

Case Number:	CM13-0071284		
Date Assigned:	01/08/2014	Date of Injury:	03/15/2001
Decision Date:	05/30/2014	UR Denial Date:	12/07/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/27/2013

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in Pain Management, 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 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/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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 84-year-old female with a 3/15/01 date of injury. At the time (11/26/13) of request for authorization for Lidoderm patches, there is documentation of subjective (neck pain radiating to the left shoulder with numbness in the left arm as well as low back pain radiating to the left with numbness) and objective (tenderness to palpation and spasms over the paracervical musculature, restricted and painful cervical spine range of motion, tenderness to palpation over the lumbar paravertebral musculature, positive straight leg raise, and restricted lumbar spine range of motion secondary to pain) findings, current diagnoses (cervical spine strain/stenosis, status post anterior cervical decompression/discectomy, radicular complaints, and lumbar spine strain), and treatment to date (not specified). There is no documentation that a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as Gabapentin or Lyrica) has failed.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

LIDODERM PATCHES: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Criteria for Use of Lidoderm Patches.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (Lidocaine Patch) Page(s): 56-57.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation of neuropathic pain after there has been evidence that a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as Gabapentin or Lyrica) has failed, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of a Lidocaine patch. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of cervical spine strain/stenosis, status post anterior cervical decompression/discectomy, radicular complaints, and lumbar spine strain. In addition, there is documentation of neuropathic pain. However, there is no documentation that a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as Gabapentin or Lyrica) has failed. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Lidoderm patches is not medically necessary.