MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0170372		
Date Assigned:	09/17/2015	Date of Injury:	12/04/2013
Decision Date:	11/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/28/2015

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: California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Emergency 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 65 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 12-4-13. Diagnoses are noted as cervical spine herniated nucleus pulposus, cervical radiculopathy, bilateral shoulder internal derangement, bilateral elbow internal derangement, bilateral wrist sprain-strain; rule out internal derangement, wrist tenosynovitis, lumbar spine herniated nucleus pulposus, lumbago, lumbar radiculopathy, and bilateral knee internal derangement. Previous treatment includes chiropractic treatment, acupuncture, physiotherapy, shockwave therapy, localized intense neurostimulation therapy, and medication. In a progress report dated 7-10-15, the physician notes complaints of burning radicular neck pain and muscle spasms, burning bilateral shoulder pain radiating down the arms to the fingers with muscle spasms, burning bilateral elbow, bilateral wrist and bilateral knee pain with muscle spasms. He also complains of burning low back pain radiating to the feet. Pain is rated at 6 out of 10 and is associated with numbness and tingling. The injured worker states, "that the symptoms persist but the medications do offer him temporary relief of pain and improve his ability to have restful sleep." Pain is also alleviated by activity restrictions. There is tenderness to palpation of the cervical and lumbar paraspinal muscles, over the shoulders, over the medial and lateral epicondyle, over the carpal bones, and the knees over the medial and lateral joint line. Ranges of motion are decreased. Bilateral upper extremity and bilateral lower extremity strength is decreased secondary to pain. Toxicology screening was done 7-13-15. Work status is to remain off work 7-10-15 through 8-7-15. A request for authorization is dated 7-10-15. The requested treatment of Ketoprofen 20% Cream 167 grams, Cyclobenzaprine 5% Cream 110 grams, Synapryn 10mg per ml oral

suspension 500ml, Tabradol 1mg per ml oral suspension 250ml, Deprizine 15mg per ml oral suspension 250 ml, Dicopanol (Diphenhydramine) 5mg per ml oral suspension 150ml, Fanatrex (Gabapentin) 25mg per ml oral suspension 420ml, Capsaicin 0.025%-Flurbiprofen 15%- Gabapentin 10%-Menthol 2%-Camphor 2% 180 grams, and Cyclobenzaprine 2%-Gabapentin 15%-Amitriptyline 10% 180 grams was non-certified on 8-20-15.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ketoprofen 20% cream 167gm: 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 request is for the use of a topical NSAID for pain relief. There are specific criteria require for use based on the guidelines. The MTUS states the following: 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 first 2 weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis, but either not afterward, or with a diminishing effect over another 2-week period. (Lin, 2004) (Bjordal, 2007) (Mason, 2004) When investigated specifically for osteoarthritis of the knee, topical NSAIDs have been shown to be superior to placebo for 4 to 12 weeks. Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. FDA-approved agents: Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac): Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist). It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder. In this case, as indicated above, the patient would not qualify for the use of this medication based on the treatment duration. As such, the request is not certified.

Cyclobenzaprine 5% cream 110gm: 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 request is for the use of a compounded medication for topical use to aid in pain relief. These products contain multiple ingredients, which each have specific properties and mechanisms of action. The MTUS guidelines state the following: "Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." In this case, the use of the topical muscle relaxant is not indicated for use for the patient's condition.

The MTUS states the following: "There is no evidence for use of any other muscle relaxant as a topical product." As such, the request is not certified.

Synapryn 10mg/1ml oral suspension 500ml: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: Tramadol is a pain medication in the category of a centrally acting analgesic. They exhibit opioid activity and a mechanism of action that inhibits the reuptake of serotonin and norepinephrine. Centrally acting drugs are reported to be effective in managing neuropathic type pain although it is not recommended as first line therapy. The side effect profile is similar to opioids. For chronic back pain, it appears to be efficacious for short-term pain relief, but long term (>16 weeks) results are limited. It also did not appear to improve function. The use of tramadol for osteoarthritis is indicated for short-term use only (<3 months) with poor long-term benefit. In this case, the patient does not meet the qualifying criteria. This is secondary to the duration of use, with this medication being indicated on a short-term basis only. As such, the request is not certified.

Tabradol 1mg/ml oral suspension 250ml: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a muscle relaxant to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that the use of a medication in this class is indicated as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, which can increase mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain improvement. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) Due to inadequate qualifying evidence and prolonged duration of use, the request is not certified.

Deprizine 15mg/ml oral suspension 250ml: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the class of an acid reducing medication. The guidelines do not specifically address or advise the use of an H2 blocker but does make recommendations regarding medications in the same category classified as proton pump inhibitors. This is usually given for patients with esophageal reflux, gastritis, or peptic ulcer disease. It can also be used as a preventative measure in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatories for chronic pain, which have side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically with a proton pump inhibitor or Misoprostol. Criteria for risk are as follows: "(1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." Due to the fact the patient does not meet to above stated criteria, the request for use is not certified.

