

Case Number:	CM15-0199633		
Date Assigned:	10/14/2015	Date of Injury:	06/16/2014
Decision Date:	12/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/12/2015

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, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

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 36-year-old female injured worker suffered an industrial injury on 6-16-2014. The diagnoses included cervical myospasms, sprain-strain, lumbar myospasms, and sprain-strain and right wrist sprain-strain. On 8-28-2015 the treating provider reported cervical spine pain rated 4 out of 10, lumbar spine pain rated 8 to 9 out of 10 radiating to the right extremity with numbness and tingling and right wrist pain that was minimal. On exam the lumbar spine had restricted range of motion with straight raise on the right. Prior treatment included acupuncture, physical therapy 12 sessions and epidural steroid injections. Request for Authorization date was 8-28- 2015. The Utilization Review on 9-9-2015 determined non-certification for Flurbiprofen 20%, Lidocaine 5%, and Amitriptyline 5% 240gms.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Flurbiprofen 20%, Lidocaine 5%, Amitriptyline 5% 240gms: 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: Per MTUS with regard to Flurbiprofen (p112), "(Biswal, 2006) These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder." Flurbiprofen may be indicated. Per the article "Topical Analgesics in the Management of Acute and Chronic Pain" published in Mayo Clinic Proceedings (Vol 88, Issue 2, p 195-205), "Studies in healthy volunteers demonstrated that topical amitriptyline at concentrations of 50 and 100 mmol/L produced a significant analgesic effect ($P<.05$) when compared with placebo and was associated with transient increases in tactile and mechanical nociceptive thresholds." Amitriptyline may be indicated. With regard to lidocaine MTUS p 112 states "Further research is needed to recommend this treatment for chronic neuropathic pain disorders and other than post-herpetic neuralgia" and "Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. There is only one trial that tested 4% lidocaine for treatment of chronic muscle pain. The results showed there was no superiority over placebo. (Scudds, 1995)" The injured worker has not been diagnosed with post-herpetic neuralgia. Lidocaine is not indicated. The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that topical medications are "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, α -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." Regarding the use of multiple medications, MTUS p60 states "Only one medication should be given at a time, and interventions that are active and passive should remain unchanged at the time of the medication change. A trial should be given for each individual medication. Analgesic medications should show effects within 1 to 3 days, and the analgesic effect of antidepressants should occur within 1 week. A record of pain and function with the medication should be recorded. (Mens, 2005) The recent AHRQ review of comparative effectiveness and safety of analgesics for osteoarthritis concluded that each of the analgesics was associated with a unique set of benefits and risks, and no currently available analgesic was identified as offering a clear overall advantage compared with the others." Therefore, it would be optimal to trial each medication individually. Because lidocaine is not indicated, the compound is not recommended. This request is not medically necessary.