

Case Number:	CM15-0220139		
Date Assigned:	11/13/2015	Date of Injury:	07/30/1998
Decision Date:	12/29/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/09/2015

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: Massachusetts

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

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 64 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 7-30-1998. Diagnoses include status post lumbar fusion, cervical strain-sprain, and left shoulder sprain-strain, degenerative disc disease in cervical spine with severe disc collapse, and adjacent segment degeneration in lumbar spine with radiculopathy. Treatments to date include activity modification and medication therapy. On 9-24-15, she complained of ongoing pain. Pain was rated 8-9 out of 10 VAS and 3-4 out of 10 VAS with medications. Current medications included Amitriptyline, Lyrica, Norco, and Butrans patch. The records documented that a urine drug screen obtained on 7-20-15 with consistent results; however, the Butrans was not detected. The record indicated transdermal medication may provide inconsistent results, and suggested a re-test in the near future to monitor appropriate use and safety of the medications. The record continues to documented that there were no aberrant drug behaviors and uses the medication as prescribed, the 4 A's and opioid agreement were addressed. The appeal requested authorization for a urine drug screen. The Utilization Review dated 11-4-15, denied the request.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Urine drug screen: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009. 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 (ODG) Urine Test.

Decision rationale: Recommended as a tool to monitor compliance with prescribed substances, identify use of undisclosed substances, and uncover diversion of prescribed substances. The test should be used in conjunction with other clinical information when decisions are to be made to continue, adjust or discontinue treatment. This information includes clinical observation, results of addiction screening, pill counts, and prescription drug monitoring reports. The prescribing clinician should also pay close attention to information provided by family members, other providers and pharmacy personnel. The frequency of urine drug testing may be dictated by state and local laws. Indications for UDT: At the onset of treatment: (1) UDT is recommended at the onset of treatment of a new injured worker who is already receiving a controlled substance or when chronic opioid management is considered. Urine drug testing is not generally recommended in acute treatment settings (i.e. when opioids are required for nociceptive pain). (2) In cases in which the injured worker asks for a specific drug. This is particularly the case if this drug has high abuse potential, the injured worker refuses other drug treatment and/or changes in scheduled drugs, or refuses generic drug substitution. (3) If the injured worker has a positive or "at risk" addiction screen on evaluation. This may also include evidence of a history of comorbid psychiatric disorder such as depression, anxiety, bipolar disorder, and/or personality disorder. See Opioids, screening tests for risk of addiction & misuse. (4) If aberrant behavior or misuse is suspected and/or detected. See Opioids, indicators for addiction & misuse. Ongoing monitoring: (1) If a injured worker has evidence of a "high risk" of addiction (including evidence of a comorbid psychiatric disorder (such as depression, anxiety, attention-deficit disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, bipolar disorder, and/or schizophrenia), has a history of aberrant behavior, personal or family history of substance dependence (addiction), or a personal history of sexual or physical trauma, ongoing urine drug testing is indicated as an adjunct to monitoring along with clinical exams and pill counts. See Opioids, tools for risk stratification & monitoring. (2) If dose increases are not decreasing pain and increasing function, consideration of UDT should be made to aid in evaluating medication compliance and adherence. According to the documents available for review, the injured worker meets the aforementioned MTUS criteria for the use of urine drug testing. In particular, the retest to ensure compliance given lack of evidence of buprenorphine is appropriate. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have been met, and the request is medically necessary.