MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0134926		
Date Assigned:	07/23/2015	Date of Injury:	10/20/2008
Decision Date:	08/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/24/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/13/2015

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
State(s) of Licensure: Indiana
Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 injured worker is a 49 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 10/20/08. The injured worker was diagnosed as having multi-level cervical intervertebral disc displacement without myelopathy with right upper extremity radiculopathy, impingement of the right shoulder, lumbar intervertebral disc displacement without myelopathy, and right L5 radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included right carpal tunnel release with flexor tendon tenosynovectomy and intraarticular injection on 4/21/15. Other treatment included medication. Currently, the injured worker complains of neck pain with right upper extremity tingling and right wrist pain. The treating physician requested authorization for additional physical therapy 3x4 to the right wrist and an interferential unit for 30-60 rental and purchase.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Additional physical therapy 3 x 4 to right wrist: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Postsurgical Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical medicine Page(s): 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Hand; physical therapy.

Decision rationale: California MTUS guidelines refer to physical medicine guidelines for physical therapy. "Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine." ODG states "Carpal tunnel syndrome (ICD9 354.0): Medical treatment: 1-3 visits over 3-5 weeks; Post-surgical treatment (endoscopic): 3-8 visits over 3-5 weeks; Post-surgical treatment (open): 3-8 visits over 3-5 weeks." ODG additionally states "Post surgery a home physical therapy program is superior to extended splinting. (Cook, 1995) This RCT concluded that there was no benefit in a 2-week course of hand therapy after carpal tunnel release using a short incision, and the cost of supervised therapy for an uncomplicated carpal tunnel release seems unjustified. (Pomerance, 2007) Continued visits should be contingent on documentation of objective improvement, i.e., VAS improvement greater than four, and long-term resolution of symptoms. Therapy should include education in a home program, work discussion and suggestions for modifications, lifestyle changes, and setting realistic expectations. Passive modalities, such as heat, iontophoresis, phonophoresis, ultrasound and electrical stimulation, should be minimized in favor of active treatments." The request of 12 sessions in in excess of the guidelines. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

IF (Interferential) unit for 30-60 rental and purchase: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation Page(s): 118, Postsurgical Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation, Transcutaneous electrotherapy Page(s): 114-120. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain; TENS.

Decision rationale: MTUS states regarding TENs unit, "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." For pain, MTUS and ODG recommend TENS (with caveats) for neuropathic pain, phantom limp pain and CRPSII, spasticity, and multiple sclerosis. The medical records do not indicate any of the previous conditions. ODG further outlines recommendations for specific body parts: Low back: Not recommended as an isolated intervention. Knee: Recommended as an option for osteoarthritis as adjunct treatment to a therapeutic exercise program. Neck: Not recommended as a primary treatment modality for use in whiplash-associated disorders, acute mechanical neck disease or chronic neck disorders with radicular findings. Ankle and foot: Not recommended. Elbow: Not recommended. Forearm, Wrist and Hand: Not recommended. Shoulder: Recommended for post-stroke rehabilitation. Medical records do not indicate conditions of the low back, knee, neck, ankle, elbow, or shoulders that meet guidelines. Of note, medical records do not indicate knee osteoarthritis.ODG further details criteria for the use of TENS for Chronic intractable pain (for the conditions noted above): (1) Documentation of pain of at least three months duration. (2) There is evidence that other

appropriate pain modalities have been tried (including medication) and failed. (3) A one-month trial period of the TENS unit 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; rental would be preferred over purchase during this trial. (4) Other ongoing pain treatment should also be documented during the trial period including medication usage. (5) A treatment plan including the specific short- and long-term goals of treatment with the TENS unit should be submitted. (6) After a successful 1-month trial, continued TENS treatment may be recommended if the physician documents that the patient is likely to derive significant therapeutic benefit from continuous use of the unit over a long period of time. At this point purchase would be preferred over rental. (7) Use for acute pain (less than three months duration) other than post-operative pain is not recommended. (8) A 2-lead unit is generally recommended; if a 4-lead unit is recommended, there must be documentation of why this is necessary. The medical records do not satisfy the several criteria for selection specifically, lack of documented 1-month trial, lack of documented short-long term treatment goals with TENS unit, and unit use for acute (less than three months) pain. As such, the request is not medically necessary.