

Case Number:	CM14-0206376		
Date Assigned:	12/18/2014	Date of Injury:	01/06/2014
Decision Date:	02/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/10/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/09/2014

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 Physical Medicine Rehab, 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:

This is a female patient with the date of injury of January 6, 2014. A Utilization Review dated November 6, 2014 recommended non-certification of additional physical therapy for lumbar spine (3x4) 12 sessions, MRI for lumbar spine, back brace, and TENS unit. A Follow Up Report dated October 17, 2014 identifies Present Complaints of back pain and back stiffness. Physical Examination identifies mild tenderness left and right flank and medial low back. Decreased lumbar spine range of motion. Strength is 4/5. Diagnoses identify lumbago, degeneration of lumbar spine, and displacement of lumbar disc. Treatment Plan identifies consider physical therapy of the lumbar spine three times a week for four weeks, MRI of the lumbar spine, back brace, and TENS unit.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Additional physical therapy for the lumbar spine, three times a week for four weeks:
Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 298, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 98. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for additional physical therapy for the lumbar spine, three times a week for four weeks, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend a short course of active therapy with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. The ODG has more specific criteria for the ongoing use of physical therapy. The ODG recommends a trial of physical therapy. If the trial of physical therapy results in objective functional improvement, as well as ongoing objective treatment goals, then additional therapy may be considered. The ODG recommends up to 12 physical therapy visits for low back pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior physical therapy sessions, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. Furthermore, the request exceeds the amount of physical therapy recommended by the CA MTUS and, unfortunately, there is no provision for modification of the current request. In light of the above issues, the currently requested additional physical therapy for the lumbar spine, three times a week for four weeks is not medically necessary.

TENS Unit: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 114-117.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for TENS unit, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (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. Guidelines recommend failure of other appropriate pain modalities including medications prior to a TENS unit trial. Prior to TENS unit purchase, one month trial should be documented as an adjunct to ongoing treatment modalities within a functional restoration approach, with documentation of how often the unit was used, as well as outcomes in terms of pain relief and function. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has undergone a TENS unit trial, and no documentation of any specific objective functional deficits which a tens unit trial would be intended to address. Additionally, it is unclear what other treatment modalities are currently being used within a functional restoration approach. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested TENS unit is not medically necessary.

Back Brace: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES (ODG) Low Back Chapter, Lumbar Supports.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for back brace, ACOEM guidelines state that lumbar supports have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond the acute phase of symptom relief. The ODG states that lumbar supports are not recommended for prevention. They go on to state the lumbar support are recommended as an option for compression fractures and specific treatment of spondylolisthesis, documented instability, and for treatment of nonspecific low back pain. The ODG goes on to state that for nonspecific low back pain, compared to no lumbar support, elastic lumbar belt maybe more effective than no belt at improving pain at 30 and 90 days in people with subacute low back pain lasting 1 to 3 months. However, the evidence was very weak. Within the documentation available for review, it does not appear that this patient is in the acute or subacute phase of his treatment. Additionally, there is no documentation indicating that the patient has a diagnosis of compression fracture, spondylolisthesis, or instability. As such, the currently requested back brace is not medically necessary.

MRI of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for MRI of the lumbar spine, Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines state that unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The ODG states that MRIs are recommended for uncomplicated low back pain with radiculopathy after at least one month of conservative therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic exam. Additionally, there is no statement indicating what medical decision-making will be based upon the outcome of the currently requested MRI. Furthermore, there is no documentation indicating how the patient's subjective complaints and objective findings have changed since the time of the most recent MRI of the lumbar spine. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested MRI of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary.