

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0180995		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	11/10/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/10/2001
<b>Decision Date:</b>	12/11/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/06/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/31/2014

### 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 Preventive Medicine 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 62-year-old male with a 2/10/01 date of injury. At the time (9/24/14) of the request for authorization for Lidoderm patches 5%, there is documentation of subjective (low back pain) and objective (diffuse tenderness over the bilateral lower lumbar spine, straight leg raising test was positive bilaterally, decreased sensation was noted at the L1 through S1 dermatomes) findings, current diagnoses (status post lumbar laminectomy, lumbar radiculopathy, lumbar discopathy, lumbar sprain/strain, intractable low back pain, and sacral joint arthropathy), and treatment to date (medication including Lidoderm patches for at least a year). There is no documentation that a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica) has failed; and functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications with as a result of Lidoderm use to date.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Lidoderm patches 5%:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (Lidocaine Patch) Page(s): 56-57.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch) Page(s): 56-57.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation of neuropathic pain after there has been evidence that a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica) has failed, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of a lidocaine patch. MTUS-Definitions identifies that any treatment intervention should not be continued in the absence of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications or medical services. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of status post lumbar laminectomy, lumbar radiculopathy, lumbar discopathy, lumbar sprain/strain, intractable low back pain, and sacral joint arthropathy. In addition, there is documentation of neuropathic pain. However, there is no documentation that a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica) has failed. In addition, given documentation of treatment with Lidoderm patches for at least a year, there is no documentation of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications with as a result of Lidoderm use to date. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Lidoderm patches 5% is not medically necessary.