

Case Number:	CM15-0026476		
Date Assigned:	02/18/2015	Date of Injury:	08/09/2007
Decision Date:	04/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/11/2015

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 56 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on August 9, 2007. The diagnoses have included lumbar strain, myofascial pain syndrome, and lumbar radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, swimming, home exercise program, trigger point injections, TENS, and oral and topical medications. Currently, the injured worker complains of increased pain in the back, and some numbness in the legs. The Primary Treating Physician's report dated January 12, 2015, noted spasm at the paraspinal muscles, with decreased sensation bilateral feet, and decreased range of motion (ROM) of the back. On January 20, 2015, Utilization Review non-certified Menthoderm gel 120gm; quantity not indicated, noting that there was no supporting evidence in the guidelines for the medication and no clear indication that the medication would be appropriate in this case, therefore the request was not medically necessary. The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) Guidelines, and the Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) were cited. On February 11, 2015, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of Menthoderm gel 120gm; quantity not indicated.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Menthoderm gel 120gm; quantity not indicated: 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.

Decision rationale: Mentoderm contains methyl salicylate 15% and menthol 10%. According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111), topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. That is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended. Mentoderm (menthol and methyl salicylate) contains menthol a topical analgesic that is not recommended by MTUS. Furthermore, there is no documentation of the patient's intolerance of oral anti-inflammatory medications. Based on the above, Mentoderm Gel 120gm is not medically necessary.