

Case Number:	CM15-0071993		
Date Assigned:	04/22/2015	Date of Injury:	05/12/2010
Decision Date:	05/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/15/2015

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: Maryland

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 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 39 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 5/12/10. The injured worker reported symptoms in the back. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar degenerative disc disease. Treatments to date have included epidural steroid injection, status post lumbar fusion, oral pain medication, and spinal cord stimulator. Currently, the injured worker complains of low back pain with radiation to the lower extremities. The plan of care was for topical patches and a follow up appointment at a later date. A 3/31/15 document states that the patient discontinued Lyrica and noted increased tingling in her legs. She stats that Gabapentin in the past was not effective for neuropathic pain. The treatment plan on 3/31/15 was to restart Lyrica.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm patches 5% #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch).

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

Decision rationale: Lidoderm Patch 5% is not medically necessary per the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines. The guidelines state that topical lidocaine may be recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tricyclic or SNRI antidepressants 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. The documentation does not indicate failure of first line therapy for peripheral pain. The documentation does not indicate a diagnosis of post herpetic neuralgia. For these reasons the request for Lidoderm Patch 5% is not medically necessary.