

Case Number:	CM15-0100162		
Date Assigned:	06/02/2015	Date of Injury:	09/04/2002
Decision Date:	06/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/26/2015

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: North Carolina
 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 60 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/4/2002. He reported slipping and falling down a flight of stairs, resulting in injury to the head, neck, back, and shoulders. The injured worker was diagnosed as having status post hemiplegia, cerebral palsy, lumbar sprain/strain, cervical sprain, seizure disorder, and osteoporosis. Treatment to date has included medications, CT scan, laboratory evaluations, emergency room treatment, and botox injections. The request is for Lidoderm DIS 5%. On 4/30/2015, he complained of bumping his head without loss of consciousness. He is reported to have had no seizure for 5 years prior. He has a history of cervical dystonia and seizure. After bumping his head his assistant called 911, resulting in him being airlifted to a hospital for treatment. He currently complained of left leg pain for which he uses Lidoderm patches. He had a Botox injection on 1/29/2015. He is reported to be doing well neurologically. Physical examination revealed reduced sensation of the right arm and left leg. He has an abnormal gait with a bent and twisted posture. The treatment plan included: Norco, Skelaxin, Ibuprofen, Botox, Naprosyn, and Lidoderm patches.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm DIS 5% 30 Qty: 60 refills: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on topical lidocaine states: 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) This medication is recommended for localized peripheral pain. There is no documentation of failure of first line neuropathic pain medications. Therefore criteria as set forth by the California MTUS as outlined above have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.