Dicopanol (Diphenhydramine) 5mg/ml oral suspension 150ml: 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) Mental Illness and Stress/Diphenhydramine (Benadryl).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of Dephenhydramine, which is in the category of an antihistamine. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this topic. The ODG states the following regarding its use: Not recommended. See Insomnia treatment, where sedating antihistamines are not recommended for long-term insomnia treatment. The AGS updated Beers criteria for inappropriate medication use includes diphenhydramine. (AGS, 2012) Anticholinergic drugs, including diphenhydramine, may increase the risk for dementia by 50% in older adults. There is an obvious dose-response relationship between anticholinergic drug use and risk of developing dementia, but chronic use, even at low doses, would be in the highest risk category. While there is awareness that these drugs may cause short-term drowsiness or confusion, which is included in the prescribing information, there is no mention of long-term effects on cognition, and generally awareness of this issue is very low, and both the public and doctors need to be encouraged to use alternative treatments where possible. (Gray, 2015) As stated above, the use of this medication is not indicated for use in this patient for insomnia. There is inadequate documentation of the reasoning for its use for other indications. As such, the request is not certified.

Fanatrex (Gabapentin) 25mg/ml oral suspension 420ml: 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)/Compounded drugs.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication. The official disability guidelines state the following regarding this topic: 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. (Wynn, 2011) See specific entries for each ingredient. See also Topical analgesics, compounded. Pharmacy compounding has traditionally involved combining drug ingredients to meet the needs of specific patients for medications that are not otherwise commercially available, and it is undertaken on a patient-by-patient basis for patients who, for example, might be allergic to inactive ingredients in FDA-approved drugs or may need a different dosage strength or route of administration. Unlike commercially available drugs, these products are not approved by the FDA but rather are regulated by the state pharmacy board and state law governing the practice of pharmacy. The FDA does not regulate pharmacy-compounded products in recognition of the important public health function performed by traditional compounding. Recently, some pharmacies have been making and marketing stock compound drugs for the WC patient population. Among the FDA "Red Flags" for Enforcement Action on Compounded Drugs is: "Compounding drugs in anticipation of receiving prescriptions, except in very limited quantities in relation to amounts compounded after receiving valid prescriptions." (FDA, 2011) Compound topical analgesics may provide relief by acting locally over the painful site with lower risk of systemic adverse effects on the gastrointestinal system and drug interactions than oral NSAIDs. The issues surrounding compound drugs are due to uncertainties regarding whether the products are medically appropriate and whether payments are reasonable, with the latter issue possibly also involving who dispenses the drug. Medical necessity should be based on the patient's needs combined with the medical and scientific evidence presented in ODG. ODG does not address pricing and fee schedules, but in general there should be consistency within a pharmacy fee schedule for products containing the same active ingredients, so that there is not an inappropriate incentive to use compounding. (Wynn, 2011) See also Co-pack drugs; Medical foods; Physician-dispensed drugs; Repackaged drugs; & Topical analgesics, compounded. Criteria for Compound drugs: (1) Include at least one drug substance (or active ingredient) that is the sole active ingredient in an FDA-approved prescription drug, not including OTC drugs. (2) Include only bulk ingredients that are components of FDA-approved drugs that have been made in an FDA-registered facility and have an NDC code. (3) Is not a drug that was withdrawn or removed from the market for safety reasons. (4) Is not a copy of a commercially available FDA-approved drug product. (5) Include only drug substances that have been supported as safe and effective for the prescribed indication by the FDA-approval process and/or by adequate medical and scientific evidence in the medical literature. This would allow off-label usage when supported by medical evidence. See specific entries for each ingredient in ODG for the medical and scientific evidence. (6) Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. The use of compounded agents requires knowledge of the specific analgesic effect of each agent and how it will be useful for the specific therapeutic goal required. See also Topical analgesics, compounded. (Wynn, 2011) As stated above the use of this medication is not indicated. This is secondary to no documentation which states that there has been a failure of first-line FDA approved drug therapy or an indication as to why a compounding formula is superior in efficacy or side-effect profile. As such, the request is not certified.

Capsaicin 0.025%, Flurbiprofen 15%, Gabapentin 10%, Menthol 2%, Camphor 2% 180gm: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication for topical use to aid in pain relief. These products contain multiple ingredients, which each have specific properties and mechanisms of action. The MTUS guidelines state the following: "Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." In this case, the use of Gabapentin is stated to be not indicated for use for the patient's condition. The guidelines state the following: "Gabapentin: Not recommended. There is no peer-reviewed literature to support use." As such, the request is not certified.

Cyclobenzaprine 2%, Gabapentin 15%, Amitriptyline 10% 180gm: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication for topical use to aid in pain relief. These products contain multiple ingredients, which each have specific properties and mechanisms of action. The MTUS guidelines state the following: "Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." In this case, the use of Gabapentin is stated to be not indicated for use for the patient's condition. The guidelines state the following: "Gabapentin: Not recommended. There is no peer-reviewed literature to support use." As such, the request is not certified.