

Case Number:	CM15-0215733		
Date Assigned:	11/05/2015	Date of Injury:	06/16/1997
Decision Date:	12/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/03/2015

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: Indiana, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 77 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 6-16-97. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar radiculitis, lumbar disc displacement, left hip pain, obesity, and status post bilateral knee replacement. Treatment to date has included TENS, a home exercise program, and medication including Soma, Lyrica, Lidoderm, Cymbalta, Baclofen, Percocet, and Neurontin. Physical exam findings on 10-6-15 included paravertebral tenderness with decreased range of motion. Sensation was decreased in the right posterior thigh. The injured worker had been taking Lyrica and using Lidoderm patches since at least May 2015. On 8-25-15 pain was rated as 8 of 10 without medication and 3 of 10 with medication. On 10-6-15, the injured worker complained of pain in the upper and mid back with radiation to the chest rated as 8 of 10 with medication and 3 of 10 without medication. Low back pain with radiation to bilateral lower extremities was also noted. On 10-7-15 the treating physician requested authorization for Lyrica 100mg #90 and Lidoderm 5% patches #60. On 10-14-15 the requests were non-certified by utilization review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lyrica 100mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) for pain.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG state that "Pregabalin (Lyrica) has been documented to be effective in treatment of diabetic neuropathy and post herpetic neuralgia, has FDA approval for both indications, and is considered first-line treatment for both. Pregabalin was also approved to treat fibromyalgia. See Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) for general guidelines, as well as specific Pregabalin listing for more information and references." MTUS additionally comments "Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) are also referred to as anti-convulsants. Recommended for neuropathic pain (pain due to nerve damage). A good response to the use of AEDs has been defined as a 50% reduction in pain and a moderate response as a 30% reduction. It has been reported that a 30% reduction in pain is clinically important to patients and a lack of response of this magnitude may be the trigger for the following: (1) a switch to a different first-line agent (TCA, SNRI or AED are considered first-line treatment); or (2) combination therapy if treatment with a single drug agent fails. (Eisenberg, 2007) (Jensen, 2006) After initiation of treatment there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use." The patient appears to have established neuropathic pain for which Lyrica is an appropriate medication. The medical records provided do not detail any objective improvement over the last several months. Given the lack of subjective and objective improvement, a request for #90 of Lyrica is not appropriate. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Lidoderm patch 5% #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Lidoderm (lidocaine patch). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Topical analgesics.

Decision rationale: Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state "Lidoderm is the brand name for a lidocaine patch produced by [REDACTED]. 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. Formulations that do not involve a dermal-patch system are generally indicated as local anesthetics and anti-pruritics. For more information and references, see Topical analgesics." ODG further details, Criteria for use of Lidoderm patches: (a) Recommended for a trial if there is evidence of localized pain that is consistent with a neuropathic etiology. (b) There should be evidence of a trial of first-line neuropathy medications (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). (c) This

medication is not generally recommended for treatment of osteoarthritis or treatment of myofascial pain/trigger points. (d) An attempt to determine a neuropathic component of pain should be made if the plan is to apply this medication to areas of pain that are generally secondary to non-neuropathic mechanisms (such as the knee or isolated axial low back pain). One recognized method of testing is the use of the Neuropathic Pain Scale. (e) The area for treatment should be designated as well as number of planned patches and duration for use (number of hours per day). (f) A Trial of patch treatment is recommended for a short-term period (no more than four weeks). (g) It is generally recommended that no other medication changes be made during the trial period. (h) Outcomes should be reported at the end of the trial including improvements in pain and function, and decrease in the use of other medications. If improvements cannot be determined, the medication should be discontinued. (i) Continued outcomes should be intermittently measured and if improvement does not continue, lidocaine patches should be discontinued. Medical documents provided do not indicate that the use would be for post-herpetic neuralgia. Additionally, treatment notes did not detail other first-line therapy used and what the clinical outcomes resulted. As such, the request for Lidoderm 5% patches is not medically necessary.