

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM13-0046937		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/27/2013	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/07/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	02/20/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/16/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/04/2013

### HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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 physician 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### 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 applicant is a represented [REDACTED] who has filed a claim for chronic wrist and elbow pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of April 7, 2011. Thus far, the applicant has been treated with the following: Analgesic medications; unspecified amounts of physical and occupational therapy; medical foods; transfer of care to and from various providers in various specialties; and work restrictions. It does appear that the applicant has returned to work with limitations in place. In a utilization review report of October 6, 2013, the claims administrator denied a request for a tramadol containing medication and a medical food, Acetyl-Carnitine. On October 31, 2013, it was stated that the applicant had returned to work. She is apparently planning to settle her case with future medical care. She is working modify duty with limitations in place, it was stated. On May 16, 2013, the attending provider furnished the applicant with a tramadol L carnitine compound.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Tramadol 60/125 mg ea #81:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, section on Medical Food.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS does not address the topic of medical foods. In this case, the L-carnitine portion of the Tramadol compound does represent a medical food. As noted in the Official Disability Guidelines' chronic pain chapter medical foods topic, medical foods can only be recommended as medically necessary in individuals who carry a diagnosis or disease process with a specific nutritive requirement. In this case, however, the applicant's chronic pain issues do not have any specific nutritional requirement. Since one portion of the tramadol carnitine containing compound is not recommended, the entire compound is considered not recommended and therefore not certified.

**Acetyl-L-Carnitine HCL 60/125 mg ea #81:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation  
[http://www.nutrabio.com/products/acetyl\\_l carnitine.htm?gclid=COO8xLVpK0CFcOP7QodnTD Tkw](http://www.nutrabio.com/products/acetyl_l carnitine.htm?gclid=COO8xLVpK0CFcOP7QodnTD Tkw).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, section on Medical Food.

**Decision rationale:** Again, the MTUS does not address the topic. As noted in the ODG chronic pain chapter medical foods topic, medical foods are only recommended as medically necessary in individuals with a disease process that has a specific nutritive requirement. In this case, however, the claimant's chronic pain syndrome does not have any specific nutritive requirement. Therefore, the request for Acetyl-L-Carnitine is not medically necessary and appropriate.