

Case Number:	CM15-0010831		
Date Assigned:	01/28/2015	Date of Injury:	09/09/1994
Decision Date:	03/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/16/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/20/2015

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: California, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

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 52 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/9/14. On 1/20/15, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of Dilaudid 4mg, and Kadian ER 100mg, and MRI of the Upper Right Extremity Joint and Temazepam 30mg and X-ray of the right shoulder. The treating provider has reported the injured worker complained of chronic pain - neck and right shoulder is really painful and in office for medication refill. The diagnoses have included insomnia, cervical spinal stenosis, chronic pain syndrome, cervicgia, other affections of shoulder region, NEC, impingement syndrome, disc degeneration, cervical disc. Treatment to date has included x-ray cervical (2/15/11) - status post anterior cervical fusion C4, C5 and C6, MRI cervical spine (2/15/11), MRI cervical spine (8/19/14). On 1/16/15 Utilization Review non-certified MRI of the Upper Right Extremity Joint and X-ray of the right shoulder. The Utilization Reviewer modified the requested medications: Kadian ER 100mg to #38 between 12/16/14 and 3/14/15, and Dilaudid 4 mg to 1 prescription #75 between 12/16/14 and 3/14/15 and Temazepam 30mg to 1 prescription #23 between 12/16/2014 and 3/14/2015. The MTUS (May 2009) Guidelines, (or ODG) were cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Kadian ER 100 MG: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 93.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids ?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 nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the 4 A's (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any aberrant drug-taking behaviors).The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs.Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Kadian nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.It should be noted that the UR physician has certified a modification of the request for the purpose of weaning.

Dilaudid 4 MG: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-75, 93.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids 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 nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the 4 A's (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any aberrant drug-taking behaviors).The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs.Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Dilaudid nor any

documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed. It should be noted that the UR physician has certified a modification of the request for the purpose of weaning.

Temazepam 30 MG: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Benzodiazepines Page(s): 24.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p24 regarding benzodiazepines, "Not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Their range of action includes sedative/hypnotic, anxiolytic, anticonvulsant, and muscle relaxant. Chronic benzodiazepines are the treatment of choice in very few conditions. Tolerance to hypnotic effects develops rapidly. Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker has been using this medication since 7/30/14. As the treatment is not recommended for long term use, the request is not medically necessary.

MRI of The Upper Right Extremity Joint: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, Shoulder, Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Decision rationale: The MTUS is silent with regard to specific indications for shoulder MRI. Per the ODG guidelines: Indications for imaging -- Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI):- Acute shoulder trauma, suspect rotator cuff tear/impingement; over age 40; normal plain radiographs- Subacute shoulder pain, suspect instability/labral tear- Repeat MRI is not routinely recommended, and should be reserved for a significant change in symptoms and/or findings suggestive of significant pathology. (Mays, 2008) While it was noted that the injured worker had

positive impingement sign, there were no signs of instability or suspected labral tear. As the criteria is not met, the request is not medically necessary.

X-Ray of The Right Shoulder: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177.

Decision rationale: ACOEM guidelines support ordering of imaging studies for emergence of red flags, physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction, failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery, and clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination, electrodiagnostic studies, laboratory tests, or bone scans. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Electromyography (EMG), and nerve conduction velocities (NCV), including H-reflex tests, may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck or arm symptoms, or both, lasting more than three or four weeks. The documentation submitted for review did not contain evidence of any red flag neurologic findings on physical examination. There was no acute injury to the shoulder that would warrant imaging study. Medical necessity cannot be affirmed.