MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0030469		
Date Assigned:	02/24/2015	Date of Injury:	09/13/2013
Decision Date:	04/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/18/2015

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
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 62 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/13/13. The injured worker has complaints of spasms in low back and it immobilizes him. The documentation noted that he has lower back pain radiating into the right lower extremity to the ankle along the lateral aspect. The documentation noted that the injured worker has mild to moderate relief from his narcotic medications. The lower extremity pain is relieved by epidural steroid injections but back pain continues. The diagnoses have included lumbar disc syndrome; lumbar radiculopathy and lumbar stenosis. According to the utilization review performed on 1/30/15, the requested Lidocaine pad 5% #30 has been non-certified. California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) 2009: 992.24.2 Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Pages 111-112, 56-57 Topical Analgesics was used in the utilization review.

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 Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Compound creams.

Decision rationale: ODG also states that topical lidocaine is appropriate in usage as patch under certain criteria, but that "no other commercially approved topical formulations of lidocaine (whether creams, lotions or gels) are indicated for neuropathic pain." MTUS states regarding lidocaine, "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)." MTUS indicates lidocaine "Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended." The medical records do not indicate failure of first-line therapy for neuropathic pain and lidocaine is also not indicated for non-neuropathic pain. ODG states regarding lidocaine topical patch, "This is not a first-line treatment and is only FDA approved for post-herpetic neuralgia." Medical documents do not document the patient as having post-herpetic neuralgia. Therefore, the request for lidocaine pad 5% #30 is not medically necessary.