

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0174096		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/15/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/06/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/16/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/11/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/03/2015

### 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 (n) 43 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8-6-10. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar sprain. The physical exam on 5-27-15, revealed spasms in the lumbar spine, a positive seated straight leg raise test on the right at 60 degrees and diminished sensation in the right L5-S1 distribution. Treatment to date has included several lumbar MRIs, a lumbar epidural injection x 2 in 2013, physical therapy, Lidocaine and Soma (since at least 5-27-15). As of the PR2 dated 7-8-15, the injured worker reports persistent low back and right leg pain. Objective findings include spasms in the lumbar spine, a positive seated straight leg raise test on the right at 60 degrees and diminished sensation in the right L5-S1 distribution. The treating physician requested Soma 350mg #360 and Lidoderm patch 5% #30. On 7-30-15, the treating physician requested a Utilization Review for Soma 350mg #360 and Lidoderm patch 5% #30. The Utilization Review dated 8-11-15, non-certified the request for Soma 350mg #360 and Lidoderm patch 5% #30.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Soma 350mg, 360: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (Van Tulder, 2003) (Van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain, but rather for ongoing and chronic lumbar pain. This is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

**Lidoderm patches 5%, #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

**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). The FDA for neuropathic pain has designated topical lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch (Lidoderm) for orphan status. 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. The patient does have lower extremity pain, however the patient has no documented failure of all first line agents indicated for the treatment of neuropathic pain as outlined above. Therefore, criteria as set forth by the California MTUS as outlined above have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.