

Case Number:	CM15-0049629		
Date Assigned:	03/23/2015	Date of Injury:	08/09/2012
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/16/2015

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: Indiana

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 (IW) is a 66 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 08/09/2012. He reported back pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having chronic low back pain, lumbar degenerative disc disease, moderate-to-severe spinal stenosis, bilateral neuroforaminal stenosis at L5-S1, lumbar strain, and lumbar myofascial pain. Treatment to date has included oral and topical medications, physical therapy and a home exercise program. Currently, the injured worker complains of chronic low back pain. The plan of care includes encouraging the worker to continue his home exercise program, and a request for authorization was made for 1 Lidocaine ointment 5% with 3 refills, and 1 Tube of Voltaren Gel 1% with 3 refills.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 Tube of Voltaren Gel 1% with 3 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topicals Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Compound creams.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG recommends usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details "primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed." The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, "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." MTUS specifically states for Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac) that it is "Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist). It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder." Medical records do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis pain in the joints. Additionally, the records indicate that the treatment area would be for the lower back. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

1 Lidocaine ointment 5% with 3 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topicals Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Compound creams.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG recommends usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details "primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed." The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, "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." ODG also states that topical lidocaine is appropriate in usage as patch under certain criteria, but that "no other commercially approved topical formulations of lidocaine (whether creams, lotions or gels) are indicated for neuropathic pain." MTUS states regarding lidocaine, "Neuropathic pain Recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica)." MTUS indicates lidocaine "Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended." The medical records do not indicate failure of first-line therapy for neuropathic pain and lidocaine is also not indicated for non-neuropathic pain. ODG states regarding lidocaine topical patch, "This is not a first-line treatment and is only FDA approved for post-herpetic neuralgia." Medical documents do not document the patient as having post-herpetic neuralgia. Therefore, the request for lidocaine ointment is not medically necessary.