

Case Number:	CM15-0168835		
Date Assigned:	09/09/2015	Date of Injury:	04/13/1985
Decision Date:	10/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/27/2015

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 is a 69 year old female with an industrial injury dated 04-13-1985. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for sacroiliitis, polyneuropathy in diabetes, lumbar and lumbosacral intervertebral degenerative disc, unspecified thoracic and lumbar neuritis and radiculitis, and muscle spasm. Treatment consisted of urine drug screen, prescribed medications, epidural steroid injection (ESI), physical therapy and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 07-23-2015, the injured worker reported headache, back pain, low back pain, hip pain, knee pain and ankle pain. The injured worker rated pain at least 8 out of 10 and at worst a 9 out of 10. Objective findings revealed mild distress, decrease lumbar range of motion, tenderness to palpitation of lumbar paraspinal area, positive spasm, bilateral lumbar trigger point, positive right straight leg raises, right ankle dorsiflexion weakness, right lumbar radicular signs, bilateral tenderness to palpitation sacroiliac joint, positive bilateral Patrick's sign and bilateral Fabers test. The treatment plan consisted of request for lumbar epidural steroid injection (ESI), medication management and follow up visit. According to the progress note dated 7-23-2015, the treating physician reported that the urine drug screen obtained from prior visit was consistent. The treating physician prescribed Lidoderm 5% adhesive patch #30 with 1 refill, now under review. Utilization Review determination on 08-19-2015 denied the request for Lidoderm 5% adhesive patch #30 with 1 refill.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm 5% adhesive patch #30 with 1 refill: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

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.