

Case Number:	CM15-0162522		
Date Assigned:	08/28/2015	Date of Injury:	08/13/2012
Decision Date:	09/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/31/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/18/2015

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 43 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on August 13, 2012. The injured worker reported complaints of pain to the neck, right upper extremity, low back, and right lower extremity secondary to daily repetitive work activities. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar disc disease, lumbar radiculopathy, lumbar facet syndrome, and bilateral sacroiliac joint sprain. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date has included laboratory studies, physical therapy, chiropractic therapy, medication regimen, home exercise program, and magnetic resonance imaging. In a progress note dated January 23, 2015 the treating physician reports complaints of pain to the low back with constant needles and pins that radiates to the buttocks into the hamstring with the right worse than the right, along with numbness and tingling to the shin and calf. Examination reveals decreased sensation along the bilateral lumbar four dermatomes, decreased range of motion to the lumbar spine, positive Kemp's testing bilaterally, positive straight leg raises bilaterally, sacroiliac tenderness, positive Fabere's testing, positive Patrick testing, positive sacroiliac thrust testing, positive Yeoman's testing, tenderness to the lumbar paraspinal muscles, moderate facet tenderness to the lumbar four through sacral one levels, antalgic gait to the right, and heel-toe walk on the right. The treating physician noted magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine performed on October 03, 2014 that was revealing for a disc protrusion at lumbar four to five with bilateral neuroforaminal narrowing and bilateral facet hypertrophy, along with a disc bulge at lumbar five to sacral one with bilateral facet hypertrophy. The treating physician requested bilateral lumbar four to five and lumbar five to sacral one transforaminal epidural steroid injection (ESI) times two and a 30 day trial of a

interferential unit to the low back with the treating physician noting radicular symptoms on extremity and neuroforaminal stenosis on magnetic resonance imaging along with noting that the injured worker failed conservative therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Bilateral L4-5 and L5-S1 transforaminal epidural steroid injection (ESI) x 2: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural steroid injections.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines epidural steroid injections Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on epidural steroid injections (ESI) states: Criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003) (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007) 8) Current research does not support a series-of-three Injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. The provided clinical documentation for review does not show dermatomal radiculopathy on exam that is corroborated by imaging or EMG studies that are included for review in the provided clinical documentation. Therefore the request does not meet all criteria as outlined above and is not medically necessary.

Interferential (IF) unit x 30 days trial, low back: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential current stimulation.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines interferential therapy Page(s): 118-119.

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 electroacupuncture 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 been met. In addition, ICS is only initially approved for a one-month trial period. Therefore the request is medically necessary.

