

Case Number:	CM15-0141612		
Date Assigned:	07/31/2015	Date of Injury:	02/09/2011
Decision Date:	09/09/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/21/2015

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: California

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:

This injured worker is a 55 year old female who reported an industrial injury on 2-9-2011. Her diagnoses, and or impression, were noted to include: lumbar sprain-strain; lumbar discogenic syndrome; peripheral neuropathy; and sprain-strain of the hand. No current imaging studies were noted. Her treatments were noted to include trans-cutaneous electrical stimulation unit therapy, and medication management. The progress notes of 6-2-2015 reported complaints of increased weakness with multiple falls. Objective findings were noted to include a normal gait with decreased heel and toe walking, decreased lumbar spine range-of-motion, and positive straight leg raise. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include trans-cutaneous electrical stimulation unit patches x 2 cases as she lived in a different City.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

TENS Patch x2: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Transcutaneous electrotherapy, TENS, chronic pain (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Transcutaneous Electrotherapy Section Page(s): 114-116.

Decision rationale: The use of TENS for chronic pain is not recommended by the MTUS Guidelines as a primary treatment modality, but a one-month home-based TENS trial may be considered if used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based functional restoration in certain conditions. A home based treatment trial of one month may be appropriate for neuropathic pain and CRPS II and for CRPS I. There is some evidence for use with neuropathic pain, including diabetic neuropathy and post-herpetic neuralgia. There is some evidence to support use with phantom limb pain. TENS may be a supplement to medical treatment in the management of spasticity in spinal cord injury. It may be useful in treating MS patients with pain and muscle spasm. The criteria for use of TENS include chronic intractable pain (for one of the conditions noted above) with documentation of pain of at least three months duration, evidence that other appropriate pain modalities have been tried (including medication) and failed, 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, and a treatment plan including specific short and long term goals of treatment. In this case, the injured worker has been using the TENS unit for an unspecified period of time without documented functional improvement or pain relief. As the use of TENS is not supported, there is no need for patches. The request for TENS Patch x2 is not medically necessary.