

Case Number:	CM15-0093501		
Date Assigned:	05/19/2015	Date of Injury:	05/21/2013
Decision Date:	06/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/14/2015

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: 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 61 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on May 21, 2013. He reported a lower back injury due to repetitive work activities. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar radiculitis and lumbar stenosis. He is status post a lumbar decompression and fusion on October 24, 2014. Diagnostic studies to date have included MRIs. Treatment to date has included heat, stretching, postoperative physical therapy, medications including topical pain, oral pain, steroid, muscle relaxant, and anti-epilepsy. On April 1, 2015, the injured worker complains of constant low back pain with intermittent radiating down the bilateral legs, greater on the right than left. The physical exam revealed decreased active lumbar range of motion, tenderness and marked tenderness over the lumbar 1 through sacral 1 disc space, bilateral lumbosacral paraspinal muscles, bilateral quadratus lumborum, mid sacrum, and bilateral gluteal musculature. The bilateral sitting straight leg raise was positive. He had a slow, guarded gait. The treatment plan includes Tylenol XS, Lidocaine 5% Patch, and Lyrica 75mg.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tylenol XS 500mg #180 with 2 refills: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines tylenol Page(s): 11.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS section on Tylenol states: Recommended for treatment of chronic pain & acute exacerbations of chronic pain. With new information questioning the use of NSAIDs, acetaminophen should be recommended on a case by case basis. The side effect profile of NSAIDs may have been minimized in systematic reviews due to the short duration of trials. On the other hand, it now appears that acetaminophen may produce hypertension, a risk similar to that found for NSAIDs. The patient has no contraindications to this medication and therefore the request is medically necessary.

Lidocaine 5% patch #60 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

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). Topical lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch (Lidoderm) has been designated for orphan status by the FDA for neuropathic pain. 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 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.

Lyrica 75mg #30 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy drugs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lyrica
Page(s): 19.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on Lyrica states: Pregabalin (Lyrica, no generic available) has been documented to be effective in treatment of diabetic neuropathy and post herpetic neuralgia, has FDA approval for both indications, and is considered first-line treatment for both. This medication is designated as a Schedule V controlled substance because of its causal relationship with euphoria. (Blommel, 2007) This medication also has an anti-anxiety effect. Pregabalin is being considered by the FDA as treatment for generalized anxiety disorder and social anxiety disorder. In June 2007 the FDA announced the approval of pregabalin as the first approved treatment for fibromyalgia. (ICSI, 2007) (Tassone, 2007) (Knotkova, 2007) (Eisenberg, 2007) (Crofford, 2005) (Stacey, 2008) The patient does not have the diagnoses of diabetic neuropathy, fibromyalgia or post herpetic neuropathy. There is no documentation of failure of other first line agents for peripheral neuropathy. Therefore, guideline recommendations have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.