

Case Number:	CM14-0072798		
Date Assigned:	07/16/2014	Date of Injury:	09/14/2007
Decision Date:	10/10/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/05/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/19/2014

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 Family 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 53-year-old male patient who reported an industrial injury on 9/14/2007, over seven (7) years ago, attributed to the performance of his usual and customary job tasks reported as a slip and fall when entering the building. The patient underwent right knee surgical intervention on 8/15/2013. The patient is diagnosed with cervical radiculopathy, lumbar radiculopathy, and right knee osteoarthritis. The patient is also received lumbar spine ESI's to the right L5. The patient has been prescribed Norco; Soma; Protonix; Terocin cream; Flector patches; OxyContin; Tramadol; and Gabapentin. The treatment plan included a prescription for topical Terocin cream 120ml (2).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Terocin 120 ml (x2): 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 Salicylate, Topical Analgesics Anti-Inflammatory Medications Page(s): 105, 111-113, 67-6. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain Salicylate Topicals

Decision rationale: The prescription for Terocin cream 120 ml x2 is not medically necessary for the treatment of the patient for pain relief for the orthopedic diagnoses of the patient. There is no Orthopedic clinical documentation submitted to demonstrate the use of the topical creams for appropriate diagnoses or for the recommended limited periods of time. It is not clear that the topical NSAID medications are medically necessary in addition to prescribed oral medications. There is no provided subjective/objective evidence that the patient has failed or not responded to other conventional and recommended forms of treatment for relief of the effects of the industrial injury. Only if the subjective/objective findings are consistent with the recommendations of the Official Disability Guidelines, then topical use of topical preparations is only recommended for short-term use for specific orthopedic diagnoses. The request for Terocin cream is not medically necessary for the treatment of the patient for the diagnosis of chronic back pain. The patient is 7 years DOI and has exceeded the time period recommended for topical treatment. There are alternatives available OTC for the prescribed topical analgesics. The use of the topical creams does not provide the appropriate therapeutic serum levels of medications due to the inaccurate dosing performed by rubbing variable amounts of creams on areas that are not precise. The volume applied and the times per day that the creams are applied are variable and do not provide consistent serum levels consistent with effective treatment. There is no medical necessity for the addition of creams to the oral medications in the same drug classes. There is no demonstrated evidence that the topicals are more effective than generic oral medications. The prescription for Terocin cream is not medically necessary for the treatment of the patient's pain complaints. The prescription of Terocin cream is not recommended by the California MTUS and the Official Disability Guidelines. The continued use of topical NSAIDs for the current clinical conditions is not otherwise warranted or appropriate - noting the specific comment that "There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip, or shoulder." The objective findings in the clinical documentation provided do not support the continued prescription for the treatment of chronic pain. There is no documented medical necessity for the prescribed Terocin cream 120 ml x2 for the effects of the industrial injury.