

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0056687		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/01/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/02/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/05/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/11/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/25/2015

### 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: Georgia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

### 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 56-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/02/2013. The injured worker was diagnosed as having myoligamentous strain of the lumbar and cervical spines, inflammatory process of the shoulders, and rule out frozen shoulder syndrome, right elbow lateral epicondylitis, and obesity. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, an unspecified right knee surgery on 1/17/2014, medications, and physical therapy. On 11/20/2014, the injured worker was documented as examined, although subjective/objective findings were not noted. Current medication regime was not noted. The treatment plan included "Start Terocin". More recent progress reports were not noted.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Terocin Patches Qty 30 (retrospective 1-13-15): 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 Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

**Decision rationale:** Terozin Patches #30 (retrospective 1-13-15) is not medically necessary. According to California MTUS, 2009, chronic pain, page 111 California MTUS guidelines does not cover topical analgesics that are largely experimental in use with a few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. Additionally, Per CA MTUS page 111 states that topical analgesics are " recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (anti-depressants or AED) Only FDA-approved products are currently recommended. Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. The claimant was not diagnosed with neuropathic pain and there is no documentation of physical findings or diagnostic imaging confirming the diagnosis; therefore, the requested medication is not medically necessary.

**Ultracet 37.5/325 mg Qty 60 (retrospective 1-13-15): Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-95.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol Page(s): 83.

**Decision rationale:** Ultracet 37.5/325mg is not medically necessary. Ultracet contains Tramadol. Tramadol is a centrally- acting opioid. Per MTUS page 83, opioids for osteoarthritis are recommended for short-term use after failure of first line non-pharmacologic and medication option including Acetaminophen and NSAIDS. Additionally, Page 79 of MTUS guidelines states that weaning of opioids are recommended if (a) there are no overall improvement in function, unless there are extenuating circumstances; (b) continuing pain with evidence of intolerable adverse effects; (c) decrease in functioning; (d) resolution of pain; (e) if serious non-adherence is occurring; (f) the patient requests discontinuing. The claimant's medical records did not document that there was an overall improvement in function or a return to work with previous opioid therapy. In fact, the claimant continued to report pain. Given Tramadol is a synthetic opioid, its use in this case is not medically necessary. The claimant has long-term use with this medication and there was a lack of improved function or return to work with this opioid and all other medications.