

Case Number:	CM15-0130363		
Date Assigned:	07/16/2015	Date of Injury:	05/15/2013
Decision Date:	08/13/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/24/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/06/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 5/15/13. Initial complaints were not reviewed. The injured worker was diagnosed as having pain in the joint wrist; cervical degenerative disc disease; lumbar degenerative disc disease; shoulder joint pain; cervical radiculitis. Treatment to date has included physical therapy; medications. Diagnostics studies included EMG/NCV study upper extremities (1/14/15). Currently, the PR-2 notes dated 5/29//15 indicated the injured worker complains of continued nick, right shoulder, low back pain that radiates to the upper extremities and lower extremities with numbness and tingling. She reports she has been exercising regularly and medications maintain her functionality helping her pain about 30% with no side-effects. She uses a TENS and self TPT with mild symptom relief. She takes NSAIDS, Naproxen and unable to tolerate them without Omeprazole due to stomach upset. She has a history of "PUD" and gastritis. Gabapentin and Lidopro ointment are helpful in managing her neuropathic pain. She feels the Gabapentin alone is not sufficient for managing her neuropathic pain. He notes she is tender to palpation in the cervical and lumbar region with positive muscle spasms and tightness in the cervical and trapezius region. The provider is requesting authorization of Lidopro ointment.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidopro ointment: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for LidoPro, CA MTUS states that topical compound medications require guideline support for all components of the compound in order for the compound to be approved. Topical NSAIDs are indicated for "Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. Neuropathic pain: Not recommended as there is no evidence to support use." Topical lidocaine is "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)." Additionally, it is supported only as a dermal patch. Capsaicin is "Recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments." Within the documentation available for review, none of the above mentioned criteria have been documented. Furthermore, there is no clear rationale for the use of topical medications rather than the FDA-approved oral forms for this patient. Given all of the above, the requested LidoPro is not medically necessary.