

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0070941		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/20/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/03/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/19/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/19/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/14/2015

### 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: North Carolina  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

### 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 35 year old, female who sustained a work related injury on 11/3/14. The diagnoses have included cervical spine strain/sprain, post-traumatic cervical myofasciitis, lumbar herniated nucleus pulposus and thoracolumbar post-traumatic strain/strain. The treatments have included an MRI of lumbar spine, x-rays, medications, physical therapy, and home exercises. In the Doctor's First Report of Occupational Injury or Illness dated 2/10/15, the injured worker complains of constant neck pain. She rates this pain a 7-8/10. She has pain that radiates down both hands with numbness and tingling in hands. She has radiating pain to upper back that causes headaches. She complains of constant lower back pain. She rates this pain an 8-9/10. She has radiating pain with numbness and tingling in legs. The treatment plan is placing the injured worker on Duexis.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Duexis 800mg/26.6 tablet #80, 1 refill:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAID  
Page(s): 68-70.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID therapy and proton pump inhibitors (PPI) states: Recommend with precautions as indicated below. Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors. 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 a 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 gastro duodenal lesions. 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. There is no documentation provided that places this patient at intermediate or high risk that would justify the use of a H2 blocker in conjunction with a NSAID. There is no mention of current gastrointestinal or cardiovascular disease. For these reasons the criteria set forth above per the California MTUS for the use of this medication has not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.