

Case Number:	CM15-0202023		
Date Assigned:	10/16/2015	Date of Injury:	01/16/2013
Decision Date:	12/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/18/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	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: 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 injured worker is a 44 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on January 16, 2013. She reported injury to her neck, hands and low back. The injured worker was currently diagnosed as having cervical sprain and strain, carpal tunnel syndrome and lumbar spine discopathy. Treatment to date has included chiropractic treatment with benefit, acupuncture therapy with benefit and medication. On July 9, 2015, notes stated that she was taking Advil and Aleve as needed, which were both noted to be helping. On September 4, 2015, the injured worker complained of ongoing neck pain rated a 4-5 on a 1-10 pain scale. She reported a constant, sharp-like sensation with numbness and tingling to her cervical spine as well as her upper back. She complained of stabbing pain in her hip rated an 8 on the pain scale and stabbing pain in her thumb rated a 9 on the pain scale. She was noted to be taking Motrin on an as needed basis. The treatment plan included eight visits of physical therapy for the cervical spine, transdermal cream and a follow-up visit. On September 18, 2015, utilization review denied a request for flurbiprofen-gabapentin-capsaicin-camphor-menthol 10-10-0.025-2-2%.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Flurbiprofen/gabapentin/capsaicin/camphor/menthol 10/10/0.025/2/2%: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS guidelines, capsaicin is recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. Capsaicin may have an indication for chronic lower back pain in this context. Per MTUS p 112 "Indications: There are positive randomized studies with capsaicin cream in patients with osteoarthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic non-specific back pain, but it should be considered experimental in very high doses. Although topical capsaicin has moderate to poor efficacy, it may be particularly useful (alone or in conjunction with other modalities) in patients whose pain has not been controlled successfully with conventional therapy." 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." The documentation contains no evidence of osteoarthritis or tendinitis. Flurbiprofen is not indicated. Per MTUS p113 with regard to topical gabapentin: "Not recommended. There is no peer-reviewed literature to support use." 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. The CA MTUS, ODG, National Guidelines Clearinghouse, and ACOEM provide no evidence-based recommendations regarding the topical application of menthol or camphor. It is the opinion of this IMR reviewer that a lack of endorsement, a lack of mention, inherently implies a lack of recommendation, or a status equivalent to "not recommended". Since several components are not medically indicated, then the overall product is not indicated per MTUS as outlined below. Note the statement on page 111: Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. The request is not medically necessary.