

Case Number:	CM15-0112660		
Date Assigned:	06/19/2015	Date of Injury:	07/12/2002
Decision Date:	07/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/11/2015

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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 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:

The injured worker is a 70 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/12/02. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbago. Treatment to date has included lumbar epidural steroid injections, diagnostic injections in sacroiliac joints, oral medications including Vicoprofen and topical Terocin lidocaine patch. Currently, the injured worker complains of increased right sciatic or radicular pain through the right buttock and into the leg, rated 4-5/10. He notes continued improvement in activities of daily living and function. He is medically retired. Physical exam noted sciatic notch tenderness, worse on the right with focal tenderness over the facets and sacroiliac joints, a sensory deficit to light touch and restricted range of motion. A request for authorization was submitted for Vicoprofen, Zolpidem, Prilosec and Terocin 4% lidocaine patch #30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Terocin 4% Lidocaine patch Qty 30 (retrospective DOS 5/4/15): 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
Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Terocin, Terocin is a combination of methyl salicylate, menthol, lidocaine and capsaicin. Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. Regarding the use of topical non-steroidal anti-inflammatory, guidelines state that the efficacy in clinical trials for this treatment modality has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. Topical NSAIDs have been shown in meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the 1st 2 weeks of treatment osteoarthritis, but either not afterwards or with the diminishing effect over another two-week period. Regarding use of capsaicin, guidelines state that it is recommended only as an option for patients who did not respond to or are intolerant to other treatments. Regarding the use of topical lidocaine, guidelines the state that it is recommended for localized peripheral pain after there is evidence of a trial of first-line therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient is unable to tolerate oral NSAIDs. Oral NSAIDs have significantly more guideline support compared with topical NSAIDs. Additionally, there is no indication that the topical NSAID is going to be used for short duration. Additionally, there is no documentation of localized peripheral pain with evidence of failure of first-line therapy as recommended by guidelines prior to the initiation of topical lidocaine. And, guidelines do not support topical lidocaine except in patch form. Finally, there is no indication that the patient has been intolerant to or did not respond to other treatments prior to the initiation of capsaicin therapy. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested Terocin is not medically necessary.