

Case Number:	CM15-0236032		
Date Assigned:	12/11/2015	Date of Injury:	04/04/2014
Decision Date:	01/22/2016	UR Denial Date:	11/13/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/02/2015

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, California

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:

This 38 year old female sustained an industrial injury on 4-4-14. Documentation indicated that the injured worker was receiving treatment for right carpal tunnel syndrome, right elbow sprain and strain and right lateral epicondylitis. Previous treatment included acupuncture, physical therapy and medications. In a PR-2 dated 7-29-15, the injured worker complained of pain to the right elbow and right wrist, rated 6 to 7.5 out of 10 on the visual analog scale. The injured worker reported getting relief from medications and rest. Physical exam was remarkable for right elbow with tenderness to palpation, muscle spasms and positive Cozen's test and right wrist with decreased range of motion, tenderness to palpation and positive Tinel's and Phalen's. Subjective complaints and objective findings did not mention gastrointestinal issues. The treatment plan included continuing medications (Protonix, Voltaren, Gabapentin, Tramadol and topical compound creams). In the most recent PR-2 submitted for review, dated 9-29-15, gastrointestinal issues were not mentioned. The injured worker complained of ongoing pain to the right wrist and elbow. Physical exam was remarkable for was essentially unchanged. The treatment plan included acupuncture and physical therapy. On 11-4-15, a request for authorization was submitted for Voltaren, Gabapentin and Protonix. On 11-13-15, Utilization Review non-certified a request for Protonix 20mg #60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Protonix 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk. 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 do not establish the patient has experienced GI discomfort. 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.