

Case Number:	CM15-0170493		
Date Assigned:	09/11/2015	Date of Injury:	03/23/2015
Decision Date:	10/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/19/2015
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: 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:

This 27 year old male sustained an industrial injury on 3-23-15. Diagnoses include cervicgia, lumbago and left wrist pain. Treatments to date include MRI testing, a wrist brace and Ibuprofen medication. A physical therapy evaluation was noted in the medical file. A urine drug screen of May 19, 2015 was included in the medical file. The injured worker has continued complaints of low back, left hand and right shoulder pain. The pain has affected the injured worker's activity level. The injured worker has remained off work. Upon examination, straight leg raising test, facet loading test and Spurling's test were positive. There is tenderness to palpation noted over the cervical paraspinal musculature, upper trapezius, scapular border and in the lumbar paraspinal musculature and sacroiliac joint region. Hawkins and cross-body tests were positive for the right shoulder. Tenderness to palpation was also noted over the right bicipital tendon. Pain reported ranges from 2 to 6 on a scale of 10. A request for Capsaicin cream 0.25% topical #120gm and Random urine drug testing was made by the treating physician.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Capsaicin cream 0.25% topical #120gm: 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): Capsaicin, topical.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS section on capsaicin states: Recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. Formulations: Capsaicin is generally available as a 0.025% formulation (as a treatment for osteoarthritis) and a 0.075% formulation (primarily studied for post-herpetic neuralgia, diabetic neuropathy and post- mastectomy pain). There have been no studies of a 0.0375% formulation of capsaicin and there is no current indication that this increase over a 0.025% formulation would provide any further efficacy. Indications: There are positive randomized studies with capsaicin cream in patients with osteoarthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic non-specific back pain, but it should be considered experimental in very high doses. Although topical capsaicin has moderate to poor efficacy, it may be particularly useful (alone or in conjunction with other modalities) in patients whose pain has not been controlled successfully with conventional therapy. The number needed to treat in musculoskeletal conditions was 8.1. There is no documentation of intolerance or poor responses to first line treatment options. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Random urine drug testing: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

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

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non-adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain

diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to nonopioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. The California MTUS does recommend urine drug screens as part of the criteria for ongoing use of opioids .The patient was not on opioids at the time of request and not showing aberrant behavior therefore the request is not medically necessary.