the lowest effective dose for the shortest amount of time due to the increased cardiovascular risk, renal, hepatic and GI side effects associated with long term use. Fenoprofen (Nalfon, generic available): 200, 600 mg. Dosing: osteoarthritis; (off-label use for ankylosing spondylitis); 300 - 600mg PO 3 to 4 times per day (Max daily dose is 3200mg). Improvement may take as long as 2 to 3 weeks. Mild to moderate pain (off-label use for bone pain): 200mg PO every 4 to 6 hours as needed. Medical records do indicate that the patient has been on NSAID for several years and would not be considered shortest amount of treatment time. Additionally, the medical records do not subjectively define the pain well and do not subjectively or objectively annotate improvement. As such, the request for Nalfon 400mg #60 is not medically necessary.

**Protonix 20mg #60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines PPIs.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

**Decision rationale:** Protonix is the brand name version of Pantoprazole, which is a proton pump inhibitor. MTUS states, "Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." And "Patients at intermediate risk for gastrointestinal events and no cardiovascular disease:(1) A non-selective NSAID with either a PPI (Proton Pump Inhibitor, for example, 20 mg omeprazole daily) or misoprostol (200 g four times daily) or (2) a Cox-2 selective agent. Long-term PPI use (> 1 year) has been shown to increase the risk of hip fracture (adjusted odds ratio 1.44)." ODG states, "If a PPI is used, omeprazole OTC tablets or lansoprazole 24HR OTC are recommended for an equivalent clinical efficacy and significant cost savings. Products in this drug class have demonstrated equivalent clinical efficacy and safety at comparable doses, including esomeprazole (Nexium), lansoprazole (Prevacid), omeprazole (Prilosec), pantoprazole (Protonix), dexlansoprazole (Dexilant), and rabeprazole (Aciphex). (Shi, 2008) A trial of omeprazole or lansoprazole is recommended before Nexium therapy. The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should also be second-line. According to the latest AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Research, all of the commercially available PPIs appeared to be similarly effective. (AHRQ, 2011)." The patient does not meet the age recommendations for increased GI risk. The medical documents provided establish the patient has experienced GI discomfort, but is nonspecific and does not indicate history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation. Medical records do not indicate that the patient is on ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or high dose/multiple NSAID. Additionally per guidelines, Pantoprazole is considered second line

therapy and the treating physician has not provided detailed documentation of a failed trial of omeprazole and/or lansoprazole. As such, the request for Protonix 20mg #60 is not medically necessary.

**Norco 10/325mg #120:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids  
Page(s): 74-96.

**Decision rationale:** ODG does not recommend the use of opioids for neck, low back, and shoulder pain except for short use for severe cases, not to exceed 2 weeks. The patient has exceeded the 2 week recommended treatment length for opioid usage. MTUS does not discourage use of opioids past 2 weeks, but does state that ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Additionally, medical documents indicate that the patient has been on Norco in excess of the recommended 2-week limit. As such, the request for Norco 10/325mg #120 is not medically necessary.