

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM14-0137156 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 09/05/2014 | Date of Injury: | 09/13/2013 |
| Decision Date: | 10/02/2014 | UR Denial Date: | 07/24/2014 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 08/25/2014 |

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 Family 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 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:

This is a 59-year-old female patient who reported an industrial injury on 9/13/2013, one (1) year ago, attributed to the performance of her usual and customary job duties reported as a slip and fall striking her knee on the ground. The patient was diagnosed with bilateral knee arthralgia left greater than right with internal derangement osteoarthritis. The MRI of the left knee dated 10/30/2013 demonstrated injury to the posterior horn of the medial meniscus and moderate chondromalacia patella. The patient complained of ongoing knee pain. The objective findings on examination included intact sensation, normal motor strength, and normal reflexes to the lower extremity, normal range of motion; restricted range of motion to the lumbar spine. The orthopedic surgeon assessed that the patient was not a candidate for injection or surgical intervention. The patient was prescribed Lidoderm patches.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm Patch 5% #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 56-57.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment Page(s): 47-48, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines anti-inflammatory medications;

topical analgesics Page(s): 67-68; 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) pain chapter medications for chronic pain; topical analgesics

Decision rationale: The prescription of topical Lidoderm 5% patches #30 was not demonstrated to be medically necessary and no objective evidence to support the medical necessity of the prescribed topical lidocaine for the cited diagnoses. The CA MTUS does not recommend the use of Lidoderm patches for pain control as the patches or ointment are only FDA approved for the treatment of neuropathic pain attributed to post herpetic neuralgia. The patient is being treated with Lidoderm patches for chronic knee pain. There is no medical necessity for the use of the Lidoderm patches for the objective findings documented on examination. The request for authorization of the Lidoderm patches is not supported with objective evidence and is not recommended as a first-line treatment for the treatment of chronic neck pain. There is no objective evidence that the Lidoderm patches are more effective than the many available alternatives for the treatment of chronic pain. There is no objective evidence to support the use of Lidoderm patches for the stated symptoms, as there are available alternatives. There is no objective evidence to support the use of topical lidocaine for the treatment of the documented diagnoses. The applicable evidence-based guidelines state that more research is required prior to endorsing the use of Lidoderm patches for the treatment of chronic pain. The prescription of Lidoderm patches is FDA approved only for post herpetic neuralgia and is not to be used as a first line treatment. The provider provides no rationale for the use of the dispensed/prescribed Lidoderm patches over the readily available medical alternatives. The prescription of the Lidoderm patches is inconsistent with evidence-based guidelines. There are no prescribed antidepressants or gabapentin to support the medical necessity of Lidoderm topical patches. Evidence-based guidelines necessitate documentation of localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica) to support the medical necessity of Lidoderm patch. The patient is not taking Neurontin, thus Lidoderm is not appropriate for the treatment of this patient. There is no objective evidence to support the use of Lidoderm patches for the continuous and daily treatment of chronic back pain. There is no current clinical documentation that indicates that the patient has a localized area of neuropathic pain for which this medication would be medically necessary. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for Lidoderm patches or topical lidocaine ointment to treat the effects of the industrial injury. ODG identifies that Lidoderm is the brand name for a lidocaine patch produced by [REDACTED]. Topical lidocaine may be recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). This is not a first-line treatment and is only FDA approved for post-herpetic neuralgia. Further research is needed to recommend this treatment for chronic neuropathic pain disorders other than post-herpetic neuralgia. Formulations that do not involve a dermal-patch system are generally indicated as local anesthetics and anti-pruritic. Additionally, ODG states that topical lidocaine 5% patch/ointment has been approved by the FDA for post-herpetic neuralgia, and is used off-label for diabetic neuropathy and other neuropathic pain. It has been shown to be useful in treating various chronic neuropathic pain conditions in open-label trials. (Argoff, 2006) (ODG, Pain Chapter). There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the prescribed Lidoderm 5% patches #30.