

Case Number:	CM15-0166249		
Date Assigned:	09/03/2015	Date of Injury:	10/17/2002
Decision Date:	10/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/24/2015

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: Arizona, California

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 51 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 10-17-2002. She has reported neck pain, middle back pain, and left shoulder pain and has been diagnosed with myalgia and myositis not otherwise specified, thoracic or thoracolumbar disc degeneration, sprains and strains of the neck, and sprains and strains of the thoracic spine. Treatment has included medications, injections, massage, acupuncture, TENS, and chiropractic care. There was spasm and tenderness to the cervical spine. Range of motion to the lumbar spine was limited. There was tenderness of the lumbar spine and sacroiliac spine. The treatment request included medications and chiropractic therapy. The treatment request included Lidopro 4 % ointment 1 tube.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidopro 4% Ointment #1 tube: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS guidelines, topical analgesics are recommended as an option as indicated below. They are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. 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). In this case the claimant did not have the above diagnoses. Long-term use of topical analgesics such as Lidoderm Lidocaine is not recommended. The claimant was previously on topical Terocin, which contains topical Lidocaine. The request for continued and long-term use of Lidocaine as above is not medically necessary.