

Case Number:	CM15-0046511		
Date Assigned:	03/18/2015	Date of Injury:	12/05/2011
Decision Date:	04/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/11/2015

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 69-year-old female with an industrial injury dated December 5, 2011. The injured worker diagnoses include carpal tunnel syndrome and meniscus tear of knee. She has been treated with diagnostic studies, prescribed medications and periodic follow up visits. According to the progress note dated 2/11/2015, the injured worker reported bilateral hand pain with numbness, greater on the right than left. The injured worker also reported right leg pain and knee discomfort. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of the knee from 6/5/2013 revealed degenerative joint disease and a shallow oblique tear of the lateral meniscus. Physical exam revealed mild weakness and mild decrease sensation of bilateral hands. The treating physician prescribed Lidopro cream 121gm now under review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Purchase of Lidopro cream 121gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111), topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. That is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. Lido Pro (capsaicin, menthol and methyl salicylate and lidocaine) contains capsaicin a topical analgesic and lidocaine not recommended by MTUS. Furthermore, there is no documentation of failure or intolerance of first line oral medications for the treatment of pain. Based on the above Lido Pro cream is not medically necessary.