

Case Number:	CM15-0094509		
Date Assigned:	05/20/2015	Date of Injury:	09/16/2012
Decision Date:	06/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/15/2015

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
 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 55 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/16/2012. He reported neck and right upper extremity pain during lifting type activity. Diagnoses include spinal stenosis and cervical radiculopathy. He is status post right epicondylar reconstruction. Treatments to date include medication therapy, cortisone injections, and physical therapy. Currently, he complained of no change in the pain, although topical compound creams were noted to be helpful in relieving symptoms. On 4/22/15, the physical examination documented decreased cervical range of motion with tenderness and muscle spasms. There was a positive Spurling's maneuver to the right side. The MRI resulted were documented to reveal multiple disc bulges and spinal stenosis at C4-5 indenting the thecal sac. The plan of care included chiropractic therapy twice a week for four weeks and a topical compound cream (Lidocaine 6%/ Gabapentin 10%/ Ketoprofen 10% 240 grams).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidocaine 6%, Gabapentin 10%, Ketoprofen 10% 240 grams topical cream: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on topical analgesics states: Recommended as an option as indicated below. Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. (Namaka, 2004) These agents are applied locally to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. (Colombo, 2006) Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control (including NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics, antidepressants, glutamate receptor antagonists, -adrenergic receptor agonist, adenosine, cannabinoids, cholinergic receptor agonists, agonists, prostanoids, bradykinin, adenosine triphosphate, biogenic amines, and nerve growth factor). (Argoff, 2006) 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. The requested medication contains ingredients, which are not indicated per the California MTUS for topical analgesic use. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Chiropractic 2 times a week for 4 weeks, cervical spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual Therapy and Manipulation Page(s): 58-60.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines manual manipulation Page(s): 58-59.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical guidelines section on manual manipulation states: Recommended for chronic pain if caused by musculoskeletal conditions. Manual Therapy is widely used in the treatment of musculoskeletal pain. The intended goal or effect of Manual Medicine is the achievement of positive symptomatic or objective measurable gains in functional improvement that facilitate progression in the patient's therapeutic exercise program and return to productive activities. Manipulation is manual therapy that moves a joint beyond the physiologic range-of-motion but not beyond the anatomic range-of-motion. Low back: Recommended as an option. Therapeutic care: Trial of 6 visits over 2 weeks, with evidence of objective functional improvement, total of up to 18 visits over 6-8 weeks. Elective/maintenance care: Not medically necessary. Recurrences/flare-ups: Need to reevaluate treatment success, if RTW achieved then 1-2 visits every 4-6 months. Ankle & Foot: Not recommended. Carpal tunnel syndrome: Not recommended. Forearm, Wrist, & Hand: Not recommended. Knee: Not recommended. Treatment Parameters from state guidelines: A. Time to produce effect: 4 to 6 treatments. Manual manipulation is recommended form of treatment for chronic pain. However the requested amount of therapy sessions is in excess of the recommendations per the California MTUS. The California MTUS states there should be not more than 6 visits over 2 weeks and documented evidence of functional improvement before continuation of therapy. The request is for greater than 6 sessions. This does not meet criteria guidelines and thus is not medically necessary.