

Case Number:	CM14-0163787		
Date Assigned:	10/08/2014	Date of Injury:	07/23/2011
Decision Date:	11/24/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/27/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/06/2014

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:

There were 29 pages provided for this review. The application for independent medical review was for PT (physical therapy) two times a week for six weeks for the lumbar, chiropractic without modalities two times a week for six weeks for the lumbar, a TENS (Transcutaneous Electrical Neural Stimulation) unit for 60 days rental or possible purchase. It was signed on September 26, 2014. There was a peer review from August 25, 2014. Per the records provided, a QME (qualified medical examination) note she has low back pain more on the left side. The pain travels to the left anterior thigh. The diagnosis was a lumbar strain which was resolved and chronic myofascial pain syndrome of the lumbar spine. The PR 2 notes complaints of low back pain. There is positive straight leg raise on the right and positive SI joint pain, positive lumbar spasm and positive pain with extension. The diagnosis is lumbar spine herniated nucleus pulposus. They plan for PT, chiropractic care and a TENS unit.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical Therapy 2x a week for 6 weeks for lumbar/low back: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 98.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does permit physical therapy in chronic situations, noting that one should allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. The conditions mentioned are Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks; Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks; and Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. This claimant does not have these conditions. And, after several documented sessions of therapy, it is not clear why the patient would not be independent with self-care at this point. Also, there are especially strong caveats in the MTUS/ACOEM guidelines against over treatment in the chronic situation supporting the clinical notion that the move to independence and an active, independent home program is clinically in the best interest of the patient. They cite:1. Although mistreating or under treating pain is of concern, an even greater risk for the physician is over treating the chronic pain patient...Over treatment often results in irreparable harm to the patient's socioeconomic status, home life, personal relationships, and quality of life in general.2. A patient's complaints of pain should be acknowledged. Patient and clinician should remain focused on the ultimate goal of rehabilitation leading to optimal functional recovery, decreased healthcare utilization, and maximal self-actualization. Therefore, this request for more skilled, monitored therapy is not medically necessary.

Chiropractic without modalities exercises 2x a week for 6 weeks for the lumbar/low back:
Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual Therapy & Manipulation.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.2 9792.26 Page(s): 58.

Decision rationale: The MTUS stipulates that the intended goal of this form of care is the achievement of positive symptomatic or objective measurable gains in functional improvement that facilitate progression in the patient's therapeutic exercise program and return to productive activities. It notes for that elective and maintenance care, such as has been used for many years now in this case, is not medically necessary. In this case, the appeal letter was carefully considered, but these records fail to attest to 'progression of care'. The guides further note that treatment beyond 4-6 visits should be documented with objective improvement in function. Further, in Chapter 5 of ACOEM, it speaks to leading the patient to independence from the healthcare system, and self-care. It notes that over treatment often results in irreparable harm to the patient's socioeconomic status, home life, personal relationships, and quality of life in general. The patient and clinician should remain focused on the ultimate goal of rehabilitation leading to optimal functional recovery, decreased healthcare utilization, and maximal self-actualization. Objective, functional improvement out of past rehabilitative efforts is not known. Therefore, this request is not medically necessary.

TENS unit for 60 days rental or possible purchase: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 116.

Decision rationale: The MTUS notes that TENS is not recommended 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, for the conditions described below:- Neuropathic pain: Some evidence (Chong, 2003), including diabetic neuropathy (Spruce, 2002) and post-herpetic neuralgia. (Niv, 2005)- Phantom limb pain and CRPS II: Some evidence to support use. (Finsen, 1988) (Lundeberg, 1985)-Spasticity: TENS may be a supplement to medical treatment in the management of spasticity in spinal cord injury. (Aydin, 2005) - Multiple sclerosis (MS): While TENS does not appear to be effective in reducing spasticity in MS patients it may be useful in treating MS patients with pain and muscle spasm. (Miller, 2007)I did not find in these records that the claimant had these conditions that warranted TENS. Moreover, a 60 day trial of TENS is not supported. Therefore, this request is not medically necessary.