

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0143977		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/12/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/11/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/29/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/25/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/05/2014

### 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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### 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 is a 32 year-old male with a 2/11/14 date of injury. Mechanism of injury was slip and fall. The patient was most recently seen on 7/15/14 with complaints of low back pain and right knee pain. Exam findings revealed pain, spasm, and decreased range of motion in the spine. There was a positive Lasegue's test on the right, and equivocal on the left. There was a positive straight leg raise test on the right, and a cross positive test on the left. Deep tendon reflexes for the knees were absent on the right. Sensory deficits were noted on neurological examination, and motor weakness is evident in the big toe. The patient's diagnoses included: 1) Lumbar spine strain/sprain, herniated lumbar disc with radiculitis/radiculopathy; 2) Status post ACL repair non work-related 5 years ago with full recovery; 3) Right knee strain/sprain internal derangement, complete tear of ACL graft. The medications included Norco. Treatment to date: medications. An adverse determination was received on 8/25/14 due to ODG guidelines, which state that testing for potential opioid abuse is not recommended. Furthermore, while there appears to be a strong genetic component to addictive behavior, current research is experimental in terms of testing for this.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**DNA testing plain:** 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), TWC

Pain Procedure Summary, Learn Genetics; Genetic Science Learning Center, University of Utah  
(<http://learn.genetics.utah.edu/content/addiction/genetics>)

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Genetic Testing for Potential Opioid Abuse

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS does not specifically address this request. ODG states that while there appears to be a strong genetic component to addictive behavior, current research is experimental in terms of testing for this. This patient is being treated for various musculoskeletal injuries sustained in an industrial injury on 2/11/14. While the Utilization Reviewer referenced a DNA testing letter of medical necessity dated 8/19/14, this document was not included in the treatment notes provided. Genetic testing for potential opioid abuse is readily available, and it is understandable that a treating physician might have this concern in a patient taking opiates on an ongoing basis. However, as stated above, ODG states that while there appears to be a strong genetic component to addictive behavior, current research is experimental in terms of testing for this. Therefore, the request for DNA testing plain is not medically necessary.