

Case Number:	CM15-0233128		
Date Assigned:	12/08/2015	Date of Injury:	04/01/2013
Decision Date:	01/20/2016	UR Denial Date:	10/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/30/2015

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: California, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This 42 year old male sustained an industrial injury on 4-1-13. Documentation indicated that the injured worker was receiving treatment for lumbosacral strain with history of L4-5 degenerative disc bulge. Previous treatment included physical therapy, acupuncture, chiropractic therapy, tenderness to palpation, medial branch block and medications. On 5-28-15, the injured worker reported having 80% improvement to his global symptoms following trigger point injections and medial branch block on 11-19-14. In a PR-2 dated 8-13-15, the injured worker reported that he had marked worsening of his back pain. Physical exam was remarkable for tenderness to palpation at L4-S1 with "marked and active" trigger points on the right and at the right superior iliac crest with "diminished" range of motion due to pain. The treatment plan included requesting authorization for trigger point injections. In a PR-2 dated 10-2-15, the injured worker still had not received approval for trigger point injections. Physical exam was unchanged. The physician stated that at this point, the injured worker's good results from medial branch blocks had worn off and that at this point, the injured worker's options were rhizotomy or fusion. The physician recommended topical compound creams in order to minimize the amount of oral medications. On 10-28-15, Utilization Review noncertified a request for Flurbiprofen 20%, Lidocaine 5% 150gm, Cyclobenzaprine 10%, Lidocaine 2% 150gm and Gabapentin 10%, Amitriptyline 5%, Capsaicin 0.025% 150gm.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Flurbiprofen 20% Lidocaine 5% 150gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Lidoderm (lidocaine patch).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS with regard to Flurbiprofen (p112), "(Biswal, 2006) these medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder." There was no indication for flurbiprofen. Regarding topical lidocaine, MTUS states (p112) "Neuropathic pain: Recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI antidepressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. There is only one trial that tested 4% lidocaine for treatment of chronic muscle pain. The results showed there was no superiority over placebo. (Scudds, 1995)" The injured worker has not been diagnosed with post-herpetic neuralgia. There is no evidence of trial of first-line therapy. Lidocaine is not indicated. The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that topical medications are 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, a-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. Regarding the use of multiple medications, MTUS p60 states only one medication should be given at a time, and interventions that are active and passive should remain unchanged at the time of the medication change. A trial should be given for each individual medication. Analgesic medications should show effects within 1 to 3 days, and the analgesic effect of antidepressants should occur within 1 week. A record of pain and function with the medication should be recorded. (Mens, 2005) The recent AHRQ review of comparative effectiveness and safety of analgesics for osteoarthritis concluded that each of the analgesics was associated with a unique set of benefits and risks, and no currently available analgesic was identified as offering a clear overall advantage compared with the others. Therefore, it would be optimal to trial each medication individually. Because lidocaine is not indicated, the compound is not recommended. This request is not medically necessary.

Cyclobenzaprine 10% Lidocaine 2% 150gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Lidoderm (lidocaine patch).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS CPMTG p113, "There is no evidence for use of any other muscle relaxant as a topical product. [Besides Baclofen, which is also not recommended]" Cyclobenzaprine is not indicated. Regarding topical lidocaine, MTUS states (p112) "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). Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. There is only one trial that tested 4% lidocaine for treatment of chronic muscle pain. The results showed there was no superiority over placebo. (Scudds, 1995)" The injured worker has not been diagnosed with post-herpetic neuralgia. There is no evidence of trial of first-line therapy. Lidocaine is not indicated. The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that topical medications are 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, α -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. Regarding the use of multiple medications, MTUS p60 states only one medication should be given at a time, and interventions that are active and passive should remain unchanged at the time of the medication change. A trial should be given for each individual medication. Analgesic medications should show effects within 1 to 3 days, and the analgesic effect of antidepressants should occur within 1 week. A record of pain and function with the medication should be recorded. (Mens, 2005) The recent AHRQ review of comparative effectiveness and safety of analgesics for osteoarthritis concluded that each of the analgesics was associated with a unique set of benefits and risks, and no currently available analgesic was identified as offering a clear overall advantage compared with the others. Therefore, it would be optimal to trial each medication individually. Because topical cyclobenzaprine is not indicated, the compound is not recommended. This request is not medically necessary.

Gabapentin 10% Amitriptyline 5% Capsaicin 0.025% 150gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Capsaicin, topical.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS p113 with regard to topical gabapentin: "Not recommended. There is no peer-reviewed literature to support use." Per the article "Topical Analgesics in the Management of Acute and Chronic Pain" published in Mayo Clinic Proceedings (Vol 88, Issue 2, p 195-205), "Studies in healthy volunteers demonstrated that topical amitriptyline at concentrations of 50 and 100 mmol/L produced a significant analgesic effect ($P < .05$) when compared with placebo and was associated with transient increases in tactile and mechanical nociceptive thresholds." Amitriptyline may be indicated. Per the MTUS guidelines, capsaicin is recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. Per MTUS p 112, Indications: There are positive randomized studies with capsaicin cream in patients with osteoarthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic non-specific back pain, but it should be considered experimental in very high doses. 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. Regarding the use of multiple medications, MTUS p60 states only one medication should be given at a time, and interventions that are active and passive should remain unchanged at the time of the medication change. A trial should be given for each individual medication. Analgesic medications should show effects within 1 to 3 days, and the analgesic effect of antidepressants should occur within 1 week. A record of pain and function with the medication should be recorded. (Mens, 2005) The recent AHRQ review of comparative effectiveness and safety of analgesics for osteoarthritis concluded that each of the analgesics was associated with a unique set of benefits and risks, and no currently available analgesic was identified as offering a clear overall advantage compared with the others. Therefore, it would be optimal to trial each medication individually. Note the statement on page 111: Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. As topical gabapentin is not recommended, the compound is not medically necessary.