

Case Number:	CM15-0083065		
Date Assigned:	05/05/2015	Date of Injury:	08/04/2014
Decision Date:	06/04/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/30/2015

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 35 year old male injured worker suffered an industrial injury on 08/04/2014. The diagnoses included right shoulder joint pain and right AC joint arthritis. The injured worker had been treated medications and home exercise program. On 2/11/2015, the treating provider reported with pain that was burning and throbbing in nature. The pain was rated 6/10. On exam, there was tenderness of the AC joint and reduced range of motion. The treatment plan included Terocin patch.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retro Terocin patch #10, DOS: 2/11/15: Upheld

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

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 based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: Physician Desk Reference, under Terocin.

Decision rationale: Per the PDR, Terocin is a topical agent that contains: Methyl Salicylate 25%, Capsaicin 0.025%, Menthol 10%, Lidocaine 2.50%. The MTUS Chronic Pain section notes: Salicylate topical. Recommended. Topical salicylate (e.g., Ben-Gay, methyl salicylate) is significantly better than placebo in chronic pain. (Mason-BMJ, 2004) See also Topical analgesics; & Topical analgesics, compounded. Topical Analgesics: 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. Capsaicin: 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. These agents however are all over the counter; the need for a prescription combination is not validated. The request is appropriately non-certified under MTUS criteria. The request is not medically necessary.