

Case Number:	CM15-0173155		
Date Assigned:	09/15/2015	Date of Injury:	06/25/2010
Decision Date:	10/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/02/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 is a 41 year old male with a date of injury on 6-25-2010. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for cervical spine myospasms with radiculopathy and lumbar spine disc protrusions with radiculopathy. Medical records (6-19-2015 to 7-17-2015) indicate ongoing lumbar spine pain and stiffness with bilateral radiculopathy and weakness in the lower extremities. The injured worker also complained of increasing cervical spine pain radiating down into the bilateral arms. Per the treating physician (6-19-2015), the employee was temporarily totally disabled. The physical exam (6-19-2015 to 7-17-2015) revealed tenderness to palpation with spasms of the cervical spine and lumbar spine. Straight leg raise was positive on the right. Treatment has included magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and medications. Current medications (6-19-2015) included Fexmid, Anaprox and Protonix. The original Utilization Review (UR) (8-5-2015) non-certified a request for Pantoprazole.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pantoprazole 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter (Online Version) Proton pump inhibitors (PPIs).

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

Decision rationale: Proton pump inhibitor (PPI) medication is for treatment of the problems associated with active gastric ulcers, erosive esophagitis, Barrett's esophagitis, or in patients with pathologic hypersecretion diseases. Although preventive treatment is effective for the mentioned diagnosis, studies suggest; however, nearly half of PPI prescriptions are used for unapproved or no indications. Per MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, the patient does not meet criteria for PPI namely reserved for patients with history of prior GI bleeding, the elderly (over 65 years), diabetics, and chronic cigarette smokers. Long term use of PPIs have potential increased risks of B12 deficiency; iron deficiency; hypomagnesemia; susceptibility to pneumonia, enteric infections, fractures, hypergastrinemia and cancer, and cardiovascular effects of myocardial infarction (MI). In the elderly, studies have demonstrated increased risk for Clostridium difficile infection, bone loss, and fractures from long-term use of PPIs. Given treatment criteria outweighing risk factors, if a PPI is to be used, omeprazole (Prilosec), lansoprazole (Prevacid), and esomeprazole (Nexium) are to be considered over second-line therapy of other PPIs such as Pantoprazole (Protonix), dexlansoprazole (Dexilant), and rabeprazole (Aciphex). Submitted reports have not described or provided any GI diagnosis that meets the criteria to indicate medical treatment. Review of the records show no documentation of any identified history of acute GI bleeding, active ulcers, or confirmed specific GI diagnosis criteria to warrant this medication. The Pantoprazole 20mg #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.