

Case Number:	CM15-0096621		
Date Assigned:	05/27/2015	Date of Injury:	09/27/2010
Decision Date:	06/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/19/2015

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, Alabama, 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 (IW) is a 63-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 09/27/2010. Diagnoses include cervical and lumbar spine sprain/strain and bilateral epicondylitis. Treatment to date has included medications, physical and chiropractic therapy. According to the progress notes dated 4/14/15, the IW reported constant, sharp left wrist pain rated 8/10; right elbow pain rated 6/10; left elbow pain rated 7-8/10 and constant, aching lumbar spine pain rated 8-9/10 with radiation to the bilateral lower extremities. The IW declined cortisone injections for the elbows and epidural steroid injections for the lumbar spine. An MRI of the lumbar spine on 3/31/11 showed osteoarthritis and reduced disc height at L2-3, L4-5 and L5-S1. A request was made for MRI of the bilateral elbows to rule-out internal derangement; MRI of the lumbar spine to assess if changes qualify her for surgery; and Prilosec 20mg, #30 with one refill for diagnosis of GI upset.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of the bilateral elbows: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 10 Elbow Disorders (Revised 2007) Page(s): 601-602. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Elbow, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Elbow Complaints Page(s): 42.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, and in MRI of the elbow is recommended in case of suspected ulnar collateral ligament tears. There is no clear evidence of such damage in this case. Therefore, the request for bilateral elbows' MRI is not necessary.

MRI of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-305. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Lumbar MRI.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303.

Decision rationale: Regarding the indications for imaging in case of back pain, MTUS guidelines stated: "Lumbar spine x rays should not be recommended in patients with low back pain in the absence of red flags for serious spinal pathology, even if the pain has persisted for at least six weeks. However, it may be appropriate when the physician believes it would aid in patient management. Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computer tomography [CT] for bony structures)". Furthermore, and according to MTUS guidelines, MRI is the test of choice for patients with prior back surgery, fracture or tumors that may require surgery. The patient does not have any clear evidence of new lumbar nerve root compromise. There is no clear evidence of significant change in the patient signs or symptoms suggestive of new pathology. Therefore, the request for lumbar MRI is not medically necessary.

Prilosec 20mg #30 with 1 refill: Upheld

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

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, the request for Prilosec 20mg #30 with 1 refill is not medically necessary.