

Case Number:	CM15-0041904		
Date Assigned:	03/12/2015	Date of Injury:	02/02/2012
Decision Date:	04/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/11/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/05/2015

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: 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 50-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on February 2, 2012. The injured worker had reported a left shoulder injury. The diagnoses have included left shoulder sprain/strain, pain in joint of the shoulder and stiffness of joint in the shoulder region. Treatment to date has included medications, radiological studies, a transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation unit and Cortisone injections. Current documentation dated January 5, 2015 notes that the injured worker complained of constant left shoulder pain, which radiated into the left arm. Associated symptoms include burning and numbness. Physical examination of the left shoulder revealed tenderness, myofascial trigger points and a restricted range of motion. A Waddell's test was positive on the left. The treating physician's recommended plan of care included a prescription for Lidoderm 5% Patch.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm patch 5%: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 111-113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792.20
9792.26 Page(s): 56.

Decision rationale: 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. The patient does not suffer from post-herpetic neuralgia or localized peripheral pain. According to the MTUS, Lidoderm 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. The medical record has no documentation that the patient has undergone a trial of first-line therapy. Lidoderm patch 5% is not medically necessary.