

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0131912		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/22/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/12/1995
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/01/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/29/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	08/18/2014

### 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 Occupational Medicine 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 55-year-old female with a 1/12/95 date of injury. At the time (7/17/14) of request for authorization for urine drug screen, there is documentation of subjective (neck pain and low back pain radiating to the upper and lower extremities) and objective (cervical paraspinal tenderness with decreased range of motion; tenderness to palpation over the lumbar spine with pain on flexion; decreased sensation over the bilateral C6 nerve root; and weakness of the bilateral lower extremities) findings, current diagnoses (lumbago, failed lumbar surgery, cervical radiculitis, and cervicgia), and treatment to date (ongoing opioid therapy). In addition, medical report identifies a 4/18/14 urine drug screen consistent with medications. There is no documentation of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control and that the patient is at "moderate risk" of addiction & misuse.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Urine drug screen:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Urine drug testing: (Substance abuse (tolerance, dependence, addi.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines On-Going Management Page(s): 78. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Urine Drug Testing

**Decision rationale:** MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control in patient under on-going opioid treatment, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of Urine Drug Screen. ODG supports urine drug testing within six months of initiation of opioid therapy and on a yearly basis thereafter for patients at "low risk" of addiction, 2 to 3 times a year for patients at "moderate risk" of addiction & misuse, and testing as often as once per month for patients at "high risk" of adverse outcomes (individuals with active substance abuse disorders). Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of lumbago, failed lumbar surgery, cervical radiculitis, and cervicgia. In addition, there is documentation of on-going opioid therapy. However, there is no documentation of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. In addition, given documentation of a 4/18/14 urine drug screen consistent with medications, there is no documentation that the patient is at "moderate risk" of addiction & misuse. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for urine drug screen is not medically necessary.