

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0196180		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/16/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/23/2006
<b>Decision Date:</b>	12/23/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/14/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/06/2015

### 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: Emergency 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 57 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 6-23-06. The injured worker is diagnosed with lumbago and radiculopathy. Her work status is modified duty. A note dated 8-18-15 reveals the injured worker presented with complaints of low back pain that radiates across her upper and lower back and is rated at 4-6 out of 10. A physical examination dated 8-18-15 revealed pain with palpation over the right iliac crest and right buttock. Treatment to date has included medication; Lyrica, Lidoderm patches, Voltaren gel (8-2015). A request for authorization dated 8-31-15 for EMG-NVC of the bilateral lower extremities, Voltaren gel 2-4 grams topical 1 bottle, TENS unit (dispensed on 8-18-15) and a neurological consult is denied, per Utilization Review letter dated 9-14-15.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**EMG/NCV of the bilateral lower extremity:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) ([http://www.odg-twc.com/odgtwc/Low\\_Back.htm](http://www.odg-twc.com/odgtwc/Low_Back.htm)).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic)/EMGs (electromyography).

**Decision rationale:** The request is for an EMG. The ODG state the following regarding this topic: Recommended as an option (needle, not surface). EMGs (electromyography) may be useful to obtain unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, after 1-month conservative therapy, but EMG's are not necessary if radiculopathy is already clinically obvious. (Bigos, 1999) (Ortiz-Corredor, 2003) (Haig, 2005) No correlation was found between intraoperative EMG findings and immediate postoperative pain, but intraoperative spinal cord monitoring is becoming more common and there may be benefit in surgery with major corrective anatomic intervention like fracture or scoliosis or fusion where there is significant stenosis. (Dimopoulos, 2004) EMGs may be required by the AMA Guides for an impairment rating of radiculopathy. (AMA, 2001) (Note: Needle EMG and H-reflex tests are recommended, but Surface EMG and F-wave tests are not very specific and therefore are not recommended. See Surface electromyography.) In this case, the patient does not meet criteria for the study requested. This is secondary to radiculopathy already diagnosed in the records. Pending receipt of information further clarifying how this would change the management rendered, the study is not medically necessary.

**Voltaren gel 2-4grams topical, 1 bottle:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

**Decision rationale:** The request is for the use of a topical NSAID for pain relief. There are specific criteria require for use based on the guidelines. The MTUS states the following: The efficacy in clinical trials for this treatment modality has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. Topical NSAIDs have been shown in meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the first 2 weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis, but either not afterward, or with a diminishing effect over another 2-week period. (Lin, 2004) (Bjordal, 2007) (Mason, 2004) When investigated specifically for osteoarthritis of the knee, topical NSAIDs have been shown to be superior to placebo for 4 to 12 weeks. Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. FDA-approved agents: Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac): Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist). It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder. In this case, as indicated above, the patient would not qualify for the use of this medication based on the treatment duration. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

**TENS unit (Dispensed on 08/18/2015):** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Transcutaneous electrotherapy.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Lumbar the thoracic/TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation).

