

Case Number:	CM15-0144378		
Date Assigned:	08/05/2015	Date of Injury:	04/12/2013
Decision Date:	09/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/24/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 36-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on April 12, 2013, incurring low back, right knee and right wrist injuries after heavy lifting. He was diagnosed with lumbosacral disc disease, lumbar radiculopathy, and lumbosacral sprain. Treatment included pain medications, anti-inflammatory drugs, physiotherapy, chiropractic sessions, acupuncture, work restrictions, home exercise program, physical therapy, and steroid injections. Currently, the injured worker complained of continued low back and leg pain greater on the left. He was noted to have muscle spasms of the low back. He complained of constant radiculopathy in the lower extremities. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization included computerized range of motion and muscle testing, interferential unit and a functional capacity evaluation.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Computerized range of motion and muscle testing: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back, Flexibility.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301-308.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS does not specifically address this request. The ACOEM does not address flexibility and strength testing specifically in the knee or wrist chapter. However, the low back chapter states flexibility testing should be simply part of the routine physical exam. There I no indication why this would not be included in the routine physical examination and why any specialized range of motion and, muscle strength testing would be necessary beyond the physical exam. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Interferential unit: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines intereferential therapy Page(s): 1181, 9.

Decision rationale: The California medical treatment guidelines section on ICS therapy states: Not recommended as an isolated intervention. There is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments, including return to work, exercise and medications, and limited evidence of improvement on those recommended treatments alone. The randomized trials that have evaluated the effectiveness of this treatment have included studies for back pain, jaw pain, soft tissue shoulder pain, cervical neck pain and post-operative knee pain. (Van der Heijden, 1999) (Werner, 1999) (Hurley, 2001) (Hou, 2002) (Jarit, 2003) (Hurley, 2004) (CTAF, 2005) (Burch, 2008) The findings from these trials were either negative or non-interpretable for recommendation due to poor study design and/or methodologic issues. In addition, although proposed for treatment in general for soft tissue injury or for enhancing wound or fracture healing, there is insufficient literature to support Interferential current stimulation for treatment of these conditions. There are no standardized protocols for the use of interferential therapy; and the therapy may vary according to the frequency of stimulation, the pulse duration, treatment time, and electrode-placement technique. Two recent randomized double-blind controlled trials suggested that ICS and horizontal therapy (HT) were effective in alleviating pain and disability in patients with chronic low back pain compared to placebo at 14 weeks, but not at 2 weeks. The placebo effect was remarkable at the beginning of the treatment but it tended to vanish within a couple of weeks. The studies suggested that their main limitation was the heterogeneity of the low back pain subjects, with the interventions performing much better for back pain due to previous multiple vertebral osteoporotic fractures, and further studies are necessary to determine effectiveness in low back pain from other causes. (Zambito, 2006) (Zambito, 2007) A recent industry-sponsored study in the Knee Chapter concluded that interferential current therapy plus patterned muscle stimulation (using the RS-4i Stimulator) has the potential to be a more effective treatment modality than conventional low-current TENS for osteoarthritis of the knee. (Burch, 2008) This recent RCT found that either electro acupuncture or interferential electrotherapy, in combination with shoulder exercises, is equally effective in treating frozen shoulder patients. It should be noted that this study only showed the combined

treatment effects with exercise as compared to no treatment, so the entire positive effect could have been due to the use of exercise alone. (Cheing, 2008) See also sympathetic therapy. See also TENS, chronic pain. While not recommended as an isolated intervention, Patient selection criteria if Interferential stimulation is to be used anyway: Possibly appropriate for the following conditions if it has documented and proven to be effective as directed or applied by the physician or a provider licensed to provide physical medicine: Pain is ineffectively controlled due to diminished effectiveness of medications; or Pain is ineffectively controlled with medications due to side effects; or History of substance abuse; or Significant pain from postoperative conditions limits the ability to perform exercise programs/physical therapy treatment; or Unresponsive to conservative measures (e.g., repositioning, heat/ice, etc.). If those criteria are met, then a one-month trial may be appropriate to permit the physician and physical medicine provider to study the effects and benefits. There should be evidence of increased functional improvement, less reported pain and evidence of medication reduction. A 'jacket' should not be certified until after the one-month trial and only with documentation that the individual cannot apply the stimulation pads alone or with the help of another available person. The criteria as set forth above per the California MTUS have not been met. In addition, ICS is only initially approved for a one-month trial period. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Functional capacity evaluation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Fitness for Duty, Functional Capacity Evaluation.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) functional capacity evaluation.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address functional capacity evaluations. Per the ODG, functional capacity evaluations (FCE) are recommended prior to admission to work hardening programs, with preference for assessments tailored to a specific job. Not recommended as a routine use as part of occupational rehab or screening or generic assessments in which the question is whether someone can do any type of job. Consider FCE: 1. Case management is hampered by complex issues such as: a. Prior unsuccessful RTW attempts; b. Conflicting medical reporting on precaution and/or fitness for modified jobs; c. Injuries that require detailed exploration of the worker's abilities; 2. Timing is appropriate; a. Close or at MMI/all, key medical reports secured; b. Additional/secondary conditions clarified There is no indication in the provided documentation of prior failed return to work attempts or conflicting medical reports or injuries that require detailed exploration of the worker's abilities. Therefore, criteria have not been met as set forth by the ODG and the request is not medically necessary.