

Case Number:	CM15-0065606		
Date Assigned:	04/13/2015	Date of Injury:	07/30/2010
Decision Date:	05/12/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/01/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/07/2015

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 53 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/30/10. Several documents included in the submitted medical records are difficult to decipher. She reported shoulder pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar spine sprain/strain, bilateral wrist tendinitis status post bilateral carpal tunnel release, right shoulder sprain/strain, and bilateral elbow epicondylitis. Treatment to date has included left shoulder arthroscopy on 9/10/14, chiropractic treatment, a home exercise program, and medications. Currently, the injured worker complains of shoulder pain. The treating physician requested authorization for Prilosec 20mg #30, Ultram 50mg #120, and Lidoderm 5% patches #60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

30 Capsules of Prilosec 20mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Omeprazole is indicated when NSAID are used in patients with intermediate or high risk for gastrointestinal events. The risk for gastrointestinal events are: (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). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDS to develop gastroduodenal lesions. There is no documentation that the patient has GI issue that requires the use of prilosec. There is no documentation in the patient's chart supporting that she is at intermediate or high risk for developing gastrointestinal events. Therefore, Prilosec 20mg #30 prescription is not medically necessary.

120 tablets of Ultram 50mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol Page(s): 113.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Ultram (Tramadol) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework. There is no clear recent and objective documentation of pain and functional improvement in this patient with previous use of Ultram. There is no clear documentation of compliance for previous use of Ultram. Therefore, the prescription of Ultram 50mg QTY: 120 is not medically necessary.

60 Patches of Lidoderm 5%: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, Topical analgesics. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch) Page(s): 56.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Lidoderm is the brand name for a lidocaine patch produced by [REDACTED]. Topical lidocaine may be recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin). In this case, there is no documentation that the patient developed neuropathic pain that did not respond to first line therapy and the need for Lidoderm patch is unclear. There is no documentation of efficacy of previous use of Lidoderm patch. Therefore, the prescription of Lidoderm patches #60 is not medically necessary.