**Decision rationale:** The request is for the use of TENS unit therapy to aid in low back pain. The ODG state the following regarding this topic: Not recommended as an isolated intervention, but a one-month home-based TENS trial may be considered as a noninvasive conservative option for chronic back pain, if used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based conservative care to achieve functional restoration, including reductions in medication use. Acute: Not recommended based on published literature and a consensus of current guidelines. No proven efficacy has been shown for the treatment of acute low back symptoms. (Herman, 1994) (Bigos, 1999) (van Tulder, 2006) Chronic: Not generally recommended as there is strong evidence that TENS is not more effective than placebo or sham. (Airaksinen, 2006) There is minimal data on how efficacy is affected by type of application, site of application, treatment duration, and optimal frequency/intensity. (Brousseau, 2002) There are sparse randomized controlled trials that have investigated TENS for low back pain. One study of 30 subjects showed a significant decrease in pain intensity over a 60-minute treatment period and for 60 minutes after. (Cheing, 1999) A larger trial of 145 subjects showed no difference between placebo and TENS treatment. (Deyo, 1990) Single-dose studies may not be effective for evaluating long-term outcomes, or the standard type of use of this modality in a clinical setting. (Milne-Cochrane, 2001) (Sherry, 2001) (Philadelphia Panel, 2001) (Glaser, 2001) (Maher, 2004) (Brousseau, 2002) (Khadikar, 2005) (Khadikar2, 2005) Although electrotherapeutic modalities are frequently used in the management of CLBP, few studies were found to support their use. Most studies on TENS can be considered of relatively poor methodological quality. TENS does not appear to have an impact on perceived disability or long-term pain. High frequency TENS appears to be more effective on pain intensity when compared with low frequency, but this has to be confirmed in future comparative trials. It is also not known if adding TENS to an evidence-based intervention, such as exercise, improves even more outcomes, but studies assessing the interactions between exercise and TENS found no cumulative impact. (Poitras, 2008) For more information, see the Pain Chapter. Recent research: A recent meta-analysis concluded that the evidence from the small number of placebo-controlled trials does not support the use of TENS in the routine management of chronic LBP. There was conflicting evidence about whether TENS was beneficial in reducing back pain intensity and consistent evidence that it did not improve back-specific functional status. There was moderate evidence that work status and the use of medical services did not change with treatment. Patients treated with acupuncture-like TENS responded similarly to those treated with conventional TENS. (Khadilkar-Cochrane, 2008) On June 8, 2012, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) issued an updated decision memo concluding that TENS is not reasonable and necessary for the treatment of chronic low back pain based on a lack of quality evidence for its effectiveness. Coverage is available only if the beneficiary is enrolled in an approved clinical study. (Jacques, 2012) As stated above the use of TENS therapy in acute low back pain is not indicated. There is also poor evidence of utility in chronic low back pain as well, with the Centers of Medicare & Medicaid Services stating that "TENS is not reasonable and necessary for the treatment of chronic low back pain based on a lack of quality evidence for its effectiveness." As such, the request is not medically necessary.

**Neurological consult:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (chronic)/Office visits.

**Decision rationale:** The request is for a neurological consultation. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this issue. The ODG state the following: Recommended as determined to be medically necessary. Evaluation and management (E&M) outpatient visits to the offices of medical doctor(s) play a critical role in the proper diagnosis and return to function of an injured worker, and they should be encouraged. The need for a clinical office visit with a health care provider is individualized based upon a review of the patient concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability, and reasonable physician judgment. The determination is also based on what medications the patient is taking, since some medicines such as opiates, or medicines such as certain antibiotics, require close monitoring. As patient conditions are extremely varied, a set number of office visits per condition cannot be reasonably established. The determination of necessity for an office visit requires individualized case review and assessment, being ever mindful that the best patient outcomes are achieved with eventual patient independence from the health care system through self care as soon as clinically feasible. The ODG Codes for Automated Approval (CAA), designed to automate claims management decision-making, indicates the number of E&M office visits (codes 99201-99285) reflecting the typical number of E&M encounters for a diagnosis, but this is not intended to limit or cap the number of E&M encounters that are medically necessary for a particular patient. Office visits that exceed the number of office visits listed in the CAA may serve as a "flag" to payors for possible evaluation, however, payors should not automatically deny payment for these if preauthorization has not been obtained. Note: The high quality medical studies required for treatment guidelines such as ODG provides guidance about specific treatments and diagnostic procedures, but not about the recommended number of E&M office visits. Studies have and are being conducted as to the value of "virtual visits" compared with inpatient visits, however the value of patient/doctor interventions has not been questioned. (Dixon, 2008) (Wallace, 2004) Further, ODG does provide guidance for therapeutic office visits not included among the E&M codes, for example Chiropractic manipulation and Physical/Occupational therapy. See also Telehealth. In this case, the request is not medically necessary. This is secondary to no documentation indicating a change in the neurological exam or new "red flags" seen.