

Case Number:	CM14-0088843		
Date Assigned:	07/23/2014	Date of Injury:	10/22/2010
Decision Date:	08/26/2014	UR Denial Date:	06/10/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/12/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 43-year-old female with a 10/22/10 date of injury, and decompressive cervical laminectomy with decompression of spinal cord on 1/29/13. At the time (5/15/14) of request for authorization for Lenza Gel (Lidocaine 4%, Menthol 1%) #120gm, there is documentation of subjective (neck pain) and objective (tenderness and spasm over the cervical paravertebral muscles with decreased range of motion, tenderness over the lumbar paravertebral muscles with decreased range of motion, and positive straight leg raise test) findings, current diagnoses (cervical sprain, cervical radiculitis, C5-C6 disc protrusions, thoracic sprain, and lumbar strain), and treatment to date (medications and physical therapy).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lenza Gel (Lidocaine 4%, Menthol 1%) #120gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies that many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control; that any compounded medications containing ketoprofen, lidocaine (in creams, lotion or gels), capsaicin in a 0.0375% formulation, baclofen and other muscle relaxants, and gabapentin and other anti-epilepsy drugs are not recommended for topical applications; and that any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended, is not recommended. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of cervical sprain, cervical radiculitis, C5-C6 disc protrusions, thoracic sprain, and lumbar strain. However, Lenza Gel (Lidocaine 4%, Menthol 1%) contains at least one drug (Lidocaine) that is not recommended. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Lenza Gel (Lidocaine 4%, Menthol 1%) #120gm is not medically necessary