

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0057012		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/01/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/13/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/04/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/02/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/25/2015

### 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: Arizona, Michigan

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 50 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 04/13/2010. Medical records provided by the treating physician did not indicate the injured worker's mechanism of injury. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervical intervertebral disc disorder with myelopathy, rotator cuff syndrome of the shoulder, lumbar intervertebral disc disorder with myelopathy, carpal tunnel syndrome of the wrist (median nerve). Treatment to date has included medication regimen and magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar back. In a progress note dated 02/13/2015 the treating physician reports complaints of bilateral cervical, left anterior and posterior shoulder, left posterior arm, elbow, forearm, wrist, and hand, left anterior hand, bilateral lumbar, bilateral sacroiliac, and bilateral anterior knee pain with the pain rated as a three on a scale of one to ten and the pain rating at its worst is a seven. The injured worker also has complaints of numbness to the bilateral anterior and posterior hands. The treating physician requested a magnetic resonance imaging of the cervical spine because of persistent symptoms, Prilosec 20mg one by mouth every morning with a quantity of 30 to protect the stomach lining, interferential stimulator unit for over 90 days with an initial trial of 60 days for use due to chronic pain, and an electromyogram of the upper extremity.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI Cervical spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-179.

**Decision rationale:** Per the MTUS / ACOEM, "for most patients presenting with true neck or upper back problems, special studies are not needed unless a three- or four-week period of conservative care and observation fails to improve symptoms. Most patients improve quickly, provided any red-flag conditions are ruled out. Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag, Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction, Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery and Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. A review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me do not reveal any red flags, surgical considerations or any of the above referenced criteria for imaging as recommended by the guidelines and therefore the request for MRI of The Cervical Spine is not medically necessary.

**Prilosec 20mg one (1) QAM #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

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

**Decision rationale:** Per the MTUS, Clinicians should weigh the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors according to specific criteria listed in the MTUS and a selection should be made based on these criteria 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). Per the ODG, PPI's are recommended for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events. Prilosec (omeprazole), Prevacid (lansoprazole) and Nexium (esomeprazole magnesium) are PPIs. Healing doses of PPIs are more effective than all other therapies, although there is an increase in overall adverse effects compared to placebo. Nexium and Prilosec are very similar molecules. (Donnellan, 2010) In this RCT omeprazole provided a statistically significantly greater acid control than lansoprazole. (Miner, 2010) In general, the use of a PPI should be limited to the recognized indications and used at the lowest dose for the shortest possible amount of time. PPIs are highly effective for their approved indications, including preventing gastric ulcers induced by NSAIDs. Studies suggest, however, that nearly half of all PPI prescriptions are used for unapproved indications or no indications at all. Many prescribers believe that this class of drugs is innocuous, but much information is available to demonstrate otherwise. 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 had been recommended before prescription Nexium therapy (before it went OTC). The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should be second-line. According to the latest AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Research, all of the commercially available PPIs appeared to be similarly effective. (AHRQ, 2011). A review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me do not reveal current gastrointestinal complaints or a past history of gastrointestinal issues that would put the injured worker at increased risk for a gastrointestinal event, therefore the request for Prilosec 20mg one (1) QAM #30 is not medically necessary.

**EMG Upper Extremity: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-179. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back (Acute & Chronic)/ Electrodiagnostic studies, Electromyography.

**Decision rationale:** Per ACOEM in the MTUS, most patients presenting with true neck and upper back problems do not need special studies until a 3-4 week period of conservative care fails to improve symptoms, most patients improve quickly once red-flag conditions are ruled out. Criteria for ordering imaging studies are emergence of a red flag, physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction, failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery and clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination, electrodiagnostic studies, laboratory tests or bone scans. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persists. When the neurological examination is less clear, however further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. EMG and NCV may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck and or arm symptoms lasting more than 3-4 weeks. Per the ODG, cervical electrodiagnostic studies are not necessary to demonstrate a cervical radiculopathy, they have been suggested to confirm a brachial plexus abnormality or some problem other than a cervical radiculopathy, but these studies can result in unnecessary over treatment. A review of the injured workers medical records reveal clear subjective and objective findings of radiculopathy and per the guidelines EMG is not needed if this is the case, therefore the request for EMG Upper Extremity is not medically necessary.

**Interferential Stimulator home unit for 90 days: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS) Page(s): 118-120.

**Decision rationale:** Per the MTUS, Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS) is not recommended as an isolated intervention. There is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments. If interferential treatment is to be used, it should follow very specific guidelines as described in the MTUS in cases where pain is ineffectively controlled due to diminished effectiveness of medications, pain is ineffectively controlled with medications due to side effects, history of substance abuse, significant pain for post operative conditions limiting the ability to perform exercise programs/physical therapy treatments or unresponsive to conservative methods. If the criteria are met then a one month trial may be appropriate to permit the physician and physical medicine provider to study the effects and benefits. There should be evidence of increased functional improvement, less reported pain and evidence of medication reduction. A review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me show that the injured worker has not met the above referenced criteria as described in the MTUS and therefore the request for interferential unit is not medically necessary.