

Case Number:	CM15-0011824		
Date Assigned:	02/24/2015	Date of Injury:	02/11/2012
Decision Date:	03/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/30/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/20/2015

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: North Carolina
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 48 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 2/11/2012. He has reported an index finger cut off by a meat slicer with subsequent reattachment. The diagnoses have included status post finger reattachment and post traumatic stress disorder. Treatment to date has included Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs), analgesic, muscle relaxer, and post operative physical therapy. Currently, the Injured Worker complains of a sensation of pins sticking into the finger. The provider documented x-ray imaging results revealed loose foreign bodies thought to be metallic pieces/hardware embedded in the soft tissue and complete bone healing. The physical examination from 11/18/14 documented atrophy of the left hand index finger, palpable lumps underneath the skin at the PIP joint, and decreased sensation of left nieces finger distal to attachment. The plan of care included a follow up with the surgeon, changing ibuprofen to naproxen. On 12/30/2014 Utilization Review non-certified a compound cream (Ketoprofen 10%/Cyclobenzaprine 3%/Capsaicin 0.0375%/Menthol 2%/Camphor 1%/Lipoderm Base) and the dispensing fee, noting the MTUS Guidelines. On 1/20/2015, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of compound cream (Ketoprofen 10%/Cyclobenzaprine 3%/Capsaicin 0.0375%/Menthol 2%/Camphor 1%/Lipoderm Base) and the dispensing fee.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective request:Compound Cream: 1. Ketoprofen 10% 2. Cyclo 3% 3. Capsaicino .0375% 4. Menthol 2% 5. Camphor 1% 6. Lipoderm Base (DOS 11/18/14): Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on topical analgesics states: 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. The requested medication is a combination of ingredients. These ingredients are not listed in the California MTUS as recommended agents to be used as topical analgesics. Therefore criteria as set forth in the California MTUS have not been met and the request is not certified.