

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0148494		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/11/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/03/1999
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/08/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/01/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/30/2015

### 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: Maryland

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Neuromuscular 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 76 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on May 3, 1999. The initial symptoms reported by the injured worker are unknown. The injured worker was recently diagnosed as having degenerative disc disorder with radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included exercise, epidural steroid injection and medication. On May 7, 2015, the injured worker complained of increased pain in her lower back while sitting, bending and twisting. A lumbar epidural steroid injection provided only temporary relief of her lower back and lower extremity radicular symptoms. The treatment plan included daily lumbar range of motion and stretching with local heat application, medications and possible surgical decompression. On July 1, 2015, Utilization Review non-certified the request for Lidoderm patches 5% #90, citing California MTUS Guidelines.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Lidoderm patches 5%, ninety count:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch) Page(s): 56.

**Decision rationale:** Lidoderm patches 5%, ninety count is not medically necessary per the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines The guidelines state that 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. The documentation does not indicate failure of first line therapy for peripheral pain. The documentation does not indicate a diagnosis of post herpetic neuralgia. For these reasons the request for Lidoderm Patches 5% is not medically necessary.