

Case Number:	CM15-0124148		
Date Assigned:	07/08/2015	Date of Injury:	02/05/2013
Decision Date:	08/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/26/2015

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 28-year-old male with an industrial injury dated 02/05/2013. The injured worker's diagnoses include right a shoulder impingement; rule out rotator cuff pathology, lumbar spondylosis, protrusion L5-S1 and thoracic myofascial pain. Treatment consisted of diagnostic studies, prescribed medications, and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 04/27/2015, the injured worker reported right shoulder pain rated 6/10, low back pain rated 7/10 and thoracic pain rated 7/10. Objective findings revealed tenderness of the right shoulder, positive impingement signs, and limited range of motion with pain and spasm of the right cervical trapezius/deltoid musculature. Documentation also noted tenderness of lumbar and thoracic spine. The treating physician prescribed services for Hydrocodone 10mg #60, Pantoprazole 20mg #60 and Compound Medication with Gabapentin 6% Base, 300 grams now under review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Hydrocodone 10mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, criteria for use.

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): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for hydrocodone, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS) and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested hydrocodone is not medically necessary.

Pantoprazole 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDS, GI symptoms and cardiovascular risk.

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 based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter, Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs).

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for pantoprazole (Protonix), 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. Additionally, ODG recommends Nexium, Protonix, Dexilant, and AcipHex for use as 2nd line agents, after failure of omeprazole or lansoprazole. 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. Furthermore, there is no indication that the patient has failed first-line agents prior to initiating treatment with pantoprazole (a 2nd line proton pump inhibitor). In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested pantoprazole is not medically necessary.

Compound Medication with Gabapentin 6% Base, 300 grams: Upheld

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

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): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for compounded gabapentin, CA MTUS states that topical compound medications require guideline support for all components of the compound in order for the compound to be approved. Gabapentin is not supported by the CA MTUS for topical use. Given all of the above, the requested compounded gabapentin is not medically necessary.