

Case Number:	CM15-0081536		
Date Assigned:	05/04/2015	Date of Injury:	09/03/2014
Decision Date:	06/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/22/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/28/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 35 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/3/14. She has reported initial complaints of slipping and falling on a piece of plastic and falling backwards with pain in her back and left lower extremity. The diagnoses have included lumbosacral spondylosis, pain in the joint of lower leg and sciatica. Treatment to date has included medications, ice, crutches, physical therapy, knee immobilizer and activity modifications. The diagnostic testing that was performed included x-rays and electromyography (EMG)/nerve conduction velocity studies (NCV). The current medications included Tramadol, Naproxen and Protonix. Currently, as per the physician progress note dated 4/15/15, the injured worker complains of low back pain with radiation to the left lower extremity with associated numbness and tingling. The pain is relieved with rest and medications. She is working full time duties. She has discontinued the use of Naproxen due to nausea and has been using Protonix with relief. The objective findings were unremarkable. Work status was with restrictions. The physician requested treatment included Pantoprazole-Protonix 20 MG #60 DOS 2/18/15.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pantoprazole-Protonix 20 MG #60 DOS 2/18/15: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAID Page(s): 68-70.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID therapy and proton pump inhibitors (PPI) states: Recommend with precautions as indicated below. Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular riskfactors. 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 a anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDS to develop gastro duodenal lesions. Recommendations:-Patients with no risk factor and no cardiovascular disease: Non-selective NSAIDs OK (e.g ibuprofen, naproxen, etc.)-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 (200g 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). Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox-2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely necessary. There is no documentation provided that places this patient at intermediate or high risk that would justify the use of a PPI. There is no mention of current gastrointestinal or cardiovascular disease. For these reasons the criteria set forth above per the California MTUS for the use of this medication has not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.