

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0074843		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/24/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/19/2008
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/22/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/31/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/20/2015

### 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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 60 year old female with an industrial injury dated October 19, 2008. The injured worker's diagnoses include cervical radiculopathy on the right side, work related injury with SLAP (superior labrum, anterior to posterior) lesion of the right shoulder, status post shoulder surgery, cervical spine degenerative disc disease, myofascial pain, lumbar facet arthropathy, gastroesophageal reflux disease, anxiety and depression. Treatment consisted of diagnostic studies, prescribed medications, and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 3/11/2015, the injured worker reported neck pain. Objective findings revealed limited lumbar range of motion due to pain, tenderness to palpitation in the bilateral lumbar paraspinals and positive bilateral facet loading. The treatment plan included medication management and follow up. The treating physician prescribed Voltaren 1% Gel now under review.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Voltaren 1% Gel Count #5 Tubes:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 112. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Compound creams.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS and ODG recommends usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, there is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. MTUS specifically states for Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac) that it is 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. Medical records do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis pain in the joints. Additionally, the records indicate that the treatment area would be for shoulder, neck and back. As such, the request for Voltaren 1% Gel Count #5 Tubes is not medically necessary.