

Case Number:	CM15-0071512		
Date Assigned:	04/21/2015	Date of Injury:	12/06/2014
Decision Date:	05/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/14/2015

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: Texas, New York, California
 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:

The applicant is a represented 55-year-old who has filed a claim for knee and leg pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of December 10, 2014. In a Utilization Review report dated April 8, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for Keratek gel. The claims administrator referenced a RFA form dated March 12, 2015 in its determination, as well as a prescription of March 12, 2015, and a progress note of March 19, 2015. On March 12, 2015, the applicant reported ongoing complaints of knee pain reportedly imputed to knee arthritis, highly variable, 3-9/10. The applicant was using six tablets of tramadol daily. The attending provider appealed a previously denied total knee arthroplasty. Keratek gel was prescribed and dispensed. It was not clearly stated whether the request was a first-time request or a renewal request. Tramadol was also renewed while the applicant was kept off of work, on total temporary disability. On January 15, 2015, the applicant was given a knee corticosteroid injection. The applicant was placed off of work, on total temporary disability. The applicant's medication list included metformin, Zestril, and Zocor, it was stated. The applicant's pain medication list was not, however, detailed. The remainder of the file was surveyed. There was no explicit mention of the applicant's having used Keratek analgesic gel prior to the March 12, 2015 progress note in question.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Kera-tek gel 4oz-retrospective DOS 3/12/2015: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation www.drugs.com.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Salicylate topicals Page(s): 105. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Search ResultsDailyMed - KERATEK- menthol and methyl salicylate [gldailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/drugInfo.cfm?setid=5527b965-615b](http://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/drugInfo.cfm?setid=5527b965-615b).

Decision rationale: Yes, the request for Keratek gel was medically necessary, medically appropriate, and indicated here. Keratek, per the National Library of Medicine (NLM), is a salicylate topical. Page 105 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines notes that salicylate topicals such as Keratek gel are recommended in the chronic pain context present here. the request in question, per a progress note of March 12, 2015, furthermore, did appear to represent a first-time request for the same. The attending provider had reported that analgesia with tramadol, Motrin, and naproxen had not been altogether satisfactory as of the March 12, 2015 progress note in question. Introduction of Keratek gel, thus, was indicated on or around the date in question. Therefore, the request was medically necessary.