

Case Number:	CM14-0108460		
Date Assigned:	08/01/2014	Date of Injury:	10/22/2002
Decision Date:	10/14/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/03/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/11/2014

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:

Patient is a 51 year-old male with date of injury 10/22/2002. The medical document associated with the request for authorization, a primary treating physician's progress report, dated 06/25/2014, lists subjective complaints as pain in the lower back with radicular symptoms down the left leg. Objective findings: Examination of the lumbar spine revealed tenderness to palpation of the paravertebral muscles and restricted range of motion due to pain. Strength was 5/5 and sensory was intact. Diagnosis: 1. Chronic neck pain 2. Cervical strain 3. Cervical spondylosis 4. Clerical radiculopathy 5. Status post neck surgery 6. Lower back pain (LBP) 7. Lumbar strain 8. Lumbar spondylosis 9. Lumbar radiculopathy 10. Anxiety/depression 11. BPH 12. OA 13. H/O left shoulder surgery 14. Gastritis.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

One month trial of home transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation unit as a rental:
Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not recommend a TENS unit as a primary treatment modality, but a one-month home-based TENS trial may be considered as a noninvasive conservative option, if used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based functional restoration. There is documentation that the patient meets the criteria necessary for a one-month trial of a TENS unit.