

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0207111		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/19/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/23/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	02/17/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	11/10/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	12/10/2014

### 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 neck and low back pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of June 23, 2011. In a Utilization Review Report dated November 10, 2014, the claims administrator denied a request for a urine drug screen while approving transfer of care to a pain management physician. The claims administrator referenced an October 16, 2014 progress note in which it was stated that the applicant did not exhibit any aberrant or drug seeking behavior. The claims administrator referenced a non-MTUS Chapter 7 ACOEM Guidelines in its determination and, furthermore, mislabeled said guidelines as originating from the MTUS. Urine drug testing was performed on an earlier office visit of September 9, 2014, it was suggested. Tramadol and Mobic were endorsed, along with a rather proscriptive 20-pound lifting limitation. It was not clearly stated whether the applicant was or was not working with said limitation in place, although this did not appear to be the case. The remainder of the file was surveyed. There was no reference to the results of the drug testing performed on September 9, 2014 on file.

### 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 Page(s): 43.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing Page(s): 43. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG Chronic Pain Chapter, Urine Drug Testing topic.

**Decision rationale:** While page 43 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines does support intermittent drug testing in the chronic pain population, the MTUS does not establish specific parameters for or identify with which to perform drug testing. ODG's Chronic Pain Chapter Urine Drug Testing, however, stipulates that an attending provider attach an applicant's complete medication list to the request for authorization for testing, eschew confirmatory and/or quantitative testing outside of the emergency department drug overdose context, and attempt to categorize applicants into higher- or lower-risk categories for which more or less frequent drug test would be indicated. Here, the attending provider apparently ordered testing on consecutive office visits of September 9, 2014 and October 16, 2014. No clear rationale for such frequent drug testing was furnished. Per the claims administrator, furthermore, the attending provider stated that the applicant did not exhibit any drug-seeking behavior, arguing against the need for such frequent drug testing here. ODG further stipulates that attending provider clearly attach and discuss an applicant's drug test results. Here, however, the results of drug testing performed were not discussed nor were the results presented in a meaningful manner. Since several ODG criteria for pursuit of drug testing were not met, the request is not medically necessary.