

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0086032		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	05/08/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/30/2006
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/29/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/07/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/05/2015

### 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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

### 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 52-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on March 30, 2006. The injured worker was diagnosed as having bicep tenosynovitis. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date have included medication. A progress note dated January 5, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of neck and back pain radiating to right arm with numbness and tingling, right knee and left leg pain. She rates her pain 6/10. Physical exam notes cervical, lumbosacral and right knee tenderness on palpation. The plan includes tramadol, Naproxen, Doral, Soma and Omeprazole and a bow flex tread climber.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

#### **1 Bowflex tread climber TC 10: 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 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 46-47 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Bowflex, CA MTUS supports the use of aerobic activity to avoid deconditioning. Exercise is recommended. They go on to state that there is no sufficient evidence to support the recommendation of any particular exercise regimen over any other exercise regimen. Guidelines do not support the need for additional exercise equipment, unless there is documentation of failure of an independent exercise program without equipment, despite physician oversight and modification. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has failed an independent program of home exercise without equipment. Additionally, there is no statement indicating how the requested exercise equipment will improve the patient's ability to perform a home exercise program, or that the patient has been instructed in the appropriate use of such equipment to decrease the chance of further injury. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Bowflex is not medically necessary.

**60 Naproxen 550mg:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 67-72 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for naproxen, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that naproxen is providing any specific objective functional improvement. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested naproxen is not medically necessary.

**60 Soma 350mg:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 63-66 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Soma, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of non-sedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of specific objective functional improvement as a result of the medication. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Soma is not medically necessary.

**60 Prilosec 20mg:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 68-69 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for omeprazole (Prilosec), California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use, a risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use, or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested omeprazole (Prilosec) is not medically necessary.