

Case Number:	CM15-0133302		
Date Assigned:	07/21/2015	Date of Injury:	12/09/2011
Decision Date:	08/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/18/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/09/2015

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:

State(s) of Licensure: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

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

The injured worker is a 53-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 12/9/2011. She reported falling onto her knees, arms and hands. Diagnoses have included acute capsulitis, acute tenosynovitis and lateral left ankle sprain. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, custom orthotics and medication. According to the progress report dated 6/3/2015, the injured worker complained of constant pain and swelling to both ankles. She reported that the left ankle was not improving, so she was applying more weight to the right ankle. Objective findings revealed mild edema to the bilateral feet. There was tenderness to palpation of the medial and lateral gutter of the left ankle. Authorization was requested for topical LidoPro cream.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Topical Lidopro cream, 4oz tube #2: 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 Capsaicin Topical Section, Topical Analgesics Section Page(s): 28, 29, 111-113.

Decision rationale: Lidopro ointment contains the active ingredients methyl salicylate 27.5%, capsaicin 0.0375%, lidocaine 4.5% and menthol 10%. Salicylate topical is recommended by the MTUS Guidelines, as it is significantly better than placebo in chronic pain. The MTUS Guidelines recommend the use of topical capsaicin only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. There have been no studies of a 0.0375% formulation of capsaicin and there is no current evidence that this increase over a 0.025% formulation would provide any further efficacy. Topical lidocaine is used primarily for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. Topical lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch (Lidoderm) has been designated for orphan status by the FDA for neuropathic pain. Lidoderm is also used off-label for diabetic neuropathy. No other commercially approved topical formulations of lidocaine (whether creams, lotions or gels) are indicated for neuropathic pain. Non-dermal patch formulations are generally indicated as local anesthetics and anti-pruritics. Menthol is not addressed by the MTUS Guidelines, but it is often included in formulations of anesthetic agents. It induces tingling and cooling sensations when applied topically. Menthol induces analgesia through calcium channel-blocking actions, as well as binding to kappa-opioid receptors. Menthol is also an effective topical permeation enhancer for water-soluble drugs. There are reports of negative effects from high doses of menthol such as 40% preparations. The use of topical analgesics are recommended by the MTUS Guidelines as an option for the treatment of chronic pain, however, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. In regards to Lidopro cream, the use of capsaicin at 0.0375% and topical lidocaine not in a dermal patch formulation are not recommended by the MTUS Guidelines, therefore, the request for topical lidopro cream, 4oz tube #2 is determined to not be medically necessary.