

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0102105		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/04/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/05/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/03/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/29/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/27/2015

### 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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

### 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 (IW) is a 54 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 11/05/2011. He reported a fall. The injured worker was diagnosed as having neck pain with a MRI 07/18/2013 showing cervical disc protrusion at C5, bilateral foraminal stenosis, broad based paracentral endplate spur, and asymmetric annular bulge. A MRI on 04/08/2015 showed multilevel cervical spondylosis similar to prior exam in 07/18/ 2013, apart from progressive loss in disk height at C6-C7. He also has Left shoulder pain, Left rotator cuff repair 01/26/2012, manipulation under anesthesia 09/04/2013, right shoulder pain, left biceps repair 02/34/2012. Treatment to date has included surgery and medication. Currently, the injured worker complains of ongoing bilateral neck and shoulder pain with a current pain level of 6/10, an average pain of 5/10 with a maximum of 9/10 and a minimum of 3/10 (with medication). His current medications include Fentanyl patch, Norco, Atenolol, Flexeril, and Lidoderm patches. His urine drug screens are consistent with medication. On examination, he has tenderness to palpation over the paraspinal muscles of the cervical spine, left side greater than right. Range of motion in the shoulders is limited, left greater than right. The plan of treatment is to continue current medications, and plan a consultation with a spine surgeon (already authorized). A CT of the lungs is pending. Work restrictions were given. Requests for authorization are made for: 15 tablets of Flexeril 10mg with 3 refills; and 30 Lidoderm 5% patches with 3 refills.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**15 tablets of Flexeril 10mg with 3 refills: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints, Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril); Muscle relaxants (for pain).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-65.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also, there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain. This is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

**30 Lidoderm 5% Patches with 3 refills: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch); Topical Analgesics.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical lidocaine Page(s): 111-112.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on topical lidocaine states: Lidocaine Indication: Neuropathic pain 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). Topical lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch (Lidoderm) has been designated for orphan status by the FDA for neuropathic pain. Lidoderm is also used off-label for diabetic neuropathy. No other commercially approved topical formulations of lidocaine (whether creams, lotions or gels) are indicated for neuropathic pain. Non-dermal patch formulations are generally indicated as local anesthetics and anti-pruritics. 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. In February 2007, the FDA notified consumers and healthcare professionals of the potential hazards of the use of topical lidocaine. Those at particular risk were individuals that applied large amounts of this substance over large areas, left the products on for long periods of time, or used the agent with occlusive

dressings. Systemic exposure was highly variable among patients. Only FDA-approved products are currently recommended. (Argoff, 2006) (Dworkin, 2007) (Khaliq-Cochrane, 2007) (Knotkova, 2007) (Lexi-Comp, 2008) Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. There is only one trial that tested 4% lidocaine for treatment of chronic muscle pain. The results showed there was no superiority over placebo. (Scudds, 1995) This medication is recommended for localized peripheral pain. There is no documentation of failure of first line neuropathic pain medications. Therefore, criteria as set forth by the California MTUS as outlined above have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.