

Case Number:	CM15-0029460		
Date Assigned:	02/24/2015	Date of Injury:	04/10/2005
Decision Date:	04/07/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/17/2015

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, Michigan, 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 56 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on April 10, 2005. The diagnoses have included L3-4 left disc bulge and L4-5 disc bulge on Magnetic resonance imaging scan on December 5, 2007, chronic left L5 radiculopathy on electromyogram and nerve conduction study on April 13, 2006, status post left knee arthroscopy on November 4, 2009, left carpal tunnel syndrome, left greater trochanteric bursitis, depression secondary to chronic pain and disability related to the industrial injury, acute posttraumatic sprain/strain cervical spine, posttraumatic chest contusion, acute posttraumatic sprain/strain left shoulder, post left carpal tunnel release surgery, status post repeat left knee arthroscopy on December 27, 2011 and history of elevated enzymes per test on August 21, 2014. Treatment to date has included oral pain medications and patches. Currently, the injured worker complains of lumbar and cervical spine pain and left wrist and left knee. In a progress note dated January 20, 2015, the treating provider reports examination of cervical spine there is tenderness over the surrounding musculature of the cervical spine with minimal spasms, upper extremities positive Tinel's left elbow and right wrist are positive and positive Phalen's on the right decreased strength with the left abductor pollicis brevis, the lumbar spine muscle spasm noted and tenderness myofascial, lower extremities positive straight leg raise on the left decreased strength and tenderness over the left knee predominantly in the medial joint line. On February 2, 2015 Utilization Review non-certified a Dilaudid 2mg quantity 60, noting, Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule Guidelines was cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Dilaudid 2mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 76-79.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Dilaudid is a short acting opioids is seen an effective medication to control pain. "Hydromorphone (Dilaudid; generic available): 2mg, 4mg, 8mg. Side Effects: Respiratory depression and apnea are of major concern. Patients may experience some circulatory depression, respiratory arrest, shock and cardiac arrest. The more common side effects are dizziness, sedation, nausea, vomiting, sweating, dry mouth and itching. (Product Information, Abbott Labs 2006) Analgesic dose: Usual starting dose is 2mg to 4mg PO every 4 to 6 hours. A gradual increase may be required, if tolerance develops." According to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules: "(a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework" There is no clear evidence and documentation form the patient file, for a need for more narcotic medications. There is no clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement with previous use of opioids. There is no evidence of pain breakthrough. There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of opioids. Therefore, the prescription of Dilaudid 2mg #60 is not medically necessary.