

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0148488		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/11/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/17/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/09/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/13/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/30/2015

### 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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

### 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 52-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on September 17, 2010. The initial symptoms reported by the injured worker are unknown. The injured worker was currently diagnosed as having overuse syndrome, bilateral CTS release, adjustment disorder, chronic pain syndrome, bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome and bilateral epicondylitis - lateral. Treatment to date has included home exercises, physical therapy and medications. On June 3, 2015, the injured worker complained of neck pain and lower back pain that was unchanged since a prior exam. She rated her pain as an 8 on a 1-10 pain scale. The treatment plan included home exercises, physical therapy and medications. On July 13, 2015, Utilization Review non-certified the request for compound cream: Ketoprofen 10%, Cyclobenzaprine 2%, Ketamine 5%, Lidocaine 75%, citing California MTUS Guidelines.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Compound Cream - Ketoprofen 10%, Cyclobenzaprine 2%, Ketamine 5%, Lidocaine 75%:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics.

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

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on topical analgesics states: Recommended as an option as indicated below. Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. (Namaka, 2004) These agents are applied locally to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. (Colombo, 2006) Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control (including NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics, antidepressants, glutamate receptor antagonists, adrenergic receptor agonist, adenosine, cannabinoids, cholinergic receptor agonists, agonists, prostanoids, bradykinin, adenosine triphosphate, biogenic amines, and nerve growth factor). (Argoff, 2006) There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. The requested medication contains ingredients (cyclobenzaprine), which are not indicated per the California MTUS for topical analgesic use. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.