MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0102867		
Date Assigned:	06/05/2015	Date of Injury:	09/09/2014
Decision Date:	07/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/07/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/28/2015

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: New York
Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology

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 33 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/9/14. The injured worker has complaints of frequent mid back pain; occasional rib pain; frequent low back pain that radiates to the bilateral lower extremities with numbness and tingling. The documentation noted that there are spasms along the thoracic paravertebral muscles and straight leg raise was positive bilaterally. The diagnoses have included thoracic spine sprain/strain; rib cage sprain/strain; lumbar spine strain/sprain; lumbar spine myalgia/myositis and lumbar radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included topical creams/patches help decrease pain and oral medications and physical therapy. The request was for terocin 120ml; capsaicin 0.25 percent, flurbi (nap) cream-la 180grams; gabacyclotram 180 grams; terocin pain patch #20; physical therapy, spine two times six and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the thoracic and lumbar spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Terocin 120ml: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: According to the California MTUS Guidelines, topical analgesics are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. These agents are applied topically to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control including, for example, NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics or antidepressants. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. In this case, there is no documentation provided necessitating Terocin. This medication contains methyl salicylate, capsaicin, menthol, and lidocaine. MTUS states that capsaicin is recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. There is no documentation of intolerance to other previous oral medications. Medical necessity for the requested topical medication has not been established. The requested treatment is not medically necessary.

Capsaicin 0.25%, Flurbi (nap) cream-la 180gm: 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 Topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: According to the California MTUS Guidelines (2009), topical analgesics are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. These agents are applied topically to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control including, for example, NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics or antidepressants. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. In this case, there is no documentation provided necessitating a Capsaicin/Flurbi (NAP) cream. This topical cream contains: Capsaicin 0.25%, Flurbiprofen 20%, Tramadol 10%, and Cyclo-benzaprine 6%. There is no documentation of intolerance to other previous oral medications. Flurbiprofen, used as a topical NSAID, has been shown in a meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the first two weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis but either not afterward, or with diminishing effect, over another two-week period. In addition, Tramadol is not FDA approved for a topical application. Medical necessity for the requested topical compounded medication has not been established. The requested compounded topical analgesic cream is not medically necessary.

Gabacyclotram 180gms: 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 Topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: According to the California MTUS Guidelines (2009), topical analgesics are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. These agents are applied topically to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control including, for example, NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, muscle relaxants, local anesthetics or antidepressants. Guidelines indicate that any compounded product that contains at least 1 non-recommended drug (or drug class) is not recommended for use. In this case, the requested compounded topical agent is Gabapentin, Cyclobenzaprine, Tramadol (GabaCycloTram) cream. Cyclobenzaprine is not FDA approved for use as a topical application. There is no evidence for the use of any muscle relaxant as a topical agent. In addition, Gabapentin and Tramadol are not FDA approved for a topical application. There is no peer-reviewed literature to support its use. Medical necessity for the requested compounded topical analgesic cream has not been established. The request for the compounded topical analgesic agent is not medically necessary.

Terocin pain patch #20: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: According to the California MTUS Guidelines, topical analgesics are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. These agents are applied topically to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control including, for example, NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics or antidepressants. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. In this case, there is no documentation provided necessitating Terocin patches. This medication contains methyl salicylate, capsaicin, menthol, and lidocaine. MTUS states that capsaicin is recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. There is no documentation of intolerance to other previous oral medications. Medical necessity for the requested topical medication has not been established. The requested treatment is not medically necessary.

Physical therapy-spine 2 x 6: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical medicine Page(s): 98-99.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Therapy Page(s): 98. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Physical Therapy: Low Back Pain.

Decision rationale: According to the California MTUS Treatment guidelines, physical therapy (PT) is indicated for the treatment of musculoskeletal pain. Recommendations state that for most patients with more severe and sub-acute low back pain conditions, 8 to12 visits over a period of 6 to 8 weeks is indicated as long as functional improvement and program progression are documented. Active therapy is based on the philosophy that therapeutic exercise and/or activity are beneficial for restoring flexibility, strength, endurance, function, range of motion, and can alleviate discomfort. Patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Home exercise can include exercise with or without mechanical assistance or resistance and functional activities with assisting devices. In this case, the patient has completed a total of 18 physical therapy sessions. There is no documentation indicating that he had a defined functional improvement in his condition. There is no specific indication for the requested additional PT sessions. Medical necessity for the requested sessions has not been established. The requested PT is not medically necessary.

MRI of the thoracic and lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints,Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines MRI L/S spine Page(s): 304.

Decision rationale: According to the ACOEM Guidelines, most true neck and upper back problems, special studies, such as an MRI (magnetic resonance imaging), are not indicated unless a neurologic deficit is documented on physical exam, failure to progress in a strengthening program, or for clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. In this case, an MRI of the thoracic spine was obtained on 11/4/14. There is no documentation of any new neurological deficits related to the thoracic spine to necessitate a repeat MRI of the thoracic spine. Medical necessity for the requested imaging study is not established. The requested imaging study is not medically necessary. According to California MTUS Guidelines, an MRI of the lumbar spine is recommended to evaluate for evidence of cauda equina, tumor, infection, or fracture when plain films are negative and neurologic abnormalities are present on physical exam. In this case, there is no indication for a repeat MRI of the lumbar spine. The documentation indicates that the claimant had an MRI of the lumbar spine on 14/4/14. There are no new subjective complaints of increased back pain, radiculopathy, bowel or bladder incontinence, and there are no new neurologic findings on physical exam. Therefore, there is no specific indication for a repeat MRI of the lumbar spine. Medical necessity for the requested MRI has not been established. The requested imaging is not medically necessary.