

Case Number:	CM15-0061435		
Date Assigned:	04/07/2015	Date of Injury:	07/06/2009
Decision Date:	05/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/01/2015

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: Georgia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, 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 27 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on July 6, 2009. He has reported lower back pain and bilateral leg pain. Diagnoses have included chronic lower back pain, lumbar spine radiculopathy, lumbar spine myofascial strain, and lumbar facet arthropathy. Treatment to date has included medications, acupuncture, ice, heat, epidural steroid injection, and imaging studies. A progress note dated January 13, 2015 indicates a chief complaint of lower back pain radiating to the bilateral legs, and numbness of the right leg. The treating physician documented a plan of care that included medications and physical therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidopro topical ointment: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Chronic Pain, Compound Drugs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

Decision rationale: Lidopro topical ointment is not medically necessary. According to California MTUS, 2009, chronic pain, page 111 California MTUS guidelines does not cover topical analgesics that are largely experimental in use with a few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. Additionally, Per CA MTUS page 111 states that topical analgesics are recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (anti-depressants or AED). Only FDA-approved products are currently recommended. Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. The claimant was not diagnosed with neuropathic pain and there is no documentation of physical findings or diagnostic imaging confirming the diagnosis; therefore, the requested medication is not medically necessary.