

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0201328		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/16/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/26/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	12/02/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/23/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/14/2015

### 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 [REDACTED] beneficiary who has filed a claim for chronic low back pain (LBP) reportedly associated with an industrial injury of March 26, 2012. In a Utilization Review report dated September 23, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for several topical compounded medications. A September 4, 2015 office visit was referenced in its determination. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On June 6, 2015, the applicant was placed off of work, on total temporary disability owing to ongoing complaints of mid and low back pain with derivative complaints of sleep disturbance, moderate-to-severe. Multiple dietary supplements, topical compounds, localized intense neurostimulation therapy, and extracorporeal shockwave therapy were endorsed while the applicant was seemingly kept off of work.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Compound HMPC2 240 grams:** 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 topical compounded HMPC-2 containing compound was not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. As noted on page 111 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, topical analgesics such as the compound in question are, as a class, are deemed "largely experimental." Here, the attending provider's documentation was highly templated and did not clearly state what the MTUS Guideline in ACOEM Chapter 3, page 47 considers first-line oral pharmaceuticals could not be employed in favor of the largely experimental topical compounded agent in question. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.

**Compound HNPC1 240 grams:** 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:** Similarly, the request for topical compounded HNPC-1 compound was likewise not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. As noted page 111 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, topical analgesics such as the compound in question, as a class, are deemed "largely experimental." Here, the attending provider did not state what the MTUS Guideline in ACOEM Chapter 3, page 47 considers first-line oral pharmaceuticals could not be employed in favor of the largely experimental topical compounded agent at issue. Little-to-no rationale accompanied the request for the compound in question. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.