

Case Number:	CM13-0057705		
Date Assigned:	12/30/2013	Date of Injury:	03/20/2013
Decision Date:	03/24/2014	UR Denial Date:	11/05/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/25/2013

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Interventional Spine, and is licensed to practice in California. 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 physician 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This is a 49 year-old-male who injured his back on 3/20/13 as he was picking up a piece of metal and throwing it into a container. On 11/5/13 UR (utilization review) recommended non-certification on a retrospective review of an unknown dosage of flurb/Lido/Amitrip and gaba/cyclo/tram that was dispensed on 9/24/13. The 9/24/13 medical report was not provided for this IMR Independent Medical Review). The most recent medical report available for this IMR, is dated 6/11/13, from [REDACTED]. According to [REDACTED], the patient has a specific injury to the back and cumulative trauma to the shoulders, back, hips, legs, and feet. The diagnoses includes: bilateral shoulder sprain; lumbar sprain with paresthesia in bilateral lower extremities (BLE); bilateral hip sprain, bilateral ankle /feet sprain; psychological overlay; polyarthritis; insomnia.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective request for medications dispensed 9/24/13, unknown frequency and duration: Flurb/Lido/Amitrip: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 123-125. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Physician's Desk Reference

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: The patient presents with low back and bilateral lower extremity pain. Under section topical analgesics, MTUS gives a general statement about compounded products: "Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." The compound topical contains a non-dermal patch form of lidocaine. MTUS guidelines specifically state, other than the dermal patch, other formulations of lidocaine whether creams, lotions or gels are not approved for neuropathic pain. So a compounded topical cream that contains Lidocaine would not be recommended by MTUS criteria. As such, the request is not certified.

Retrospective request for medication dispensed 9/24/13, unknown frequency and duration:
Gaba/Cyclo/Tram: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 123-125. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Physician's Desk Reference

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: The patient presents with low back and bilateral lower extremity pain. MTUS guidelines states "Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." MTUS specifically states topical gabapentin is not recommended, therefore, any compounded topical product that contains gabapentin is not recommended. As such, the request is not certified.