

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0079662		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/30/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/25/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/02/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/24/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/27/2015

### 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, Georgia  
 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:

The injured worker is a 37 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 10/25/2012. The current diagnoses are thoracic/lumbar sprain/strain, lumbar disc protrusion, lumbar radiculopathy, right shoulder bursitis, right shoulder impingement syndrome, involuntary tremors, right elbow subcortical cyst of posterolateral capitellum, right elbow sprain/strain, right medial/lateral epicondylitis, right/left knee chondromalacia, and right knee internal derangement. According to the progress report dated 3/5/2015, the injured worker complains of pain in the upper/mid/lower back, right shoulder, and bilateral knees. The pain is described as constant, moderate, and achy. The current medication list was not available for review. Treatment to date has included medication management, MRI studies, physical therapy, chiropractic, and acupuncture. The plan of care includes prescriptions for compound medications.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Flurbiprofen 20%, Baclofen 5%, Camphyr 2%, Menthol 2%, Dexamethasone Mirco 0.2%, Capsaicin 0.025%: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Section 2 Page(s): 111-113.

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS recommends limited use of topical analgesics. These are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain with antidepressants and antiepileptics have failed. CA MTUS specifically prohibits the use of combination topical analgesics in which any component of the topical preparation is not recommended. Muscle relaxants in topical formulation are explicitly not approved in the CA MTUS. Menthol is not recommended as a topical agent. As such, the request for flurbiprofen/baclofen/camphyr/menthol/dexamthasone, capsaicin is not medically necessary and the original UR decision is upheld.

**Amitriptyline HCL 10%, Gabapentin 10%, Bupivacaine HCL 5%, Hyaluronic acid 0.2% in cream base:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Section 2 Page(s): 111-113.

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS recommends limited use of topical analgesics. These are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain with antidepressants and antiepileptics have failed. Gabapentin in topical formulation is explicitly not approved in the CA MTUS as there is no peer reviewed literature to support its use. As such, the request for amitriptyline/gabapentin/bupivacaine/hyaluronic acid is not medically necessary and the original UR decision is upheld.