

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0215489		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	11/05/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/07/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	12/16/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/23/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/02/2015

### 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: New York, Pennsylvania, Washington  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Geriatric 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 53 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 1-7-12. The injured worker reported right elbow discomfort. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatments for exacerbation of right lateral epicondylitis. Provider documentation dated 10-13-15 noted the work status as modified work. Treatment has included status post left carpal tunnel decompression. Objective findings dated 10-13-15 were notable for right elbow with tenderness to the lateral epicondyle and conjoint tendon, pain "exacerbated by resistance to forearm supination". The original utilization review (10-23-15) denied a request for Lidocaine Pad 5% #30 and Flector Dis 1.3% #30.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Lidocaine Pad 5% #30:** Upheld

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

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

**Decision rationale:** Per the guidelines, 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. Lidoderm is FDA approved only for post-herpetic neuralgia and the worker does not have that diagnosis. The medical records do not support medical necessity for the prescription of Lidoderm in this injured worker. The request is not medically necessary.

**Flector Dis 1.3% #30:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, specific drug list & adverse effects, Topical Analgesics.

**Decision rationale:** Per the guidelines, topical analgesics are largely experimental with few randomized trials to determine efficacy or safety. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder and there is no evidence to support its use in neuropathic pain. There is no documentation of efficacy with regards to pain and functional status or a discussion of side effects specifically related to the topical analgesic. Regarding topical flector in this injured worker, the records do not provide clinical evidence to support medical necessity. The request is not medically necessary.