

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM13-0063616		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/30/2013	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/15/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/15/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	11/11/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	12/10/2013

### 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: Indiana

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 (IW) is a 61-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 01/15/2010. She has had pain throughout her back, paraspinal muscle spasticity and weakness in all extremities. Diagnoses include tethered cord syndrome, cervical spinal cord injury; spasticity secondary to the cervical spinal cord injury; status post intrathecal Baclofen pump; and left foot drop, status post cervical fusion surgery. Treatment to date has included medications, implanted pain pump, psychotherapy and tendon sheath injections. She reported her medications and other treatments are beneficial. Diagnostics performed include MRIs. According to the progress notes dated 10/31/13, the IW reports bilateral leg, arm and lower back pain with lower extremity spasticity, as well as a recent flare-up of neck pain. She also has left foot drop. The requested service is included in the provider's treatment plan.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**LIDODERM 5% PATCHES:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm patches Page(s): 56-57. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Topical analgesics Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: UpToDate.com, Lidocaine (topical).

**Decision rationale:** Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state "Lidoderm is the brand name for a lidocaine patch produced by [REDACTED]. 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. Formulations that do not involve a dermal-patch system are generally indicated as local anesthetics and anti-pruritics. For more information and references, see Topical analgesics." ODG further details, Criteria for use of Lidoderm patches: (a) Recommended for a trial if there is evidence of localized pain that is consistent with a neuropathic etiology. (b) There should be evidence of a trial of first-line neuropathy medications (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). (c) This medication is not generally recommended for treatment of osteoarthritis or treatment of myofascial pain/trigger points. (d) An attempt to determine a neuropathic component of pain should be made if the plan is to apply this medication to areas of pain that are generally secondary to non-neuropathic mechanisms (such as the knee or isolated axial low back pain). One recognized method of testing is the use of the Neuropathic Pain Scale. (e) The area for treatment should be designated as well as number of planned patches and duration for use (number of hours per day). (f) A Trial of patch treatment is recommended for a short-term period (no more than four weeks). (g) It is generally recommended that no other medication changes be made during the trial period. (h) Outcomes should be reported at the end of the trial including improvements in pain and function, and decrease in the use of other medications. If improvements cannot be determined, the medication should be discontinued. (i) Continued outcomes should be intermittently measured and if improvement does not continue, lidocaine patches should be discontinued. Medical documents provided do not indicate that the use would be for post-herpetic neuralgia. Additionally, treatment notes did not detail other first-line therapy used and what the clinical outcomes resulted. As such, the request for Lidoderm 5% patches is not medically necessary.