

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0070422		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/14/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/03/1999
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/15/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/06/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/15/2014

### 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 Occupational 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 70-year-old female with a 3/3/99 date of injury. At the time (4/28/14) of request for authorization for Lidoderm patches #30 with 2 refills, there is documentation of subjective (low back pain radiating to the legs with numbness and tingling) and objective (tenderness to palpation over the lower paravertebral musculature with decreased range of motion) findings, current diagnoses (lumbar spondylolisthesis with severe stenosis), and treatment to date (ongoing therapy with Lidoderm patches since at least 11/7/13). In addition, medical report identifies a request for Lyrica to address radicular complaints. There is no documentation of evidence that a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an 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 use of Lidoderm patches.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Lidoderm patches #30 with 2 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines-Pain Chapter.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines (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. 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 a diagnosis of lumbar spondylolisthesis with severe stenosis. In addition, there is documentation of neuropathic pain. However, given documentation of a request for Lyrica to address radicular complaints, there is no documentation of evidence 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, given documentation of ongoing treatment with Lidoderm patches since at least 11/7/13, 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 use of Lidoderm patches. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Lidoderm patches #30 with 2 refills is not medically necessary.