

Case Number:	CM15-0014253		
Date Assigned:	02/02/2015	Date of Injury:	06/02/2006
Decision Date:	03/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/26/2015

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 is a 66 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on June 2, 2006. The diagnoses have included cervical pain. A progress note dated November 17, 2014 provides the injured worker complains of neck stiffness and pain that is decreased after trigger injection and chiropractic treatment. Primary treating physician note dated January 5, 2015 notes neck pain that radiates to extremities with numbness and weakness in hands. On January 19, 2015 utilization review non-certified a request for Lidoderm patches 5% quantity 30. The Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) and Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) were utilized in the determination. Application for independent medical review (IMR) is dated January 26, 2015.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm patches 5% quantity 30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Work Loss Data Institute

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

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, “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”. In this case, there is no documentation that the patient developed neuropathic pain that did not respond to first line therapy and the need for Lidoderm patch is unclear. There is no documentation of efficacy of previous use of Lidoderm patch. Therefore, the prescription of Lidoderm patches #30 is not medically necessary.