

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0013101		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	03/14/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/10/2008
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/30/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/23/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	01/31/2014

### 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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 60-year-old male with a 1/10/08 date of injury, and right total knee arthroplasty September 2013. At the time (1/13/14) of request for authorization for interferential unit (IF unit) for purchase with electrodes (18 pairs), there is documentation of subjective (improvement in knee symptoms) and objective (slight edema in the right knee) findings, current diagnosis (enthesopathy of the knee), and treatment to date (surgery and post operative physical therapy). There is no documentation that the IF unit will be used in conjunction with recommended treatments, including return to work, exercise and medications, and limited evidence of improvement on those recommended treatments alone.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

#### **INTERFERENTIAL UNIT (IF UNIT) FOR PURCHASE WITH ELECTRODES (18 PAIRS): Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines INTERFERENTIAL CURRENT STIMULATION (ICS), Page(s): 118-120.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines INTERFERENTIAL CURRENT STIMULATION (ICS) Page(s): 118-120.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies that interferential current stimulation is not recommended as an isolated intervention and that there is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments, including return to work, exercise and medications, and limited evidence of improvement on those recommended treatments alone. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnosis of enthesopathy of the knee. However, there is no documentation that the IF unit will be used in conjunction with recommended treatments, including return to work, exercise and medications, and limited evidence of improvement on those recommended treatments alone. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for interferential unit (if unit) for purchase with electrodes (18 pairs) is not medically necessary.