

Case Number:	CM14-0170318		
Date Assigned:	10/20/2014	Date of Injury:	03/07/2014
Decision Date:	11/20/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/18/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/15/2014

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 and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain 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:

This is a patient with a date of injury of 3/7/14. A utilization review determination dated 9/18/14 deemed the request not medically necessary of PT, ibuprofen, and UDS. 8/26/14 medical report identifies pain in the neck and left elbow. "Response to therapy Patient is improving with less range of moti." [sic] On exam, there is limited ROM, spasm, tenderness, positive Tinel's at left medial elbow and bilateral wrists at the median nerve, positive cervical compression signs with pain, loss of motor strength in the resisted cervical spine ROM, diminished sensation in light touch and 2-point discrimination in the palmar radial aspect of the hand.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Continued physical therapy (cervical): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend up to 10 sessions with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Within the

documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior PT sessions, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. In light of the above issues, the currently requested physical therapy is not medically necessary.

Prospective usage of ibuprofen 600mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 67-72.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for ibuprofen, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction or reduction in numeric rating scale) or any objective functional improvement. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested ibuprofen is not medically necessary.

Prospective review - urine drug screen: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 76-79 and 99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter Urine Drug Testing

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for a urine drug screen, CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the drug testing is recommended as an option. Guidelines go on to recommend monitoring for the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non-adherent) drug related behaviors. ODG recommends urine drug testing on a yearly basis for low risk patients, 2-3 times a year for moderate risk patients, and possibly once per month for high risk patients. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation that the patient is currently utilizing drugs of potential abuse, the date and results of prior testing, and current risk stratification to identify the medical necessity of drug screening at the proposed frequency. In light of the above issues, the currently requested urine drug screen is not medically necessary.

Retrospective review - urine drug screen (DOS 8-26-14): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 76-79 and 99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter Urine Drug Testing

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for a urine drug screen, CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the drug testing is recommended as an option. Guidelines go on to recommend monitoring for the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non-adherent) drug related behaviors. The ODG recommends urine drug testing on a yearly basis for low risk patients, 2-3 times a year for moderate risk patients, and possibly once per month for high risk patients. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation that the patient is currently utilizing drugs of potential abuse, the date and results of prior testing, and current risk stratification to identify the medical necessity of drug screening at the proposed frequency. In light of the above issues, the currently requested urine drug screen is not medically necessary.