

Case Number:	CM14-0159767		
Date Assigned:	10/03/2014	Date of Injury:	05/23/2013
Decision Date:	10/30/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/23/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/29/2014

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 Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in Massachusetts. 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:

According to the documents available for review, the patient is an injured female worker age 54. The date of injury is May 23, 2013. The patient sustained an injury to the bilateral wrists, cervical spine, lumbar spine and left elbow. The specific mechanism of injury was not fully elaborated on in the notes available for review. The patient currently complains of pain in the bilateral wrists, neck and low back all worsened with activity. The patient is maintained on the multimodal pain medication regimen including Cyclobenzaprine 2%, Tramadol 10%, Flurbiprofen 20% Compounded Cream and Capsaicin 0.025%, Flurbiprofen 20%, Tramadol 15%, Menthol 2%, Camphor 2% Compounded Cream. A request for Cyclobenzaprine 2%, Tramadol 10%, Flurbiprofen 20% Compounded Cream and Capsaicin 0.025%, Flurbiprofen 20%, Tramadol 15%, Menthol 2%, Camphor 2% Compounded Cream was denied.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

180 gm: Cyclobenzaprine 2%, Tramadol 10%, Flurbiprofen 20%: 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

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

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS, there is little to no research to support the use of topical compounded creams. The use of these compounded agents requires knowledge of the specific analgesic effect of each agent and how it will be useful for the specific therapeutic goal required. Topical analgesics are largely experimental and there are a few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.

180 gm: Capsaicin 0.025%, Flurbiprofen 20%, Tramadol 15%, Menthol 2%, Camphor 2%: 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

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

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS, there is little to no research to support the use of topical compounded creams. It also contain menthol, a non-recommended topical agent. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. The use of these compounded agents requires knowledge of the specific analgesic effect of each agent and how it will be useful for the specific therapeutic goal required. Topical analgesics are largely experimental and there are a few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.