

MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.

Independent Medical Review

P.O. Box 138009

Sacramento, CA 95813-8009

(855) 865-8873 Fax: (916) 605-4270



Notice of Independent Medical Review Determination

Dated: 11/13/2013

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Employee:	[REDACTED]
Claim Number:	[REDACTED]
Date of UR Decision:	7/24/2013
Date of Injury:	7/8/2011
IMR Application Received:	8/5/2013
MAXIMUS Case Number:	CM13-0007074

- 1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for **urine toxicology screening is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEW DECISION AND RATIONALE

An application for Independent Medical Review was filed on 8/5/2013 disputing the Utilization Review Denial dated 7/24/2013. A Notice of Assignment and Request for Information was provided to the above parties on 9/6/2013. A decision has been made for each of the treatment and/or services that were in dispute:

- 1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for **urine toxicology screening is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

Medical Qualifications of the Expert Reviewer:

The independent Medical Doctor who made the decision has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Family Practice, 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 treatments and/or services at issue.

Expert Reviewer Case Summary:

This is a 52-year-old female patient who sustained an injury on 7/8/11 and 5/22/12 while lifting a mattress at work. She suffered from right shoulder, head, neck and low back pain. Should a working diagnosis of cervical disc disease, right shoulder joint pain, lumbar disc disease, right-sided sciatica, and gastroesophageal reflux. In April 2013 she was on omeprazole, Flexeril, tramadol and FlurFEx. A urine toxicology screen was recommended at the time to evaluate current drug intake levels.

A recent examination by her orthopedic surgeon in June 25, 2013 indicated that she continue to suffer from shoulder joint pain, cervical disc disease, low back syndrome, right sciatica and supraspinatus tendonosis. Her pain level was in general eight out of 10. She was dispensed Prilosec, tramadol and a "topical pain cream." The urine toxicology screen was recommended to evaluate drug intake levels.

Documents Reviewed for Determination:

The following relevant documents received from the interested parties and the documents provided with the application were reviewed and considered. These documents included:

- Application of Independent Medical Review
- Utilization Review Determination
- Medical Records from Claims Administrator
- Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS)

1) Regarding the request for urine toxicology screening:

Section of the Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule Relied Upon by the Expert Reviewer to Make His/Her Decision

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, page 43, which is part of the MTUS.

The Expert Reviewer based his/her decision on the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Opioids, risk for addiction, pgs. 90 & 94, which is part of the MTUS and the Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) (current version), Urine Toxicology, Indications for UDT, which is not part of the MTUS.

Rationale for the Decision:

The MTUS Chronic Pain Guidelines indicate that a urine toxicology screen is used to assess presence of illicit drugs or to monitor adherence to prescription medication program. The ODG recommends a urine drug test (UDT) at the onset of treatment of a new patient who is already receiving a controlled substance or when chronic opioid management is considered. There's no documentation from the provider, in the records submitted for review, to suggest that there was illicit drug use or noncompliance by the employee. There were no prior urine drug screen results that indicated noncompliance, substance-abuse or other inappropriate activity. Furthermore screening for addiction risk should be performed with questionnaires such as the Cage, Skinner trauma, Opioid Risk Tools, etc. **The request for a urine toxicology screening is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

Effect of the Decision:

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its physician reviewer is deemed to be the final determination of the Administrative Director, Division of Workers' Compensation. With respect to the medical necessity of the treatment in dispute, this determination is binding on all parties.

In accordance with California Labor Code Section 4610.6(h), a determination of the administrative director may be reviewed only if a verified appeal is filed with the appeals board for hearing and served on all interested parties within 30 days of the date of mailing of the determination to the employee or the employer. The determination of the administrative director shall be presumed to be correct and shall be set aside only upon proof by clear and convincing evidence of one or more of the grounds for appeal listed in Labor Code Section 4610.6(h)(1) through (5).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, MD, MPH
Medical Director

cc: Department of Industrial Relations
Division of Workers' Compensation
1515 Clay Street, 18th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

/bh

Disclaimer: MAXIMUS is providing an independent review service under contract with the California Department of Industrial Relations. MAXIMUS is not engaged in the practice of law or medicine. Decisions about the use or nonuse of health care services and treatments are the sole responsibility of the patient and the patient's physician. MAXIMUS is not liable for any consequences arising from these decisions.