

Case Number:	CM15-0179775		
Date Assigned:	09/21/2015	Date of Injury:	10/12/2010
Decision Date:	10/29/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/14/2015

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: Maryland, Texas, Virginia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Allergy and Immunology, Rheumatology

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 66 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 10-12-10. Diagnosis included arthritis of the right knee; revision total left knee replacement (12-3-13). She currently (8-27-15) complains of constant, achy left knee pain radiating to the left thigh and left lower leg. No pain levels were enumerated. On physical exam of the right knee there was tenderness to palpation; left knee exam revealed tenderness, swelling, trace of effusion, crepitus, limited range of motion. Treatments to date include physical therapy; medications: Protonix, Colace, Senna, Norco; home exercise program. In the progress note dated 8-27-15 the treating provider's plan of care included requests for Norco 10-325mg #120; Protonix 40mg #30. The request for authorization dated 9-1-15 indicates Norco 10-325mg #120; Protonix 402mg #30 (the request does indicate 402mg). On 9-9-15 utilization review evaluated and modified the request for Norco 10-325mg #120 to a one month supply based on no documentation of functional-vocational benefit with ongoing use, no urine drug screen to monitor compliance; Protonix 40 mg #30 based on no documentation of gastrointestinal issues or gastroesophageal reflux disease and that the injured worker is not at risk for gastrointestinal bleed or ulcers.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325 #120 t-1 tab tid: 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): Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids, long-term assessment. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back (Acute and Chronic), Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Pain, Opioids.

Decision rationale: ODG does not recommend the use of opioids for neck, low back, and shoulder pain "except for short use for severe cases, not to exceed 2 weeks." The patient has exceeded the 2 week recommended treatment length for opioid usage. MTUS does not discourage use of opioids past 2 weeks, but does state that "ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life." The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. As such, the request for Norco 10/325mg #120 t-1 tab bid is not medically necessary.

Protonix 402mg #30 with 3 refills t-1 tab daily: 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 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 meet the age recommendations for increased GI risk. The medical documents provided fail to establish history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation. 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 is not medically necessary.