

Case Number:	CM15-0097539		
Date Assigned:	05/28/2015	Date of Injury:	09/09/2013
Decision Date:	06/29/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/29/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/20/2015

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: 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 63 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/9/13. She reported initial complaints of neck and back pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis; cervical radiculitis with multilevel degenerative disc disease; lumbar radiculopathy with multilevel degenerative disc disease; bilateral trochanteric bursitis. Treatment to date has included medications. Diagnostics included MRI lumbar spine with Flex-Ext (11/22/13); EMG/NCV bilateral lower extremities (11/20/14). Currently, the PR-2 notes dated 3/9/15 indicated the injured worker continues working and does experience a substantial degree of persistent neck and low back pain. Her symptoms are aggravated by prolonged sitting or standing and relieved to some degree with the use of prescribed medications and a moderate amount of variable activities. Currently, her medications regime includes Tramadol, Naproxen and topical creams and Flector patch. On physical examination, she has modest tenderness in the lower to mid paracervical region as well as in the midline. Some tenderness but of mild nature is noted over the supraclavicular fossa both sides. Focal tenderness is present over the carpal tunnels as well. There is additional tenderness in the lower paralumbar region that extends over the greater trochanter on both sides. Intrinsic strength is preserved in both hands with no significant muscle weakness in the upper or lower extremities. Deep tendon reflexes are symmetrical in the upper and lower extremities with no fixed sensory deficit in the extremities. Spurling sign is associated with dysesthesias that extend towards both shoulders. Roos and supraclavicular compression test are negative bilaterally. Tinel and Phalen signs are positive over both carpal tunnels. Straight leg raise test is noted at approximately 15 degrees on both sides. An

EMG/NCV lower extremities dated 11/20/14 indicated a normal nerve conduction study with no evidence to suggest peripheral neuropathy, nerve entrapment or myelopathy. Relevant findings were radicular as indicated on the EMG examinations. The provider's treatment plan includes a request for physical therapy, lumbar support orthotic, and muscle stimulator unit. He also requests medications which included the now retrospective request for Voltaren XR 100mg, 1 tab daily, #30 (date of service 3/9/15).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retro: Voltaren XR 100mg, 1 tab daily, #30 (DOS: 3/9/15): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs Page(s): 22, 67-71.

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. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory agents (NSAIDs): The efficacy in clinical trials for this treatment modality has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. Topical NSAIDs have been shown in meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the first 2 weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis, but either not afterward, or with a diminishing effect over another 2-week period. (Lin, 2004) (Bjordal, 2007) (Mason, 2004) When investigated specifically for osteoarthritis of the knee, topical NSAIDs have been shown to be superior to placebo for 4 to 12 weeks. In this study the effect appeared to diminish over time and it was stated that further research was required to determine if results were similar for all preparations. (Biswal, 2006) These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. (Mason, 2004) Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. Neuropathic pain: Not recommended as there is no evidence to support use. FDA-approved agents: Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac): 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. Maximum dose should not exceed 32 g per day (8 g per joint per day in the upper extremity and 16 g per joint per day in the lower extremity). The most common adverse reactions were dermatitis and pruritus. (Voltaren package insert) For additional adverse effects: See NSAIDs, GI symptoms and cardiovascular risk; & NSAIDs, hypertension and renal function. Non FDA-approved agents: Ketoprofen: This agent is not currently FDA approved for a topical application. It has an extremely high incidence of photocontact dermatitis. (Diaz, 2006) (Hindsen, 2006) Absorption of the drug depends on the base it is delivered in. (Gurol, 1996). Topical treatment can result in blood concentrations and systemic effect comparable to those from oral forms, and caution should be used for patients at risk, including those with renal failure. (Krummel 2000) Topical analgesic NSAID formulations are not indicated for long-term use and have little evidence for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder. This patient does not have a diagnosis of osteoarthritis or neuropathic pain that has failed first line treatment options. Therefore, criteria for the use of topical NSAID therapy per the California MTUS have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.