

Case Number:	CM15-0071697		
Date Assigned:	04/21/2015	Date of Injury:	02/29/2012
Decision Date:	05/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/16/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/14/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 52 year old male who sustained a work related injury February 29, 2012. According to a follow-up report from the primary treating physician, dated February 10, 2015, the injured worker presented with continued back pain radiating into the lower extremities with pain, paresthasias, and numbness. Physical examination reveals spasm, tenderness and guarding in the paravertebral musculature of the lumbar spine with loss of range of motion. There is decreased sensation noted bilaterally S1 dermatomes with pain. He continues to use a four point walker to assist in ambulation. There are also complaints associated with irritable bowel syndrome including stomach pain despite taking Prilosec twice a day. Diagnoses included lumbosacral radiculopathy and disc displacement, not otherwise specified, without myelopathy. Treatment plan included request for internal medicine consultation, refill of medication for pain relief, and discussion of the importance of transitioning to a cane for ambulation. At issue, is the request for LidAll Pain Relieving Patch (5 patches per box).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

LidAll Pain Relieving Patch (5 patches per box): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Topical Analgesics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm patches Page(s): 56-57. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Topical analgesics and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines UpToDate.com, Lidocaine (topical).

Decision rationale: Lidall is a patch that contains lidocaine and menthol. Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state 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 or Lyrica). This is not a first-line treatment and is only FDA approved for post-herpetic neuralgia. 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. For more information and references, see Topical analgesics. ODG further details, Criteria for use of Lidoderm patches: (a) Recommended for a trial if there is evidence of localized pain that is consistent with a neuropathic etiology. (b) There should be evidence of a trial of first-line neuropathy medications (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). (c) This medication is not generally recommended for treatment of osteoarthritis or treatment of myofascial pain/trigger points. (d) An attempt to determine a neuropathic component of pain should be made if the plan is to apply this medication to areas of pain that is generally secondary to non-neuropathic mechanisms (such as the knee or isolated axial low back pain). One recognized method of testing is the use of the Neuropathic Pain Scale. (e) The area for treatment should be designated as well as number of planned patches and duration for use (number of hours per day). (f) A Trial of patch treatment is recommended for a short-term period (no more than four weeks). (g) It is generally recommended that no other medication changes be made during the trial period. (h) Outcomes should be reported at the end of the trial including improvements in pain and function, and decrease in the use of other medications. If improvements cannot be determined, the medication should be discontinued. (i) Continued outcomes should be intermittently measured and if improvement does not continue, lidocaine patches should be discontinued. Medical documents provided do not indicate that the use would be for post-herpetic neuralgia. Additionally, treatment notes did not detail other first-line therapy used and what the clinical outcomes resulted. As such, the request for LidAll Pain Relieving Patch (5 patches per box) is not medically necessary.