

Case Number:	CM14-0128734		
Date Assigned:	08/18/2014	Date of Injury:	10/02/2012
Decision Date:	09/23/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/29/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/13/2014

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 & 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 51-year-old male with a 10/2/12 date of injury. At the time (7/16/14) of request for authorization for Purchase 4 Lead TENS Unit, there is documentation of subjective (continued moderate low back pain) and objective (tenderness to palpation over the lumbar paravertebral muscles bilaterally and positive facet loading test) findings, current diagnoses (L4-S1 disc degeneration, L4-5 stenosis, L4-S1 facet arthropathy, left leg radiculopathy, and status post left L4 and L5 hemilaminectomy), and treatment to date (ongoing therapy with Gabapentin, Tizanidine, and Vicodin). In addition, medical report identifies a request for a 30 day trial of TENS unit. There is no documentation of evidence that other appropriate pain modalities have been tried (including medication) and failed, a statement identifying that the TENS unit will be used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based functional restoration, and a treatment plan including the specific short- and long-term goals of treatment with the TENS.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

PURCHASE 4 LEAD TENS UNIT: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS UNIT Page(s): 116.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) Page(s): 113-117.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation of pain of at least three months duration, evidence that other appropriate pain modalities have been tried (including medication) and failed, a statement identifying that the TENS unit will be used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based functional restoration, and a treatment plan including the specific short- and long-term goals of treatment with the TENS unit, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of a month trial of a TENS unit. In addition, MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation of how often the unit was used, outcomes in terms of pain relief and function, and other ongoing pain treatment during the trial period (including medication use), as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of continued TENS unit. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of L4-S1 disc degeneration, L4-5 stenosis, L4-S1 facet arthropathy, left leg radiculopathy, and status post left L4 and L5 hemilaminectomy. In addition, there is documentation of a request for a 30 day trial of TENS unit. Furthermore, there is documentation of pain of at least three months duration. However, given documentation of ongoing treatment with Gabapentin, Tizanidine and Vicodin, there is no (clear) documentation of evidence that other appropriate pain modalities have been tried (including medication) and failed. In addition, there is no documentation of a statement identifying that the TENS unit will be used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based functional restoration, and a treatment plan including the specific short- and long-term goals of treatment with the TENS unit. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Purchase 4 Lead TENS Unit is not medically necessary.