

Case Number:	CM15-0216555		
Date Assigned:	11/06/2015	Date of Injury:	10/11/2011
Decision Date:	12/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/03/2015

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: Massachusetts

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 37 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 10-11-2011. The injured worker is undergoing treatment for shoulder impingement. Medical records dated 9-30-2015 indicate the injured worker complains of left shoulder pain rated 7 out of 10. Physical exam dated 9-30-2015 notes left shoulder decreased range of motion (ROM), tenderness to palpation, spasm and positive impingement. Treatment to date has included surgery, physical therapy and medication. The original utilization review dated 10-12-2015 indicates the request for Restoril 7.5mg #30 is certified and Compound HNPC1: Amitriptyline HCL (hydrochloride) 10%, Gabapentin 10%. Bupivacaine HCL (hydrochloride) 5%, Hyaluronic Acid 0.2% in cream base 240 gm and compound HMPC2 - Flurbiprofen 20%, Baclofen 10%, Dexamethasone micro 0.2%, Hyaluronic acid 0.2% in cream base 240 grams is non-certified.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Compound HNPC1: Amitriptyline HCL (hydrochloride) 10%, Gabapentin 10%.
Bupivacaine HCL (hydrochloride) 5%, Hyaluronic Acid 0.2% in cream base, Qty 240 gm:
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: According to the MTUS, there is little to no research to support the use of topical compounded creams. 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. Topical analgesics are largely experimental and there are a few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and the request is not medically necessary and has not been established.

Compound HMPC2 - Flurbiprofen 20%, Baclofen 10%, Dexamethasone micro 0.2%, Hyaluronic acid 0.2% in cream base, 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 Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS, there is little to no research to support the use of topical compounded creams. 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. Topical analgesics are largely experimental and there are a few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and the request is not medically necessary and has not been established.