

Case Number:	CM15-0075641		
Date Assigned:	04/27/2015	Date of Injury:	07/15/2013
Decision Date:	05/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/21/2015

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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 25 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/15/2013. Diagnoses include status post right knee arthroscopy, partial medial meniscectomy and chondroplasty. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, surgical intervention (left knee arthroscopic partial medial and lateral meniscectomies on 11/26/2013 and right shoulder arthroscopy with debridement of partial rotator cuff tear and superior labral tear on 2/20/2014), physical therapy and medications. Per the Primary Treating Physician's Progress Report dated 3/23/2015, the injured worker reported mild occasional discomfort in the right knee. He has no complaints about his shoulder or left knee. Physical examination revealed full range of motion at bilateral knees with no joint line tenderness. There was bilateral 1+ patellofemoral crepitus. The plan of care included medications and authorization was requested for Ultram, Nalfon, Prilosec and compound creams.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Nalfon 400mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs), Page 22.

Decision rationale: Anti-inflammatories are the traditional first line of treatment, to reduce pain so activity and functional restoration can resume, but long-term use may not be warranted. Monitoring of NSAID's functional benefit is advised as per Guidelines, long-term use of NSAIDs beyond a few weeks may actually retard muscle and connective tissue healing and increase the risk of hip fractures. Available reports submitted have not adequately addressed the indication to continue a NSAID for a chronic injury nor have they demonstrated any functional efficacy derived from treatment already rendered. The Nalfon 400mg #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Prilosec 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms and cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI Symptoms and Cardiovascular risk, Pages 68-69.

Decision rationale: Prilosec (Omeprazole) medication is for treatment of the problems associated with erosive esophagitis from GERD, or in patients with hypersecretion diseases. Per MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, the patient does not meet criteria for Omeprazole (Prilosec) namely reserved for patients with history of prior GI bleeding, the elderly (over 65 years), diabetics, and chronic cigarette smokers. Submitted reports have not described or provided any GI diagnosis that meets the criteria to indicate medical treatment. Review of the records show no documentation of any history, symptoms, or GI diagnosis to warrant this medication. The Prilosec 20mg #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Compound creams (no info provided on what these medications are): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics, pages 111-113.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Guidelines, the efficacy in clinical trials for topical analgesic treatment modality has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. There is little evidence to utilize topical compound analgesic over oral NSAIDs or other pain relievers for a patient without contraindication in taking oral medications. There is no information or clarification provided as to what is/are the ingredients for this topical cream and how it is medically necessary to treat this injured worker who is not intolerable to oral medications. Submitted reports have not adequately

demonstrated the indication or medical need for this topical compounded analgesic. The Compound creams (no info provided on what these medications are) is not medically necessary and appropriate.