

Case Number:	CM15-0200239		
Date Assigned:	10/15/2015	Date of Injury:	02/24/2012
Decision Date:	12/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/13/2015

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 49-year-old who has filed a claim for chronic shoulder, wrist, upper extremity, and neck pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of February 24, 2012. In a Utilization Review report dated September 17, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for a topical compounded agent. Norco, conversely, was approved. The claims administrator referenced an August 28, 2015 office visit in its determination. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On said August 28, 2015 office visit, the applicant reported ongoing complaints of neck pain, headaches, wrist pain, and upper extremity paresthesias. The applicant was using a variety of medications to include Motrin and tizanidine. The topical compounded agent in question was endorsed while the applicant was placed off of work, on total temporary disability. Norco was also prescribed.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Topical compound: Sumatriptan 10% Apomorphine 0.2% Cyclobenzaprine 2% Baclofen 2% Ondansetron 1% Bupivacaine 5%, 180gm cream, apply a thin layer to affected area:
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 sumatriptan-apomorphine-cyclobenzaprine-baclofen-containing topical compound was not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. As noted on page 113 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, muscle relaxants such as cyclobenzaprine, i.e., the tertiary ingredient in the compound in question, are not recommended for topical compound formulation purposes. Page 113 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines also notes that baclofen, i.e., the quaternary ingredient in the compound, is likewise not recommended for topical compound formulation purposes. Since one or more ingredients in the compound was not recommended, the entire compound was not recommended, 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 to include Motrin, Pamelor, tizanidine, Norco, etc., 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.