

Case Number:	CM14-0175629		
Date Assigned:	10/28/2014	Date of Injury:	08/15/1996
Decision Date:	12/05/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/25/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/23/2014

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 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 65-year-old female with an 8/15/96 date of injury. At the time (9/16/14) of request for authorization for Lidoderm 6%, #30, times 5, there is documentation of subjective (burning low back pain with stiffness, bilateral lower extremity weakness, and numbness/tingling over right lower extremity) and objective (normal physical exam) findings, current diagnoses (lumbar spondylosis, degeneration of lumbar intervertebral disc, and lumbar spinal stenosis), and treatment to date (medications (including ongoing treatment with Norco, Lidoderm patch, Flector patch, and Etodolac)). Medical reports identify that patient had a very good pain relief from Lidoderm patch. There is no documentation that a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an anti-epileptic drugs (AED) such as Gabapentin or Lyrica) has failed; and functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications as a result of Lidoderm patch use to date.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm 6%, #30, times 5: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (Lidocaine Patch) Page(s): 56-57. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: Title 8, California Code of Regulations, section 9792.20.

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 Lidoderm patch. MTUS-Definitions identifies that any treatment intervention should not be continued in the absence of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications or medical services. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of lumbar spondylosis, degeneration of lumbar intervertebral disc, and lumbar spinal stenosis. In addition, there is documentation of neuropathic pain; and ongoing treatment with Lidoderm patch. 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. In addition, despite documentation that patient had a very good pain relief from Lidoderm patch; there is no documentation of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications as a result of Lidoderm patch use to date. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Lidoderm 6%, #30, times 5 is not medically necessary.