MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0208386		
Date Assigned:	10/27/2015	Date of Injury:	09/24/2014
Decision Date:	12/09/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/22/2015

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, Florida, 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 injured worker is a 57 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 9-24-14. A review of the medical records indicates that the worker is undergoing treatment for left forefoot crush injury and left talonavicular sprain and imbalance; left foot. Subjective complaints (7-13-15) include pain in the left great toe and the dorsum of the left foot (rated 4 out of 10 and as high as 8 out of 10 without medications) and "numbness-weirdness" in the third toe. It is noted she is unable to take oral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs due to marked stomach upset; therefore topicals have been requested. Objective findings (7-13-15) of the foot and ankle include an abnormal gait, limited range of motion, and mild tenderness to palpation. The physician notes (9- 24-15) current medications are Tramadol HCL-APAP 325-37.5mg #60 and Lido Hydrochloride HCL 3% 30 ml. and that these medications provide an adjunctive therapy to the ongoing treatment plan; therefore allowing modified work activity. The requested treatment of Lido Hydrochloride HCL 3% 30ml x1 was denied 10-5-15.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lido hydrochloride HCL 3%, 30ml x1: 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: There was a crush injury to the foot. She is unable to take topical medicines due to gastrointestinal upset. LidoPro is a combination of Capsaicin 0.0325%, Lidocaine 4.5%, Menthol 10%, and the primary component is the topical analgesic, Methyl Salicylate 27.5%. The MTUS notes topical analgesic compounds are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Experimental treatments should not be used for claimant medical care. MTUS notes they are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed, but in this case, it is not clear what primary medicines had been tried and failed. Also, 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 certifiable. This compounded medicine contains several medicines untested in the peer review literature for effectiveness of use topically. Moreover, the MTUS notes that the use of these compounded agents requires knowledge of the specific analgesic effect of each agent and how it will be useful for the specific therapeutic goal required. The provider did not describe each of the agents, and how they would be useful in this claimant's case for specific goals. The request is appropriately not medically necessary.