

Case Number:	CM14-0035013		
Date Assigned:	06/23/2014	Date of Injury:	06/22/2008
Decision Date:	10/13/2014	UR Denial Date:	03/07/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/20/2014

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 Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in Pain Management 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 50-year-old female with a 6/22/08 date of injury. At the time (1/27/14) of the request for authorization for Interferential Unit & Supplies: 2 months rental and supplies: (8 electrodes packs, 24 power packs, 32 adhesive removers towels, 1 TT&SS Lead wire, there is documentation of subjective (low back pain) and objective (tenderness to palpation medial joint line and lateral joint line bilateral knee, positive patellofemoral crepitus) findings, current diagnoses (right knee (illegible) with history of scope 7/2006, osteoarthritis, lumbar spine sprain/strain with bilateral lower extremity radiculitis, the rest is illegible due to handwritten note), and treatment to date (medication).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Interferential Unit & Supplies: 2 months rental and supplies: (8 electrodes packs, 24 power packs, 32 adhesive remover towels, 1 TT&SS Lead wire: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Medical Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 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. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Interferential Unit & Supplies: 2 months rental and supplies: (8 electrodes packs, 24 power packs, 32 adhesive remover towels, 1 TT&SS Lead wire are not medically necessary.