

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0193716		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/07/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/16/2015
<b>Decision Date:</b>	11/23/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/04/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/02/2015

### 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 34-year-old who has filed a claim for chronic low back pain (LPB) reportedly associated with an industrial injury of April 16, 2015. In a Utilization Review report dated September 4, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for several topical compounded agents. The claims administrator referenced a July 29, 2015 office visit and an associated RFA form in the determination. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On September 2, 2015, Neurontin, Percocet, Protonix and the topical compound in question were endorsed to ameliorate ongoing issues with 9 ½/10 low back pain. On August 20, 2015, the applicant was placed off of work, on total temporary disability. On July 15, 2015, the applicant was again placed off of work, on total temporary disability, while acupuncture was endorsed.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**240 Grams Flurbiprofen 20 Percent, Baclofen 10 Percent, Dexamethasone .2 Percent and Hyaluronic Acid .2 Percent: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS General Approaches 2004, Section(s): Initial Approaches to Treatment, and Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

**Decision rationale:** No, the request for a flurbiprofen-baclofen-dexamethasone-containing topical compound was not necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. As noted on page 113 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, baclofen, the secondary ingredient in the compound, is not recommended for topical compound formulation purposes. This result in the entire compound's an unfavorable recommendation, per page 111 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines. The applicant's concomitant usage of what the MTUS Guideline in ACOEM Chapter 3, page 47 considers first-line oral pharmaceuticals such as Percocet, moreover, effectively obviated the need for what page 111 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines considers largely experimental topical compounds such as the agent in question. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.

**240 Grams Amitriptyline 10 Percent, Gabapentin 10 Percent, Bupivacaine 5 Percent and Hyaluronic Acid .2 Percent: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

**Decision rationale:** Similarly, the request for an amitriptyline-gabapentin-bupivacaine-containing topical compound was likewise not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. As noted on page 113 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, gabapentin, i.e., the secondary ingredient in the compound, is not recommended for topical compound formulation purposes. Since one or more ingredients in the compound were not recommended, the entire compound was not recommended, per page 111 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.