

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0024943		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/17/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/15/2008
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/26/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/06/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/09/2015

### 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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

### 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 61 year old male sustained a work related injury on 04/15/2008. According to a progress report dated 12/08/2014, the injured worker complained of continued pain, weakness and decreased range of motion in the right knee and was pending surgery. He also complained of on and off flare-ups with regard to the cervical spine, bilateral shoulder, right elbow and left knee. The treatment plan included a redo Urine Drug Screen due to abnormal findings. Current medications included Ultram Anaprox, Fexmid and Neurontin. On 01/06/2015, Utilization Review non-certified urine drug screen. According to the Utilization Review physician, a urine drug screen was performed on 10/27/2014. There was a lack of clinical documentation to suggest that the injured worker was at high risk for abuse to warrant frequent random drug screening. CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines were referenced. The decision was appealed for an Independent Medical Review.

### 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 Urine drug screen.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing, page 43.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS Guidelines, urine drug screening is recommended as an option before a therapeutic trial of opioids and for on-going management to differentiate issues of abuse, addiction, misuse, or poor pain control; none of which apply to this patient who has been prescribed long-term opioid this chronic injury. Presented medical reports from the provider have unchanged chronic severe pain symptoms with unchanged clinical findings of restricted range and tenderness without acute new deficits or red-flag condition changes. Treatment plan remains unchanged with continued medication refills without change in dosing or prescription for chronic pain. There is no report of aberrant behaviors, illicit drug use, and report of acute injury or change in clinical findings or risk factors to support frequent UDS. Documented abuse, misuse, poor pain control, history of unexpected positive results for a non-prescribed scheduled drug or illicit drug or history of negative results for prescribed medications may warrant UDS and place the patient in a higher risk level; however, none are provided. The Urine drug screen is not medically necessary and appropriate.