

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0157073		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/30/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/27/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/28/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/17/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/25/2014

### 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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Management and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This is a patient of the date of injury of May 27, 2010. A utilization review determination dated September 17, 2014 recommends noncertification of Lidoderm patches. A progress report dated August 11, 2014 identifies subjective complaints including pain along the anterior aspect of his ankle and 5th MTP joint. Physical examination identifies tenderness over the 5th MTP joint with some residual clawing of the toes that have now improved to some degree. Diagnoses including both knees with meniscal tears, chondromalacia, and arthritis status post total knee arthroplastys with persistent anterior ankle pain and right ankle foot drop. The treatment plan recommends a spinal cord stimulator, AFO brace, Lidoderm patches over the foot and ankle, and possible surgical correction of the 5th toe deformity. Pharmacy records indicate that the patient has previously taken gabapentin. A progress report dated September 10, 2014 indicates that the patient is using Neurontin. The note states that the current medications are "beneficial, no side effects."

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**1 prescription for Lidoderm patch 5% with 3 refills: Upheld**

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 112 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding request for topical lidoderm, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of topical lidocaine for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of the 1st line therapy such as tri-cyclic antidepressants, SNRIs, or antiepileptic drugs. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has failed first-line therapy recommendations. Additionally, there is no documentation of analgesic effect or objective functional improvement as a result of the currently prescribed lidoderm. Finally, there is no documentation of localized peripheral pain as recommended by guidelines. As such, the currently requested lidoderm is not medically necessary.