

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0057755		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/09/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/03/2003
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/05/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/15/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/29/2014

### 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 48 year old female who reported an industrial injury to the neck on 12/3/2003, almost 11 years ago, attributed to the performance of her job tasks. The patient complained of neck pain radiating to the right upper extremity and to the head causing migraine headaches. The patient reported getting migraine headaches once per week. A prescribed medication allows the patient to go to school full-time and exercise. The objective findings on examination included a diminished range of motion of the cervical spine; however there were no documented neurological deficits. The MRI of the cervical spine demonstrated progression of C5-C6 disc narrowing and desiccation; stable 3 mm dorsal disc osteophyte complex and mild stenosis. The diagnoses included neck pain; cervical spine DDD; mild spinal stenosis; right shoulder pain; cognitive problems in the brain; MRI demonstrates a left anterior nasal septal deviation; and thoracic pain. The patient was prescribed Lidoderm patches applied to the neck for pain control.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Lidoderm Patch:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm Patch.

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

pages 67-68; chronic pain chapter's 111-113 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 patches 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 California 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 neck 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. The ODG identifies that Lidoderm is the brand name for a Lidocaine patch produced by Endo Pharmaceuticals. 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-pruritics. 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 lighted term patches.