

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0051111		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/07/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/31/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/22/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/27/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/18/2014

### 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:

The applicant is a represented [REDACTED] employee who has filed a claim for chronic shoulder pain associated with an industrial injury of October 31, 2012. Thus far, the applicant has been treated with analgesic medications, unspecified amounts of physical therapy, and transfer of care to and from various providers in various specialties. In a March 24, 2014 supplemental report, the attending provider noted that the applicant had transferred care from several other treating providers following an industrial motor vehicle accident. On February 25, 2014, the applicant presented with persistent complaints of low back pain, shoulder pain, headaches, and psychiatric complaints. The applicant stated that she was scared, under stress of her work, and fearful of being suspended by her employer. The applicant is using Motrin for pain relief, which is providing only temporary relief. The applicant was working her usual and customary work as a traffic control officer, it was acknowledged. Authorization for home interferential current unit was sought. The attending provider stated that the applicant was concerned about using muscle relaxants owing to issues with sedation which might interfere with the ability to care for her child. A psychiatric consultation to workup the applicant's stress and anxiety complaints was endorsed. The attending provider stated that the applicant could return to regular work and sought authorization for interferential stimulator on a purchase basis.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**1 Home Interferential Unit:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation Page(s): 120.

**Decision rationale:** As noted on page 120 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, an interferential stimulator is recommended for purchase purposes if there is evidence of increased functional improvement, less reported pain, and evidence of medication reduction following a successful one-month trial of the same. In this case, however, the attending provider sought authorization for purchase of the device without evidence of successful one-month trial. This is not indicated. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

**1 Psychiatric Consult:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 15 Stress Related Conditions Page(s): 387.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 15 Stress Related Conditions Page(s): 388.

**Decision rationale:** As noted in the MTUS-adopted ACOEM Guidelines, referral to a mental professional is indicated in applicant's whose mental health issues persist beyond three months. In this case, the applicant has had longstanding mental health complaints of anxiety, depression, psychological stress, counseling with management and/or on the job, etc. Obtaining the added expertise of a psychiatrist is indicated to evaluate and treat the same. Therefore, the request is medically necessary.