

Case Number:	CM14-0200302		
Date Assigned:	12/10/2014	Date of Injury:	06/19/2014
Decision Date:	01/29/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/06/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/01/2014

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 Rehab, 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 6/19/14. A utilization review determination dated 11/6/14 recommends non-certification of spine specialist consult and urine toxicology screen. 10/15/14 medical report identifies persistent lumbar spine pain with radiation to the leg. On exam, there is lumbar spine tenderness and positive SLR. Recommendations include spine specialist consultation and UDS.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Consult Spine Specialist for the Lumbar Spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 5 Cornerstones of Disability Prevention and Management Page(s): 65, 92. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 7, Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 305

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations Chapter 7, Page 127

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for consultation, California MTUS does not address this issue. ACOEM supports consultation if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. Within the documentation available for review, there is no current documentation of clinical and imaging findings consistent with radiculopathy or another potential surgical lesion. In light of the above issues, the currently requested consultation is not medically necessary.

Urine Toxicology Screening: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing, Opioids, Criteria for Use.

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 toxicology test (UDS), 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 toxicology test is not medically necessary.