

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0030984		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/24/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/16/2008
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/07/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	02/04/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/19/2015

### 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 Jersey, Michigan, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 female who sustained an industrial related injury on 5/16/08. The injured worker had complaints of low back pain and a pinching feeling in her feet. Physical examination findings included limited lumbar spine range of motion in both extension and flexion. Diagnoses included apparent history of a right fibular fracture with operative fixation, history of a right bimalleolar fracture status post-operative fixation, complex regional pain syndrome involving the right lower extremity, low back pain, thoracic spine pain, neck pain, and bilateral knee pain right greater than left. Medications included Naproxen and a Lidoderm patch. The treating physician requested authorization for retrospective Lidoderm Patch 5% #30 for 12/18/14 and retrospective Naproxen 550mg #60 for 12/18/14. On 2/4/15 the requests were non-certified. Regarding Lidoderm, the utilization review (UR) physician cited the Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) guidelines and noted the guidelines state Lidoderm is only approved for post-herpetic neuralgia. There was no documentation to indicate the injured worker had post herpetic neuralgia. Therefore the request was non-certified. Regarding Naproxen, the UR physician cited the MTUS guidelines and noted the guidelines recommend NSAIDS as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen for acute exacerbations of pain. The medical records do not indicate that acetaminophen was tried and failed before a second-line treatment medication. Therefore, the request was non-certified.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Retro Lidoderm patch 5% #30 (DOS: 12/18/14): Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidocaine Patch Page(s): 57.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch) Page(s): 56.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, "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". In this case, there is no documentation that the patient developed neuropathic pain that did not respond to first line therapy and the need for Lidoderm patch is unclear. There is no documentation of efficacy of previous use of Lidoderm patch. Therefore, the prescription of Lidoderm patch 5% #30 is not medically necessary.

**Retro Naproxen 550mg #60 (DOS: 12/18/14): Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 71; 67.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NON SELECTIVE NSAIDS Page(s): 72.

**Decision rationale:** "Naproxen (Naprosyn): delayed release (EC-Naprosyn), as Sodium salt (Anaprox, Anaprox DS, Aleve [otc]) Generic available; extended-release (Naprelan): 375 mg. Different dose strengths and formulations of the drug are not necessarily bioequivalent. Dosing Information: Osteoarthritis or ankylosing spondylitis: Dividing the daily dose into 3 doses versus 2 doses for immediate-release and delayed-release formulations generally does not affect response. Morning and evening doses do not have to be equal in size. The dose may be increased to 1500 mg/day of naproxyn for limited periods when a higher level of analgesic/anti-inflammatory activity is required (for up to 6 months). Naprosyn or naproxyn: 250-500 mg PO twice daily. Anaprox: 275-550 mg PO twice daily. (Total dose may be increased to 1650 mg a day for limited periods) EC-Naprosyn: 375 mg or 500 mg twice daily. The tablet should not be broken, crushed or chewed to maintain integrity of the enteric coating. Naprelan: Two 375 mg tablets (750 mg) PO once daily or two 500 mg tablets (1000 mg) once daily. If required (and a lower dose was tolerated) Naprelan can be increased to 1500 mg once daily for limited periods (when higher analgesia is required). Pain: Naprosyn or naproxyn: 250-500 mg PO twice daily. The maximum dose on day one should not exceed 1250 mg and 1000 mg on subsequent days. Anaprox: 275-550 mg PO twice daily. The maximum dose on day one should not exceed 1375 mg and 1100 mg on subsequent days. Extended-release Naprelan: Not recommended due to delay in absorption." (Naprelan Package Insert) There is no documentation of the rationale behind the long-term use of Naproxen. NSAID should be used for the shortest duration and the lowest

dose. There is no documentation from the patient file that the provider titrated Naproxen to the lowest effective dose and used it for the shortest period possible. Naproxen was used without clear documentation of its efficacy. Furthermore, there is no documentation that the provider followed the patient for NSAID adverse reactions that are not limited to GI side effect, but also may affect the renal function. Therefore, the request for Retro Naproxen 550mg #60 is not medically necessary.