

Case Number:	CM15-0068585		
Date Assigned:	04/16/2015	Date of Injury:	01/02/2013
Decision Date:	05/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/27/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/10/2015

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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This 41-year-old male sustained an industrial injury on 1/2/13. He subsequently reported bilateral knee pain. Diagnoses include patellofemoral chondromalacia and bilateral knee sprain. Treatments to date have included MRIs, physical therapy, a brace, injections and prescription pain medications. The injured worker continues to experience bilateral knee pain. The treating physician made a request for Hyaluronic Acid Injection - Left Knee and Tramadol and Terocin medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Hyaluronic Acid Injection - Left Knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines: Knee & Leg chapter - Criteria for Hyaluronic Acid Injection.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 337-352. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee, Hyaluronic acid injections.

Decision rationale: While ACOEM guidelines do not specifically mention guidelines for usage of Hyaluronic Acid Injections, it does state "Invasive techniques, such as needle aspiration of effusions or prepatellar bursal fluid and cortisone injections, are not routinely indicated. Knee aspirations carry inherent risks of subsequent intraarticular infection." ODG recommends as guideline for Hyaluronic acid injections "Patients experience significantly symptomatic osteoarthritis but have not responded adequately to recommended conservative nonpharmacologic (e.g., exercise) and pharmacologic treatments or are intolerant of these therapies (e.g., gastrointestinal problems related to anti-inflammatory medications), after at least 3 months; Documented symptomatic severe osteoarthritis of the knee, which may include the following: Bony enlargement; Bony tenderness; Crepitus (noisy, grating sound) on active motion; Less than 30 minutes of morning stiffness; No palpable warmth of synovium; Over 50 years of age." Pain interferes with functional activities (e.g., ambulation, prolonged standing) and not attributed to other forms of joint disease; Failure to adequately respond to aspiration and injection of intra-articular steroids. No documentation provided comments on if the patient was unsuccessful with treatment nonpharmacologic (such as physical therapy for left knee) or pharmacologic modalities (medications). Additionally, there is insufficient documentation from the result of prior injections in the knee and what pain and functional benefits resulted. The medical documentation does not support the use of a Hyaluronic Acid Injection because the guidelines have not been met. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Tramadol 150 mg ER (extended release) Qty 30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 77.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids; Tramadol Page(s): 74-123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram®).

Decision rationale: Ultram is the brand name version of tramadol, which is classified as central acting synthetic opioids. MTUS states regarding tramadol that "A therapeutic trial of opioids should not be employed until the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics. Before initiating therapy, the patient should set goals, and the continued use of opioids should be contingent on meeting these goals." ODG further states, "Tramadol is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic because of its inferior efficacy to a combination of Hydrocodone/acetaminophen." The treating physician did not provide sufficient documentation that the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics at the time of prescription or in subsequent medical notes. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. As such, the request for tramadol is not medically necessary.

Terocin 120 mg (2 bottles): 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 based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Compound creams.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG recommend usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details "primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed." The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, "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." Terocin lotion is topical pain lotion that contains lidocaine and menthol. ODG states regarding lidocaine topical patch, "This is not a first-line treatment and is only FDA approved for post-herpetic neuralgia". Medical documents do not document the patient as having post-herpetic neuralgia. Additionally, Topical analgesics are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. The treating physician did not document a trial of first line agents and the objective outcomes of these treatments. MTUS states regarding topical analgesic creams, "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." In this case, topical lidocaine is not indicated. As such, the request is not medically necessary.