

Case Number:	CM14-0198908		
Date Assigned:	12/09/2014	Date of Injury:	10/28/2004
Decision Date:	01/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/05/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/26/2014

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 Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine and is licensed to practice in New Jersey. 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 patient is a 57-year-old woman who sustained a work-related injury on October 28, 2004. Subsequently, the patient developed a chronic back pain. According to a progress report dated on June 5, 2014, the patient was complaining of low back pain and bilateral knees pain. The patient physical examination demonstrated lumbar tenderness with reduced range of motion and positive straight leg raising and nonspecific tenderness of both knees. The patient was diagnosed with lumbar and bilateral knee pain. The provider requested authorization for the following therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Interferential Orthostim 4 Unit: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 118-120.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Percutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation Page(s): 97.

Decision rationale: According to MUTUS guidelines, Interferential unit is not recommended as primary treatment modality, but a one month based trial may be considered, if used as an adjunct to a functional restoration program. There is no evidence that a functional restoration program is planned for this patient. Furthermore, there is no justification for Interferential unit if there is no

documentation of the efficacy of one month trial. Therefore, the Interferential Orthostim 4 Unit is not medically necessary.

Electrodes QTY: 12: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Batteries QTY: 36: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Adhesive Removers QTY: 48: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Leadwires: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.