

Case Number:	CM14-0185439		
Date Assigned:	11/13/2014	Date of Injury:	11/24/2008
Decision Date:	12/15/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/29/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/06/2014

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 197 pages provided for this review. The claimant was described as a 33-year-old man who was injured on November 24, 2008. The mechanism of injury was not provided in the records, but it appeared to be repetitive use. The current diagnoses included lumbar sprain strain. A progress note from August 28, 2014 indicated that the worker had pain rated as seven on a scale of 1 to 10. The patient had been treated with medicines, creams, work conditioning, home exercise, braces, and a muscle stimulator all of which have been reported to be helpful. On exam, there was a mild reduction and lumbar spine range of motion with positive straight leg raising bilaterally. Strength was five minus over five in the bilateral S1 nerve distributions. The plan was for medications as well as pain management consultation for the lumbar spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Solace Multi-Stim Unit, Electrodes: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 114-121.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 116 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain section, under NMES units

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. Also, an outright purchase is not supported, but a monitored one month trial, to insure there is objective, functional improvement. In the trial, there must be documentation of how often the unit was used, as well as outcomes in terms of pain relief and function; rental would be preferred over purchase during this trial. There was no evidence of such in these records. Moreover, the proposed Multistim unit would use NMES as well. The evidence-based synopsis in the Official Disability Duration guidelines does not give Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation devices a recommended rating. They instead cite: "Under study. The scientific evidence related to electromyography (EMG)-triggered electrical stimulation therapy continues to evolve, and this therapy appears to be useful in a supervised physical therapy setting to rehabilitate atrophied upper extremity muscles following stroke and as part of a comprehensive PT program." Given the evidence-based guidance, the use of the device might be appropriate in a supervised physical therapy setting for post-stroke rehabilitation, but not as a purchase in a home use setting for a musculoskeletal injury. For the above reasons, the request for a full purchase of the unit is appropriately not medically necessary.