

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0161311		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/06/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/14/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/30/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/15/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/01/2014

### 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 Management 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 63-year-old male with a 6/14/12 date of injury. At the time (8/13/14) of request for authorization for Diclofenac/Lidocaine Cream (3%/5%) 180 G, there is documentation of subjective (persistent pain in the neck and low back) and objective (decreased range of motion of the cervical spine, tenderness to palpation over the trapezius and paraspinal muscles, positive Spurling's test bilaterally, decreased range of motion of the lumbar spine, tenderness to palpitation over the lumbar paraspinal muscles, and positive Kemp's test) findings, current diagnoses (chronic degenerative arthrosis, cervical spine with acute injury, and lumbar strain), and treatment to date (physical therapy, chiropractic therapy, lumbar facet injections, TENS unit, and medications).

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Diclofenac/Lidocaine Cream (3%/5%) 180 G: Upheld**

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

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

**Decision rationale:** MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies that many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control; that ketoprofen, lidocaine (in creams, lotion or gels), capsaicin in a 0.0375% formulation, baclofen and other muscle relaxants, and gabapentin and other antiepilepsy drugs are not recommended for topical applications; and that any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended, is not recommended. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of chronic degenerative arthrosis, cervical spine with acute injury, and lumbar strain. However, the request for Diclofenac/Lidocaine Cream contains at least one drug (Lidocaine) that is not recommended. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request Diclofenac/Lidocaine Cream (3%/5%) 180 G is not medically necessary.