

Case Number:	CM15-0062150		
Date Assigned:	04/08/2015	Date of Injury:	12/08/2010
Decision Date:	05/07/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/01/2015

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: Texas, Florida, California

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 is a 42-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 12/8/2010. Diagnoses have included cervical spine sprain/strain, right shoulder impingement syndrome and right carpal tunnel syndrome. Treatment to date has included right shoulder surgery, physical therapy, acupuncture, cortisone injections and medication. According to the progress report dated 2/2/2015, the injured worker noted improvement in right shoulder pain following surgery. She continued to be symptomatic with right carpal tunnel syndrome. She complained of numbness and tingling. She also reported ongoing neck pain, anxiety and depression. Current medications included Norco and Amitriptyline. She rated her pain as 4/10 with medications and 7/10 without medication. Physical exam revealed right sided cervical paraspinal tenderness that radiated into the right trapezius muscle, levator scapula and rhomboid. There was palpable muscle spasm present. There was persistent Tinel's sign in the right wrist. Authorization was requested for KGL cream (Ketoprofen/Gabapentin/Lidocaine).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

KGL Cream 360 gm (Ketoprofen/Gabapentin/Lidocaine): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 & 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 111 of 127.

Decision rationale: This claimant was injured 5 years ago, and improved with surgery. There is no mention of GI issues. The topical apparently would be applied to the neck and wrist. Per the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 & 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page 111 of 127, the MTUS notes topical analgesic compounds are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Experimental treatments should not be used for claimant medical care. MTUS notes they are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed, but in this case, it is not clear what primary medicines had been tried and failed. In addition, 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 certifiable. This compounded medicine contains several medicines untested in the peer review literature for effectiveness of use topically. Moreover, the MTUS notes that 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. The provider did not describe each of the agents, and how they would be useful in this claimant's case for specific goals. The request is appropriately not medically necessary.