

Case Number:	CM15-0144699		
Date Assigned:	08/05/2015	Date of Injury:	12/03/2013
Decision Date:	10/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/27/2015

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: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 32-year-old male who sustained a work related injury December 3, 2013. He fell from a ladder approximately seven feet with injury to his neck, left shoulder, left elbow, left hand, left ribs, lower back, left hip, and left foot. An electromyography study, performed September 4, 2014, was suggestive of bilateral chronic active L5 radiculopathy (report present in the medical record). According to a primary treating physician's progress report, dated April 23, 2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of ongoing neck, left shoulder, left elbow, left long finger, left ribs, mid back, low back, bilateral hip, left knee and left ankle pain. He reports the medication offer temporary relief of pain and improves his ability to have restful sleep. On examination; crepitus noted in the jaw; cranial nerves II-XII intact; hyperlordosis noted of the cervical spine and trigger points at the bilateral upper trapezius and rhomboid muscles; Spurling's, maximal foraminal compression tests and cervical distraction are all positive left and right; tenderness to palpation 3rd-6th ribs; tenderness to palpation left shoulder trapezius and levator scapula and rhomboid; tenderness over the left medial and lateral epicondyle; Cozen's and Mills are positive and cubital Tinel's negative; sensation diminished over the C6-C7 dermatomes in the bilateral upper extremities; ambulates with normal gait and able to heel toe walk with pain; straight leg raise positive left and right at 60 degrees in a supine position; Patrick's test positive left and right; diminished sensation to pin prick and light touch L4, L5, and S1 dermatomes in the left lower extremity. Diagnoses are jaw pain rule out TMJ (transmandibular joint disorder); rule out cervical disc displacement; cervical and lumbar radiculopathy; rule out long finger and left knee internal derangement; left ankle ligament disorder. At issue, is the request for authorization for an EMG-NCV (electromyography-nerve conduction velocity studies), functional capacity evaluation, urine toxicology, Cyclobenzaprine,

Deprizine, Dicopanol, Fanatarex, Ketoprofen cream, Synapryn, Tabradol, and Terocin patches.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Unknown prescription of Ketoprofen cream: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

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

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS, there is little to no research to support the use of many of these compounded topical analgesics. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. Ketoprofen agent is not currently FDA approved for a topical application. It has an extremely high incidence of photo contact dermatitis. Unknown prescription of Ketoprofen cream is not medically necessary.

One urine toxicology evaluation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

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

Decision rationale: The MTUS recommends using a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs, a step to take before a therapeutic trial of opioids, to aid in the ongoing management of opioids, or to detect dependence and addiction. There is no documentation in the medical record that a urine drug screen was to be used for any of the above indications. One urine toxicology evaluation is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Terocin patches: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

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

Decision rationale: The active ingredients of Terocin patches are menthol 4% and lidocaine 4% and are classified as a topical analgesic. The MTUS does not recommend topical analgesics unless trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. The medical record does not document failed attempts to alleviate the patient's pain with either antidepressants or anticonvulsants. Unknown prescription of Terocin patches is not medically necessary.

One functional capacity evaluation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Fitness for Duty Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Fitness For Duty, Functional capacity evaluation (FCE).

Decision rationale: The Official Disability Guidelines state that a functional capacity evaluation is appropriate if, case management is hampered by complex issues and the timing is appropriate; such as if, the patient is close to being at maximum medical improvement or additional clarification concerning the patient's functional capacity is needed. Functional capacity evaluations are not needed if the sole purpose is to determine a worker's effort or compliance, or the worker has returned to work. There is no documentation in the medical record to support a functional capacity evaluation based on the above criteria. One functional capacity evaluation is not medically necessary.

One EMG/NCV of the bilateral upper extremities: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back (Acute & Chronic), Nerve conduction studies (NCS).

Decision rationale: The Official Disability Guidelines do not recommended repeat electrodiagnostic studies to demonstrate radiculopathy if radiculopathy has already been clearly identified by EMG and obvious clinical signs, but recommended if the EMG is not clearly radiculopathy or clearly negative, or to differentiate radiculopathy from other neuropathies or non-neuropathic processes if other diagnoses may be likely based on the clinical exam. There is minimal justification for performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is already presumed to have symptoms on the basis of radiculopathy. One EMG/NCV of the bilateral upper extremities is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Deprizine: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Compound drugs.

Decision rationale: The requested compound medication contains unnamed and then defined "other proprietary ingredients". In addition, there is no documentation that the patient has a contraindication to medication prescribed in tablet form. According to the Official Disability Guidelines, compounded drugs are not recommended as a first-line therapy. In general, commercially available, FDA-approved drugs should be given an adequate trial. If these are found to be ineffective or are contraindicated in individual patients, compound drugs that use FDA-approved ingredients may be considered. There is no documentation that the FDA

approved medication was given an adequate trial. Unknown prescription of Deprizine is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Dicopanol: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Compound drugs.

Decision rationale: The requested compound medication contains unnamed and then defined "other proprietary ingredients". In addition, there is no documentation that the patient has a contraindication to medication prescribed in tablet form. According to the Official Disability Guidelines, compounded drugs are not recommended as a first-line therapy. In general, commercially available, FDA-approved drugs should be given an adequate trial. If these are found to be ineffective or are contraindicated in individual patients, compound drugs that use FDA-approved ingredients may be considered. There is no documentation that the FDA approved medication was given an adequate trial. Unknown prescription of Dicopanol is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Fantarex: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Compound drugs.

Decision rationale: The requested compound medication contains unnamed and then defined "other proprietary ingredients". In addition, there is no documentation that the patient has a contraindication to medication prescribed in tablet form. According to the Official Disability Guidelines, compounded drugs are not recommended as a first-line therapy. In general, commercially available, FDA-approved drugs should be given an adequate trial. If these are found to be ineffective or are contraindicated in individual patients, compound drugs that use FDA-approved ingredients may be considered. There is no documentation that the FDA approved medication was given an adequate trial. Unknown prescription of Fantarex is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Synapryn: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Compound drugs.

Decision rationale: The requested compound medication contains unnamed and then defined "other proprietary ingredients". In addition, there is no documentation that the patient has a contraindication to medication prescribed in tablet form. According to the Official Disability Guidelines, compounded drugs are not recommended as a first-line therapy. In general, commercially available, FDA-approved drugs should be given an adequate trial. If these are found to be ineffective or are contraindicated in individual patients, compound drugs that use FDA-approved ingredients may be considered. There is no documentation that the FDA approved medication was given an adequate trial. Unknown prescription of Synapryn is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Tabradol: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Compound drugs.

Decision rationale: The requested compound medication contains unnamed and then defined "other proprietary ingredients". In addition, there is no documentation that the patient has a contraindication to medication prescribed in tablet form. According to the Official Disability Guidelines, compounded drugs are not recommended as a first-line therapy. In general, commercially available, FDA-approved drugs should be given an adequate trial. If these are found to be ineffective or are contraindicated in individual patients, compound drugs that use FDA-approved ingredients may be considered. There is no documentation that the FDA approved medication was given an adequate trial. Unknown prescription of Tabradol is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Cyclobenzaprine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

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

Decision rationale: The Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines do not recommend long-term use of muscle relaxants. There is no documented functional improvement from any previous use in this patient. The MTUS also state that muscle relaxants are no more effective than NSAID's alone. Based on the currently available information, the medical necessity for this muscle relaxant medication has not been established. Unknown prescription of Cyclobenzaprine is not medically necessary.