

Case Number:	CM15-0180112		
Date Assigned:	09/21/2015	Date of Injury:	06/05/2013
Decision Date:	10/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/11/2015

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: Texas, New York, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 applicant is a represented 41-year-old who has filed a claim for chronic neck pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of June 5, 2013. In a Utilization Review report dated August 17, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve request for a urine toxicology screen. Office visit of August 5, 2015 and May 13, 2015 were referenced in the determination. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On an RFA form dated August 5, 2015, tramadol, Motrin, Lyrica, and the urine drug testing at issue were endorsed. In an associated progress note of the same date, August 5, 2015, the applicant presented with ongoing complaints of neck and shoulder pain. Lyrica, tramadol, and Motrin were endorsed. The applicant was asked to diet and exercise. The applicant was returned to regular duty work. Drug testing was endorsed and apparently performed in the clinic, although the results of the same were not reported.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Urine toxicology screen: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Drug testing. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Urine drug testing (UDT).

Decision rationale: No, the request for a urine drug testing was not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. While page 43 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines does recommend drug testing as an option to assess for the presence or absence of illicit drugs in the chronic pain population, the MTUS does not establish specific parameters for or identify a frequency with which to perform drug testing. ODG's Chronic Pain Chapter Urine Drug Testing topic, 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, clearly state when an applicant was last tested, and attempt to categorize the applicants into higher-or lower-risk categories for whom more or less frequent drug testing would be indicated. Here, it was not clearly stated when the applicant was last tested. The attending provider did not incorporate the results of the drug testing into his clinical progress note of the August 5, 2015. There was no mention when the claimant was last tested. The attending provider neither signaled his intention to conform to the best practice of the United States Department of Transportation nor signaled his intention to eschew confirmatory and/or quantitative testing here. Since multiple ODG criteria for pursuit of drug testing were not seemingly met, the request was not medically necessary.