

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0086146		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/23/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/14/2009
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/28/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/03/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/09/2014

### 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 42 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 5/14/2009, after a motor vehicle accident, while employed as a truck driver. The injured worker was diagnosed as having unspecified disorder of joint, shoulder region, and disorders of bursae and tendons in shoulder region, unspecified. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, cortisone injection, and medications. Magnetic resonance imaging of the left shoulder in 7/2011 was referenced. The use of Ibuprofen was noted since at least 3/2013. On 5/14/2014, the injured worker complains of left shoulder pain, with associated anxiety and depression. Pain averaged 4-5/10, best 3/10 and worst 7/10. Medications included Ibuprofen, Norco, and Omeprazole. He was working part time. Range of motion was complete to the left shoulder, with some pain on adduction noted. The treatment plan included magnetic resonance imaging of the left shoulder and medications.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**1 prescription of Ibuprofen 600mg #60 with 2 refills: Overturned**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Ibuprofen, NSAIDs specific drug list; NSAIDs, GI symptoms and cardiovascular risk.

**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 states: Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) Back Pain Chronic low back pain: Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another. (Roelofs-Cochrane, 2008) See also Anti-inflammatory medications. Neuropathic pain: There is inconsistent evidence for the use of these medications to treat long term neuropathic pain, but they may be useful to treat breakthrough and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in with neuropathic pain. This medication is recommended for the shortest period of time and at the lowest dose possible. The dosing of this medication is within the California MTUS guideline recommendations. The definition of shortest period possible is not clearly defined in the California MTUS. Therefore the request is certified, and is medically necessary.

**1 MRI of the left shoulder:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 208-9. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Shoulder.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 208-209.

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM chapter on shoulder imaging states: Imaging may be considered for a patient whose limitations due to consistent symptoms have persisted for one month or more, i.e., in cases: When surgery is being considered for a specific anatomic defect (e.g., a full-thickness rotator cuff tear). Magnetic resonance imaging and arthrography have fairly similar diagnostic and therapeutic impact and comparable accuracy although MRI is more

sensitive and less specific. Selecting specific imaging equipment and procedures will depend on the availability and experience of local referrals. Relying only on imaging studies to evaluate the source of shoulder symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a finding that was present before symptoms began (for example, degenerative partial thickness rotator cuff tears), and therefore has no temporal association with the symptoms. The provided clinical documentation for review does not meet criteria for shoulder imaging per the ACOEM and therefore the request is not medically necessary.