

Case Number:	CM15-0072611		
Date Assigned:	04/22/2015	Date of Injury:	09/19/2013
Decision Date:	06/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/27/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/16/2015

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: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 20 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on September 19, 2013. He has reported back pain. Diagnoses have included lumbar spine strain/sprain, thoracic spine strain/sprain, reactive myofascial pain, and lumbar disc injury. Treatment to date has included medications, home exercise, and imaging studies. A progress note dated March 4, 2015 indicates a chief complaint of mid to lower back pain. The treating physician documented a plan of care that included medications and work hardening program.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Terocin 120gm Qty: 2.00: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics, pages 111-113.

Decision rationale: The provider has not submitted any new information to support for topical compound analgesic Terocin which was non-certified. Per manufacturer, Terocin is Methyl Salicylate 25%, Menthol 10%, Capsaicin 0.025%, Lidocaine 2.5%, Aloe, Borage Oil, Boswelia Serrat, and other inactive ingredients. Per MTUS, medications should be trialed one at a time and is against starting multiples simultaneously. In addition, Boswelia serrata and topical Lidocaine are specifically not recommended per MTUS. Per FDA, topical lidocaine as an active ingredient in Terocin is not indicated and places unacceptable risk of seizures, irregular heartbeats and death on patients. The provider has not submitted specific indication to support this medication outside of the guidelines and directives to allow for certification of this topical compounded Terocin. Additionally, there is no demonstrated functional improvement or pain relief from treatment already rendered for this chronic injury nor is there any report of acute flare-up, new red-flag conditions, or intolerance to oral medications as the patient continues to be prescribed multiple oral med. The Terocin 120gm Qty: 2.00 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Work hardening 2 times a week for 4 weeks: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 125-126.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Work Hardening/ Work Conditioning, Page: 125-126.

Decision rationale: The patient has received conservative treatment including therapy for this chronic injury. There are no documented limitations in current ADLs or specific clinical findings identifying deficits to be addressed nor has previous treatment rendered functional improvement. Current medical status remains unchanged and there is no medical report to address any specific inability to perform the physical demands of the job duties or to identify for objective gains and measurable improvement in functional abilities. Medical necessity for Work hardening program has not been established as guidelines criteria include functional limitations precluding ability to safely achieve current job demands; plateaued condition unlikely to benefit from continued physical, occupational therapy, or general conditioning; patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted to improve function; Physical and medical recovery sufficient to allow for progressive reactivation and participation for a minimum of 4 hours a day for three to five days a week; identified defined return to work goal agreed to by the employer & employee with documented specific job to return to with job demands that exceed abilities; and the worker has no benefit has been shown if the patient has not returned to some form of work; none demonstrated here. Additionally, treatment is not supported for longer than 1-2 weeks without evidence of patient compliance and demonstrated significant gains as documented by subjective and objective gains and measurable improvement in functional abilities. Upon completion of a rehabilitation program (e.g. work hardening, work conditioning, outpatient medical rehabilitation) neither re-enrollment in nor repetition of the same or similar rehabilitation program is medically warranted for the same condition or injury. It appears conservative treatments have not been exhausted nor is there any notation of specific impairment, hindering the patient from returning to some form of modified work. In fact, the patient was noted to be working full duties without restrictions or limitations. There are also no

documented limitations in current ADLs or specific clinical findings except for generalized pain and tenderness without consistent dermatomal or myotomal deficits to address specific inability to perform the physical demands of the job duties or to identify for objective gains and measurable improvement in functional abilities. The Work hardening 2 times a week for 4 weeks is not medically necessary and appropriate.