

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0034802		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	03/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/21/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/08/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/30/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

### 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 male who sustained an industrial injury on 06/21/2012. Current diagnosis was not provided. Previous treatments included medication management and extracorporeal shockwave therapy. Report dated 10/17/2014 noted that the injured worker presented with complaints that included headache, cervical pain, thoracic pain, and lumbar pain. Pain level was rated as 7 out of 10 on the visual analog scale (VAS). Physical examination was positive for abnormal findings. Utilization review performed on 01/30/2015 non-certified a prescription for Retrospective flurbiprofen/capsaicin/menthol/camphor, gabapentin / Amitriptyline / lidocaine / capsaicin, based on the clinical information submitted does not support medical necessity. The reviewer referenced the California MTUS in making this decision.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Retrospective flurbiprofen / capsaicin / menthol / camphor, gabapentin / amitriptyline / lidocaine / capsaicin:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 112-113, 121-122.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

**Decision rationale:** Analgesics states: Recommended as an option as indicated below. Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. (Namaka, 2004) These agents are applied locally to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. (Colombo, 2006) Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control (including NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics, antidepressants, glutamate receptor antagonists, adrenergic receptor agonist, adenosine, cannabinoids, cholinergic receptor agonists, agonists, prostanoids, bradykinin, adenosine triphosphate, biogenic amines, and nerve growth factor). (Argoff, 2006) 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 recommended. The requested medication contains multiple ingredients, which are not indicated per the California MTUS for topical analgesic use. Therefore the request is not certified.