

Case Number:	CM15-0034730		
Date Assigned:	03/03/2015	Date of Injury:	02/26/2014
Decision Date:	04/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/27/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/24/2015

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 41-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury reported on 2/26/2014. She reported for a post-operative, and post physical therapy - back, follow-up, with complaints of continued significant pain in the left great toe, causing significant limitations, and low back pain. The diagnoses were noted to include lumbago; chronic low back pain; left hip bursitis; SS foot - left and left hallux rigidus; sprain/strain of sacroiliac joint; and degenerative disc disease - lumbar. Treatments to date have included consultations; diagnostic imaging studies; lower extremity Doppler studies; right hand carpal tunnel surgery (4/2014); left great toe medial collateral ligament repair (9/30/14); 12 physical therapy sessions - back; brace; use of cane and walker; and medication management. The work status classification for this injured worker (IW) was noted to have been returned to work with modified duties. On 1/27/2015, Utilization Review (UR) non-certified, for medical necessity, the request, made on 1/21/2015, for Terocin patches #30, with 1 refill, for the low back. The Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule, chronic pain medical treatment guidelines, specific opioids, Tramadol, weaning of medications, opioids for chronic pain; and the Official Disability Guidelines, chronic pain, were cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Terocin patches #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 60, 111-113.

Decision rationale: Terocin patches are a compound consisting of capsaicin, methyl salicylate, menthol, and capsaicin. Capsaicin may have an indication for low 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." Methyl salicylate may have an indication for chronic pain in this context. Per MTUS p105, "Recommended. Topical salicylate (e.g., Ben-Gay, methyl salicylate) is significantly better than placebo in chronic pain." (Mason-BMJ, 2004) However, the CA MTUS, ODG, National Guidelines Clearinghouse, and ACOEM provide no evidence-based recommendations regarding the topical application of menthol. 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 menthol is 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. As such, this request for Terocin patches is not medically necessary. 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.