MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0103881		
Date Assigned:	06/08/2015	Date of Injury:	12/09/2011
Decision Date:	07/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/01/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/29/2015

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
State(s) of Licensure: New York, Tennessee
Certification(s)/Specialty: Emergency Medicine

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 injured worker is a 58-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on December 9, 2011. The injured worker was diagnosed as having left knee patella fracture and arthroscopic left knee resection. Treatment to date has included surgery and medication. A progress note dated March 24, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of left knee pain. Physical exam notes tenderness of the knee with decreased range of motion (ROM). The plan is for lab work to confirm compliance and identify possible drug diversion and interactions. The injured worker has been using Ultram since at least June of 2014.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Follow up visit follow up visit on 5/5/2015: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines: Knee & Leg, Office visits.

Decision rationale: Office visits are recommended as determined to be medically necessary. Evaluation and management (E&M) outpatient visits to the offices of medical doctor(s) play a critical role in the proper diagnosis and return to function of an injured worker, and they should be encouraged. The need for a clinical office visit with a health care provider is individualized based upon a review of the patient concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability, and reasonable physician judgment. The determination is also based on what medications the patient is taking, since some medicines such as opiates, or medicines such as certain antibiotics, require close monitoring. As patient conditions are extremely varied, a set number of office visits per condition cannot be reasonably established. The determination of necessity for an office visit requires individualized case review and assessment, being ever mindful that the best patient outcomes are achieved with eventual patient independence from the health care system through self care as soon as clinically feasible. The number of office visits automatically covered for an established patient is six. In this case, there is no documentation of significant change in the patient's condition since September 2014. Follow up visits every 4 months are not medically indicated. The request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective: Urine drug screen for date of service: 3/24/2015: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Pain Interventions and Guidelines Page(s): 78. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines: Pain, urine drug testing.

Decision rationale: Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that urinary drug testing should be used if there are issues of abuse, addiction, or pain control in patients being treated with opioids. ODG criteria for Urinary Drug testing are recommended for patients with chronic opioid use. Patients at low risk for addiction/aberrant behavior should be tested within 6 months of initiation of therapy and yearly thereafter. Those patients with moderate risk for addiction/aberrant behavior should undergo testing 2-3 times/year. Patients with high risk of addiction/aberrant behavior should be tested as often as once per month. In this case there is no documentation of aberrant /addictive behavior. Urine drug testing is indicated annually. There is no documentation of the frequency of prior drug testing. The lack of documentation does not allow determination of efficacy or safety. The request is not medically necessary.