

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0106129		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/10/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/05/2005
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/13/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/20/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/02/2015

### 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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

### 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 56-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 01/05/2005. Diagnoses include lumbar sprain/strain, piriformis syndrome and myofascial pain. Treatment to date has included medications, physical therapy, ice therapy, chiropractic treatment and TENS unit. According to the progress notes dated 4/23/15, the IW reported constant 5-8/10 pain across the mid back, low back and buttock as well as intermittent pain in the left leg. On examination, the mid back, low back, bilateral buttocks and bilateral sacroiliac joints were tender to palpation and spasms were noted in all areas. Lumbar flexion was 45 degrees and right and left lateral flexion was 15 degrees. A retrospective request was made for Lidopro topical 120gms dispensed on 4/23/15.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**1 Container of Lidopro Topical Ointment 120 grams, dispensed 4/23/15: Upheld**

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Lidopro, CA MTUS states that topical compound medications require guideline support for all components of the compound in order for the compound to be approved. Topical NSAIDs are indicated for "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. Neuropathic pain: Not recommended as there is no evidence to support use." Topical lidocaine is "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)." Additionally, it is supported only as a dermal patch. Capsaicin is "Recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments." Within the documentation available for review, none of the above mentioned criteria have been documented. Furthermore, there is no clear rationale for the use of topical medications rather than the FDA-approved oral forms for this patient. Given all of the above, the requested Lidopro is not medically necessary.