

Case Number:	CM15-0200355		
Date Assigned:	10/15/2015	Date of Injury:	10/29/2014
Decision Date:	12/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/13/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 53 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 10-29-14. The worker is status post lumbar spine surgery on 7-8-15. A request for authorization (9-29-15) notes lumbar spine disc herniation as the diagnosis. Subjective complaints (9-24-15) include "twinging in the butt and left knee pain with prolonged sitting or laying down." Objective findings (9-24-15) include x-rays of the thoracic spine and lumbar spine which are reported to show loss of lordosis. Work status is modified work with restrictions. The requested treatment of x-ray of the thoracic and lumbar spine (2 views) and IF (interferential) unit with supplies, and 60 day use of an IF (interferential) unit with supplies was non-certified on 10/6/15.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 X-ray of the thoracic and lumbar spine (2 views): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Radiography (x-rays).

Decision rationale: ACOEM and ODG both agree that "Lumbar spine x rays should not be recommended in patients with low back pain in the absence of red flags for serious spinal pathology, even if the pain has persisted for at least six weeks." The medical notes provided did not document (physical exam, objective testing, or subjective complaints) any red flags for serious spinal pathology or other findings suggestive of the pathologies outlined in the ODG guidelines. ODG additionally states that "it may be appropriate when the physician believes it would aid in patient management." The treating physician also does not indicate how the x-ray would "aid in patient management." ODG further specifies other indications for imaging with Plain X-rays: Thoracic spine trauma: severe trauma, pain, no neurological deficit. Thoracic spine trauma: with neurological deficit. Lumbar spine trauma (a serious bodily injury): pain, tenderness. Lumbar spine trauma: trauma, neurological deficit. Lumbar spine trauma: seat belt (chance) fracture. Uncomplicated low back pain, trauma, steroids, osteoporosis, over 70. Uncomplicated low back pain, suspicion of cancer, infection. Myelopathy (neurological deficit related to the spinal cord), traumatic. Myelopathy, painful. Myelopathy, sudden onset. Myelopathy, infectious disease patient. Myelopathy, oncology patient. Post-surgery: evaluate status of fusion. Medical records document prior x-rays on 6/25/15, the treating physician does not indicate any red flags or concerns outlined in the above ODG guidelines which would suggest necessity of repeat x-rays. As such, the request for 1 X-ray of the thoracic and lumbar spine (2 views) is not medically necessary.

60 Day use of an IF unit with supplies: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Physical Methods, and Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Transcutaneous electrotherapy.

Decision rationale: ACOEM guidelines state "Insufficient evidence exists to determine the effectiveness of sympathetic therapy, a noninvasive treatment involving electrical stimulation, also known as interferential therapy. At-home local applications of heat or cold are as effective as those performed by therapists." MTUS further states regarding interferential units, "Not recommended as an isolated intervention" and details the criteria for selection: 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." 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 for 60 Day use of an IF unit with supplies is not medically necessary.

1 IF unit with supplies: 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): Transcutaneous electrotherapy.

Decision rationale: The MTUS states that inferential current units are "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." Further, MTUS states; "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." 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, current request for 1 IF unit with supplies is not medically necessary.