

Case Number:	CM14-0185037		
Date Assigned:	11/12/2014	Date of Injury:	12/30/2013
Decision Date:	12/19/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/13/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/05/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

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 applicant is a represented [REDACTED] employee who has filed a claim for chronic low back pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of December 30, 2013. Thus far, the applicant has been treated with the following: Analgesic medications; transfer of care to and from various providers in various specialties; trigger point injection therapy; and unspecified amounts of physical therapy over the course of the claim. In a Utilization Review Report dated November 1, 2014, the claims administrator retrospectively denied prescriptions for Medrox patches apparently dispensed on September 18, 2014. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. In a September 18, 2014 progress note, the applicant reported ongoing complaints of low back pain with associated spasms. The applicant was using Medrox and Tylenol No. 3 for pain relief. It was stated that the applicant was working full duty in one section of the note. The applicant was asked to try and lose weight. Trigger point injections were administered in the clinic setting. On August 21, 2014, the applicant was reportedly using Motrin and Tylenol No. 3 for pain relief. It was again stated that the applicant was working full duty at this point in time.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective request for Medrox 5x, Qty: 5 (DOS: 9/18/14): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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

Decision rationale: As noted on page 111 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, topical analgesics such as Medrox, as a class, are deemed "largely experimental." In this case, the applicant's ongoing usage of multiple first-line oral pharmaceuticals, including Motrin and Tylenol No. 3 effectively obviated the need for the largely experimental Medrox patches. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective request for Medrox 120 gm, Qty: 2 (DOS: 9/18/14): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Capsaicin Page(s): 28. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation National Library of Medicine (NLM), Medrox Medication Guide

Decision rationale: Medrox, per the National Library of Medicine (NLM), is an amalgam of menthol, capsaicin, and methyl salicylate. While page 28 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines notes that capsaicin, one of the primary ingredients in the compound at question, is recommended only as an option in applicants who have not responded to or are intolerant to other treatments, in this case, however, the applicant's ongoing usage of multiple first-line oral pharmaceuticals, including Motrin and Tylenol No. 3, effectively obviated the need for the capsaicin-containing Medrox patches at issue. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.