

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM15-0048996 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 03/20/2015   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 12/03/2014 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 05/01/2015   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 03/03/2015 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 03/16/2015 |

### 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: Arizona, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

### 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 47 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 12/3/2014. Her diagnoses, and/or impressions, include a right knee tear. There is no record of recent magnetic resonance imaging studies. She has been treated with a brace/sleeve; Lidopro cream which has been helpful; and Naproxen as needed. In the progress report of 2/18/2015, the injured worker reports right knee injury with pain when she moves a certain way. Her treating physician reports clean/dry and intact skin and that she is alert and oriented; no other objective findings are noted. The physician's requests included Lidopro Cream 121 grams.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Retrospective: Lidopro Cream 121mg, quantity 1:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

**Decision rationale:** According to the MTUS guidelines, topical analgesics are recommended as an option as indicated below. They are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. Lidocaine is 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). In this case the claimant did not have the above diagnoses. Long-term use of topical analgesics including Lidoderm are not recommended. The claimant had been on oral NSAIDs with a pain level of 1/10. The pain control attributed to Lidopro cannot be determined. The request for continued and long-term use of Lidopro as above is not medically necessary.