

Case Number:	CM15-0137449		
Date Assigned:	07/27/2015	Date of Injury:	06/16/2011
Decision Date:	08/27/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/15/2015

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: Texas, New York, 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 applicant is a represented 53-year-old who has filed a claim for chronic foot and ankle pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of June 16, 2011. In a Utilization Review report dated July 8, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for a topical compounded LidoPro cream. The claims administrator referenced an RFA form received on July 2, 2015 in its determination. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On July 6, 2015, the applicant was placed off of work, on total temporary disability, owing to ongoing complaints of ankle pain status post ankle arthroscopy and ligament repair surgery. A topical antibiotic and oral Percocet were endorsed while the applicant was placed off of work. There was no mention of topical LidoPro's being employed on this date. In a May 26, 2015 progress note, topical LidoPro was dispensed.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Topical Lidopro cream 4 ounce tube x 2 Qty: 2.00: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 111-112.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Capsaicin, topical Page(s): 28. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation LIDOPRO (capsaicin, lidocaine, menthol, and ... - DailyMed
dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/archives/fdaDrugInfo.cfmarchiveid.Dec 1, 2012 - LIDOPRO-capsaicin, lidocaine, menthol and methyl salicylate ointment.

Decision rationale: No, the request for topical LidoPro was not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. LidoPro, per the National Library of Medicine, is an amalgam of capsaicin, lidocaine, menthol, and methyl salicylate. However, page 28 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines notes that topical capsaicin, the primary ingredient in the LidoPro compound, is not recommended except as a last-line agent, for applicants who have not responded to or are intolerant of other treatments. Here, however, the applicant's ongoing usage of first-line oral pharmaceuticals to include oral Percocet effectively obviated the need for the capsaicin-containing LidoPro compound in question. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.