

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0174560		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/16/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/15/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/23/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/21/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/04/2015

### 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, District of Columbia, Maryland  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, 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 48 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on May 15, 2013, incurring upper and lower back, right shoulder and left knee injuries. Lumbar Magnetic Resonance Imaging revealed disc bulging, facet hypertrophy and mild central canal narrowing. A left knee MARI showed a tear of the medial meniscus. She was diagnosed with cervical sprain, lumbar degenerative disc disease, lumbar stenosis, right shoulder sprain, left knee meniscal tear and myofascial pain syndrome of the neck and low back. Treatment included anti-inflammatory drugs, physical therapy, chiropractic sessions, and massage therapy and acupuncture and activity restrictions. She underwent knee arthroscopy with repair of a torn meniscus. Currently, the injured worker complained of persistent chronic pain involving multiple areas of her body from her injuries. She was noted to have gastrointestinal hypersensitivity to her multiple medications. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization on September 4, 2015, included prescriptions for Zofran and Prilosec. On August 21, 2015, a request for the prescriptions for Zofran and Prilosec was denied by utilization review.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Zofran ODT 4mg quantiy 20:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Ondansetron (Zofran).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Antiemetics.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS is silent on the use of ondansetron. With regard to antiemetics, the ODG states "Not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. Recommended for acute use as noted below per FDA-approved indications." Specifically, "Ondansetron (Zofran): This drug is a serotonin 5-HT<sub>3</sub> receptor antagonist. It is FDA-approved for nausea and vomiting secondary to chemotherapy and radiation treatment. It is also FDA-approved for postoperative use. Acute use is FDA-approved for gastroenteritis." As the injured worker is not postoperative or experiencing nausea and vomiting secondary to chemotherapy and radiation treatment, or gastroenteritis, ondansetron is not recommended. There was no documentation suggesting the ongoing necessity of the medication or its efficacy. The request is not medically necessary.

**Prilosec 20mg quantity 30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

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

**Decision rationale:** In the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy, the MTUS recommends stopping the NSAID, switching to a different NSAID, or considering the use of an H<sub>2</sub>-receptor antagonist or a PPI. The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of proton pump inhibitors in conjunction with NSAIDs in situations in which the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events including: (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). CPMTG guidelines further specify: "Recommendations: Patients with no risk factor and no cardiovascular disease: Non-selective NSAIDs OK (e.g, ibuprofen, naproxen, etc.). 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). Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox-2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely necessary. Patients at high risk of gastrointestinal events with cardiovascular disease: If GI risk is high the suggestion is for a low-dose Cox-2 plus low dose Aspirin (for cardioprotection) and a PPI. If cardiovascular risk is greater than GI risk the suggestion is naproxyn plus low-dose aspirin plus a PPI." (Laine, 2006) (Scholmerich, 2006) (Nielsen, 2006) (Chan, 2004) (Gold, 2007) (Laine, 2007) As there is no documentation of peptic ulcer, GI

bleeding or perforation, or cardiovascular disease in the records available for my review, the injured worker's risk for gastrointestinal events is low, as such, medical necessity cannot be affirmed, therefore is not medically necessary.