

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0186305		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	11/14/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/14/2002
<b>Decision Date:</b>	01/02/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/11/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/08/2014

### 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 male with a 1/14/02 date of injury. At the time (10/3/14) of request for authorization for Gabapentin 100mg #30 with 3 refills and Lidoderm patches 5% (700 mg/patch) #30 with 3 refills, there is documentation of subjective (chronic low back pain radiating to left leg) and objective (numbness throughout the left lower extremity) findings, current diagnoses (spinal stenosis of the lumbar region, sciatica, and chronic pain syndrome), and treatment to date (medications (including ongoing treatment with Gabapentin and Lidoderm patch) and acupuncture). Regarding Gabapentin, 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 Gabapentin use to date. Regarding Lidoderm patch, there is no documentation that a trial of first-line therapy (Gabapentin) has failed; and 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.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Gabapentin 100mg #30 with 3 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy Drugs (AEDS).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Gabapentin (Neurontin) Page(s): 18-19. 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, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of Neurontin (Gabapentin). 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 spinal stenosis of the lumbar region, sciatica, and chronic pain syndrome. In addition, there is documentation of neuropathic pain. However, given documentation of ongoing treatment with Gabapentin, 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 Gabapentin use to date. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Gabapentin 100mg #30 with 3 refills is not medically necessary.

**Lidoderm patches 5% (700 mg/patch) #30 with 3 refills:** Upheld

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

**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 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 spine pain. In addition there is documentation of neuropathic pain. However, given documentation of ongoing treatment with Gabapentin, there is no documentation that a trial of first-line therapy (Gabapentin) has failed. In addition, given documentation of ongoing treatment with 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 patches use to date. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Lidoderm patches 5% (700 mg/patch) #30 with 3 refills is not medically necessary.

