

Case Number:	CM14-0026551		
Date Assigned:	06/13/2014	Date of Injury:	07/18/2013
Decision Date:	11/19/2014	UR Denial Date:	02/21/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/03/2014

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 Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine and is licensed to practice in New Jersey. 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:

The patient is a 20-year-old man who sustained a work-related injury on July 18, 2013. Subsequently, he developed chronic knee pain. The patient underwent a left leg surgery (insertion of a rod and screws) on July 22, 2013. According to the progress report dated July 25, 2014, the patient was being treated for knee pain and leg joint. He reported that the pain continues to be diffused, non-specific, with numbness. His physical examination demonstrated pain upon palpation over the saphenous nerve on the left. The rest of his physical examination was normal. The patient was diagnosed with pain knee/leg joint. The patient was recommended to continue with the same medication regimen, which included Lidoderm patches. The provider requested authorization for 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 TOPICAL ANAGESICS.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch) Page(s): 56.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, 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 Anti-Epilepsy Drugs (AEDs), such as Gabapentin. In this case, there is no documentation that the patient developed neuropathic pain that did not respond to first line therapy and the need for Lidoderm patch is unclear. There is no documentation of efficacy of previous use of Lidoderm patch. Therefore, the prescription of Lidoderm patch 5% is not medically necessary.