

Case Number:	CM13-0025606		
Date Assigned:	10/11/2013	Date of Injury:	04/25/2011
Decision Date:	05/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/30/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/17/2013

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:

State(s) of Licensure: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 injured worker is a 58 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on April 25, 2011. She reported cumulative trauma of the neck and shoulder. The injured worker was diagnosed as having status post left shoulder surgery and Parkinson's disease with a component of essential tremor. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, left shoulder surgery, conservative care, medications and work restrictions. Currently, the injured worker complains of pain in the left shoulder, tremors in the bilateral hands and poor balance. The injured worker reported an industrial injury in 2011, resulting in the above noted pain. She was treated conservatively and surgically without complete resolution of the pain. It was noted the tremors were non-industrial symptoms. Evaluation on July 8, 2013, revealed continued complaints of pain and associated symptoms. Topical medications were requested.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

LIDODERM: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm patches Page(s): 56-57. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Topical analgesics Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: UpToDate.com, Lidocaine (topical).

Decision rationale: Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state 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-pruritics. For more information and references, see Topical analgesics.ODG further details, Criteria for use of Lidoderm patches: (a) Recommended for a trial if there is evidence of localized pain that is consistent with a neuropathic etiology. (b) There should be evidence of a trial of first-line neuropathy medications (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). (c) This medication is not generally recommended for treatment of osteoarthritis or treatment of myofascial pain/trigger points. (d) An attempt to determine a neuropathic component of pain should be made if the plan is to apply this medication to areas of pain that is generally secondary to non-neuropathic mechanisms (such as the knee or isolated axial low back pain). One recognized method of testing is the use of the Neuropathic Pain Scale. (e) The area for treatment should be designated as well as number of planned patches and duration for use (number of hours per day). (f) A Trial of patch treatment is recommended for a short-term period (no more than four weeks). (g) It is generally recommended that no other medication changes be made during the trial period. (h) Outcomes should be reported at the end of the trial including improvements in pain and function, and decrease in the use of other medications. If improvements cannot be determined, the medication should be discontinued. (i) Continued outcomes should be intermittently measured and if improvement does not continue, lidocaine patches should be discontinued. Medical documents provided do not indicate that the use would be for post-herpetic neuralgia. Additionally, treatment notes did not detail other first-line therapy used and what the clinical outcomes resulted. As such, the request for Lidoderm patches is not medically necessary.

SOLARAZE GEL: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Guidelines state topical diclofenac (Solaraze Gel) is indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints such as the elbow, hand, knee, and wrist, but is not recommended for neuropathic pain. There is no evidence to support the use of topical NSAIDS for osteoarthritis pain of the spine, hip, or shoulder. The medical documentation does not provide any other reason for using the medication except for her shoulder pain, and does not

document the functional limitations she has due to her current less than optimal pain control. The request is not medically necessary and appropriate.