

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0056995		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/01/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/03/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/06/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/02/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/25/2015

### 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, 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:

This 63 year old female sustained an industrial injury on 8/3/12. She subsequently reported neck, right shoulder, low back, right wrist and hand pain. Diagnoses include trigeminal neuralgia. Treatments to date have included injections, chiropractic care, physical therapy, wrist brace, TENS therapy, injections and prescription pain medications. The injured worker continues to experience neck, shoulder and right, elbow back pain. A request for Chiropractic times 12 to lumbar, cervical and shoulder, Physical therapy times 12 to right shoulder and Urine drug screen 10 panel was made by the treating physician. Notes indicate that the patient has been prescribed Norco and Ultram.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Chiropractic times 12 to lumbar, cervical and shoulder:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual therapy & manipulation.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 58-60 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for additional chiropractic care, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of chiropractic care for the treatment of chronic pain caused by musculoskeletal conditions. Guidelines go on to recommend a trial of up to 6 visits over 2 weeks for the treatment of low back pain. With evidence of objective functional improvement, a total of up to 18 visits over 6 to 8 weeks may be supported. Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior chiropractic sessions, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. In the absence of clarity regarding the above issues, the currently requested chiropractic care is not medically necessary.

**Physical therapy times 12 to right shoulder:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Guidelines Page(s): 99.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 200. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Shoulder Chapter, Physical Therapy.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for additional physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend a short course of active therapy with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. ODG has more specific criteria for the ongoing use of physical therapy. ODG recommends a trial of physical therapy. If the trial of physical therapy results in objective functional improvement, as well as ongoing objective treatment goals, then additional therapy may be considered. Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior PT sessions, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. Furthermore, it is unclear how many sessions of physical therapy the patient has already undergone, making it impossible to determine if the current request exceeds the maximum number recommended by guidelines for this patient's diagnosis. In light of the above issues, the currently requested additional physical therapy is not medically necessary.

**Urine drug screen 10 panel:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 43, 77-80 and 94.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 76-79 and 99 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter Urine Drug Testing.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for a urine toxicology test (UDS), CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the drug testing is recommended as an option. Guidelines go on to recommend monitoring for the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non-adherent) drug related behaviors. ODG recommends urine drug testing on a yearly basis for low risk patients, 2-3 times a year for moderate risk patients, and possibly once per month for high risk patients. Within the documentation available for review, it appears the patient is on controlled substance medication. Additionally, there is no identification of a recent urine drug screen. As such, the currently requested urine toxicology test is medically necessary.