

Case Number:	CM15-0035421		
Date Assigned:	03/03/2015	Date of Injury:	06/30/2014
Decision Date:	04/09/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/25/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 37 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 6/30/2014. He has reported a fall from a light pole onto a truck subsequently injuring the neck, back and right wrist. The diagnoses have included lumbar contusion, multiple thoracic disc protrusion with fissure, right wrist sprain. Treatment to date has included Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs), analgesic, and physical therapy. Currently, the IW complains of mid-low back pain that is worse with bending. A pain management evaluation on 1/26/15 documented no acute objective findings. The plan of care included obtaining a behavioral medicine evaluation, physical therapy, and a trial of lidoderm patches. On 2/6/2015 Utilization Review non-certified a prospective usage of lidoderm patches #30, noting the documentation did not support prior treatment failure per guidelines. The MTUS Guidelines were cited. On 2/25/2015, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of prospective usage of lidoderm patches #30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm patches #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical analgesics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm patches Page(s): 56-57. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Topical analgesics and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines UpToDate.com, Lidocaine (topical).

Decision rationale: Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state: Lidoderm is the brand name for a lidocaine patch produced by Endo Pharmaceuticals. 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 patches #30 is not medically necessary.