

Case Number:	CM15-0059520		
Date Assigned:	04/06/2015	Date of Injury:	09/07/2006
Decision Date:	05/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/30/2015

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: Ohio, North Carolina, Virginia
 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 69-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 09/07/2006. He has reported subsequent neck and right shoulder pain and was diagnosed with degenerative cervical disc disease with right radiculopathy, right rotator cuff syndrome and myofascial pain syndrome with trigger points. Treatment to date has included oral and topical pain medication, TENS unit and epidural injections. In a progress note dated 02/04/2015, the injured worker complained of neck and right shoulder pain. Objective findings were notable for discrete tender trigger points over the neck and posterior shoulders with muscle twitch points and decreased range of motion of the right shoulder. A request for authorization of Lidoderm cream and Flector patch refills was made.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidocaine 5% cream: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical analgesics Page(s): 112.

Decision rationale: Lidocaine Indication: 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). Topical lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch (Lidoderm) has been designated for orphan status by the FDA for neuropathic pain. Lidoderm is also used off-label for diabetic neuropathy. No other commercially approved topical formulations of lidocaine (whether creams, lotions or gels) are indicated for neuropathic pain. Non-dermal patch formulations are generally indicated as local anesthetics and anti-pruritics. 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. In February 2007, the FDA notified consumers and healthcare professionals of the potential hazards of the use of topical lidocaine. Those at particular risk were individuals that applied large amounts of this substance over large areas, left the products on for long periods of time, or used the agent with occlusive dressings. Systemic exposure was highly variable among patients. Only FDA-approved products are currently recommended. (Argoff, 2006) (Dworkin, 2007) (Khaliq-Cochrane, 2007) (Knotkova, 2007) (Lexi-Comp, 2008) Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. There is only one trial that tested 4% lidocaine for treatment of chronic muscle pain. The results showed there was no superiority over placebo. (Scudds, 1995)"In this instance, it appears the intent of the lidocaine cream is for cervical radiculopathy pain which radiates primarily into the right upper extremity. Lidocaine creams, lotions, and gels are not indicated for neuropathic pain per the referenced guidelines. Therefore, Lidocaine 5% cream is not medically necessary.

Flector 1.3% patch: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory agents (NSAIDs): The efficacy in clinical trials for this treatment modality has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. Topical NSAIDs have been shown in meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the first 2 weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis, but either not afterward, or with a diminishing effect over another 2-week period. (Lin, 2004) (Bjordal, 2007) (Mason, 2004) When investigated specifically for osteoarthritis of the knee, topical NSAIDs have been shown to be superior to placebo for 4 to 12 weeks. In this study the effect appeared to diminish over time and it was stated that further research was required to determine if results were similar for all preparations. (Biswal, 2006) These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. (Mason, 2004) Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. Flector patch

contains the NSAID diclofenac. While the exact application site intended for the requested Flector patch is not specified, it seems the intended site of application is for the cervical spine region or the shoulder. Topical anti-inflammatories like diclofenac are not recommended for the shoulder or spine. Therefore, Flector patch 1.3% is not medically necessary.