

Case Number:	CM15-0146808		
Date Assigned:	08/07/2015	Date of Injury:	03/03/2005
Decision Date:	09/04/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/28/2015

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 is a 64 year old female who sustained a work related injury March 3, 2005. According to a certified physician's assistants office visit notes, dated June 2, 2015, the injured worker presented for a follow-up and an intra-articular injection. She reports pain in the back and bilateral knee. She rated the pain 8 out of 10 for the past week and constant, lasting throughout the day. Current medication included Terocin Lotion, Lidoderm patch, Motrin, and Trazodone. Examination of the knees revealed; mild effusion and crepitus bilaterally; tenderness to palpation in the pes anserinus bursa; trigger points palpated in the gluteus medius and quadratus lumborum bilaterally; knee flexion left and right 100 degrees and extension left and right 10 degrees; paresthesias to light touch noted in the medial and lateral legs bilaterally; sacroiliac compression test positive, McMurray's test positive bilaterally, patellar compression test positive bilaterally, moderate laxity valgus stress bilaterally; slump test positive; gait slightly antalgic on the left. Diagnoses are localized osteoarthritis not otherwise specified lower leg; chondromalacia patellae; lumbosacral spondylosis without myelopathy. Treatment plan included discontinuation of Terocin and Trazodone. At issue, is the request for authorization for a Spinal Q Dynamic Support Brace and Lidoderm patch.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

SpinalQ Dynamic Support Brace: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on low back complaints and treatment recommendations states: Lumbar supports have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond the acute phase of symptom relief. This patient has chronic ongoing low back complaints. Per the ACOEM, lumbar supports have no lasting benefit outside of the acute phase of injury. This patient is well past the acute phase of injury and there is no documentation of acute flare up of chronic low back pain. Therefore, criteria for use of lumbar support per the ACOEM have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.

Lidoderm 5 Percent Patch #30: Upheld

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

