

Case Number:	CM14-0125262		
Date Assigned:	08/11/2014	Date of Injury:	11/18/2007
Decision Date:	12/05/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/14/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/07/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine 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 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/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 patient with a date of injury of 11/18/07. A utilization review determination dated 7/14/14 recommends non-certification of TGHOT and Fluriflex. 6/11/14 medical report identifies bilateral knee pain. On exam, there is tenderness bilaterally with limited ROM on the left and positive McMurray's on the right. Recommendations include PT, topical medications, right knee MRI, and UDS.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

TGHOT 180gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain (updated 7/10/14), Compound drugs, Criteria for Compound drugs

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for TGHOT, CA MTUS states that topical compound medications require guideline support for all components of the compound in order for the compound to be approved. Capsaicin is "Recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments." Gabapentin is not supported by the CA

MTUS for topical use. Within the documentation available for review, none of the abovementioned criteria have been documented. Furthermore, there is no clear rationale for the use of topical medications rather than the FDA-approved oral forms for this patient. In light of the above issues, the requested TGHOT is not medically necessary.

Fluriflex 180gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain (updated 7/10/14), Compound drugs, Criteria for Compound drugs

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Fluriflex, CA MTUS states that topical compound medications require guideline support for all components of the compound in order for the compound to be approved. Topical NSAIDs are indicated for "Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. Neuropathic pain: Not recommended as there is no evidence to support use." Muscle relaxants are not supported by the CA MTUS for topical use. Within the documentation available for review, none of the abovementioned criteria have been documented. Furthermore, there is no clear rationale for the use of topical medications rather than the FDA-approved oral forms for this patient. In light of the above issues, the requested Fluriflex is not medically necessary.