

Case Number:	CM15-0064241		
Date Assigned:	05/13/2015	Date of Injury:	09/25/2013
Decision Date:	06/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/04/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive Medicine

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 51 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 09/25/2013 when the ladder she was standing on broke and gave out. She suffered bilateral rib fractures, pelvic fracture, and a subdural hematoma without midline shift. According to a progress report dated 01/29/2015, the injured worker complained of right shoulder and right knee pain. Chief complaint included zero percent improvement in the right shoulder and right knee. She described constant right shoulder pain, numbness and weakness. Pain was rated 8 on a scale of 1-10. Right knee pain was rated 7. She noted right knee weakness and complete numbness from the right knee down to her right heel. She had completed 8 sessions of physical therapy which helped about 30 percent with pain and overall function. Naproxen helped to decrease pain. Medications included Naproxen, Amitriptyline and Prilosec. Assessment included right shoulder bursitis and impingement, right patellofemoral syndrome and right knee medial meniscal tear. Treatment plan included continuance of current medication regimen. Currently under review is the request for Omeprazole and Naproxen.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Omeprazole 20mg quantity 60 with two refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Non Steroidal Anti Inflammatory Drugs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG 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)." The medical documents provided do not establish the patient has having documented GI bleeding, perforation, peptic ulcer, high dose NSAID, or other GI risk factors as outlined in MTUS. As such, the request for Omeprazole 20mg quantity 60 with two refills is not medically necessary.

Naproxen Sodium 550mg quantity 60 with two refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Naproxen; Non Selective Non Steroidal Anti Inflammatory Drugs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) Page(s): 67-73. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Naproxen, NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: MTUS specifies four recommendations regarding NSAID use: 1) Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. 2) Back Pain - Acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. 3) 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. 4) 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. The medical documents do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis. Additionally, the treating physician does not document failure of primary (Tylenol) treatment. Progress notes do not indicate how long the patient has been on naproxen, but the MTUS guidelines recommend against long-term use. The treating physician has not provided documentation of objective functional improvement. As such, the request for Naproxen Sodium 550mg quantity 60 with two refills is not medically necessary.