

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0035918		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	03/04/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/24/1997
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/13/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	02/14/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/25/2015

### 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: New Jersey, Michigan, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 64 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 09/24/1997. He has reported subsequent wrist and back pain and was diagnosed with carpal tunnel syndrome, adjustment reaction with prolonged depressive reaction and lumbar stenosis. Treatment to date has included oral and topical pain medication and surgery. In a progress note dated 01/08/2015, the injured worker complained of continued neck, right arm, low back, bilateral leg and left elbow pain that was rated as 7-7.5 /10. Objective physical examination findings were notable for a slow antalgic gait. A request for authorization of Flector patch was made. On 02/14/2015, Utilization Review non-certified a request for Flector patch, noting that the medication is not recommended to be used long-term. MTUS and ODG guidelines were cited.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Flector patches, #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111.

**Decision rationale:** Flector patch is a topical non steroid anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID). According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111), topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. That is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. There is no documentation that the patient failed oral NSAID or oral pain medication. The effect of the patient psychiatric condition on the patient pain perception and on the number of pain medications used should be objectively evaluated. Based on the patient's records, the prescription of Flector Patches #30 is not medically necessary.