

Case Number:	CM14-0166652		
Date Assigned:	10/13/2014	Date of Injury:	01/19/2014
Decision Date:	11/17/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/09/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/09/2014

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:

The applicant is a represented [REDACTED] employee who has filed a claim for chronic low back pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of January 19, 2014. Thus far, the applicant has been treated with the following: Analgesic medications; transfer of care to and from various providers in various specialties; and unspecified amounts of physical therapy over the course of the claim. In a Utilization Review Report dated September 9, 2014, the claims administrator denied a request for opioid risk testing and genetic metabolism testing. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. In a progress note dated August 29, 2014, the applicant reportedly ongoing complaints of low back pain. The applicant was pending acupuncture, it was noted. The applicant expressed some concern that she might be pregnant. The applicant's medication list included Naprosyn, Motrin, and Prilosec. The applicant's BMI was 27. Genetic risk testing and opioid metabolism testing were apparently endorsed. The applicant was asked to hold off on pursuing injection therapy until she was able to definitely state whether or not she is pregnant.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Genetic Metabolism Test: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, screening for risk of addiction (tests) Page(s): 91. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG Pain (Chronic)

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cytokine DNA Testing for Pain topic Page(s): 42.

Decision rationale: As noted on page 42 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, DNA testing/genetic metabolism testing for pain purposes is "not recommended." In this case, the attending provider failed to furnish any compelling applicant-specific rationale or medical evidence, which would offset the unfavorable MTUS position on the article at issue. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Opioid risk test: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, screening for risk of addiction (tests). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG Pain (Chronic)

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cytokine DNA Testing for Pain topic. Page(s): 42.

Decision rationale: As noted on page 42 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, DNA testing for pain/genetic testing is "not recommended." It is further noted that the applicant does not appear to be using opioids in this case and that the applicant is not a candidate for opioid therapy in light of the fact that she believes she may be pregnant. The request, thus, is not indicated both owing to the individual circumstances of the applicant's case and care as well as owing to the unfavorable MTUS position on the article at issue. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.