

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0073892		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/23/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/18/2002
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/11/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/15/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/17/2015

### 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, Alabama, 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 60-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 6/18/02. The injured worker reported symptoms in the back. The injured worker was diagnosed as having radiculopathy and low back pain. Treatments to date have included oral pain medication and status post left L3-5 laminectomy and foraminotomy. Currently, the injured worker complains of lower back pain. The plan of care was for medication prescriptions and a follow up appointment at a later date.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Lidoderm 5% patch x 60 with 5 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

**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 #60, with 5 refills is not medically necessary.

**Zanaflex 4mg #60 with 5 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 63-66.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants Page(s): 63.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, a non-sedating muscle relaxants is recommended with caution as a second line option for short term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic lumbosacral pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. The patient in this case developed continuous pain, and has been using Zanaflex for a longtime without any evidence of spasm relief. Furthermore, there is no documentation contraindicating the use of NSAID's for the patient's condition. Therefore, the request for Zanaflex 4mg #60, with 5 refills is not medically necessary.