MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0207849		
Date Assigned:	10/26/2015	Date of Injury:	02/24/2015
Decision Date:	12/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/22/2015

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: Arizona, Michigan
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:

The injured worker is a 48 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 2-24-2015. The injured worker was diagnosed as having right shoulder periscapular strain with impingement, rule out rotator cuff tear, thoracolumbar musculoligamentous sprain-strain with right lower extremity radiculitis, cervical musculoligamentous sprain-strain, and right 12th rib fracture. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, physical therapy, neurology evaluation, and medications. On 9-10-2015, the injured worker complains of pain in his neck, right shoulder, and low back with radiation into the right leg. Pain was not rated on 9-10-2015 and was rated 5-7 out of 10 on 7-30-2015. Work status was total temporary disability. A review of symptoms was positive for ringing in the ears, palpitations, heartburn, constipation, reflux, depression, stress, difficulty sleeping, headaches, dizziness, memory loss, difficulty concentrating, and numbness (unchanged from 7-30-2015). He reported having ultrasound of the right shoulder and magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine had not been completed. Exam of the cervical spine noted tenderness to palpation and spasm over the right trapezius and positive shoulder depression test on the right. Exam of the right shoulder noted tenderness to palpation over the supraspinatus tendon and acromioclavicular joint, positive impingement test, positive cross arm test, and decreased range of motion. Exam of the lumbar spine noted tenderness to palpation with spasm over the bilateral paravertebral muscles, positive straight leg raising, and decreased range of motion. Current medication regimen was not specified. On 9-30-2015 Utilization Review non-certified a request for interferential unit and supplies (indefinite use), electrodes, batteries, wipes, and leadwire.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Interferential Unit and supplies, indefinite use: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS) is not recommended as an isolated intervention. There is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments. If interferential treatment is to be used, it should follow very specific guidelines as described in the MTUS in cases where pain is ineffectively controlled due to diminished effectiveness of medications, pain is ineffectively controlled with medications due to side effects, history of substance abuse, significant pain for post operative conditions limiting the ability to perform exercise programs/physical therapy treatments or unresponsive to conservative methods. If the 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 review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me show that the injured worker has not met the above referenced criteria as described in the MTUS and therefore the request for interferential unit is not medically necessary.

Electrodes, 6 months: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS) is not recommended as an isolated intervention. There is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments. If interferential treatment is to be used, it should follow very specific guidelines as described in the MTUS in cases where pain is ineffectively controlled due to diminished effectiveness of medications, pain is ineffectively controlled with medications due to side effects, history of substance abuse, significant pain for post operative conditions limiting the ability to perform exercise programs/physical therapy treatments or unresponsive to conservative methods. If the 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 review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me show that the

injured worker has not met the above referenced criteria as described in the MTUS and therefore the request for interferential unit and associated supplies is not medically necessary.

Batteries, 6 months: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS) is not recommended as an isolated intervention. There is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments. If interferential treatment is to be used, it should follow very specific guidelines as described in the MTUS in cases where pain is ineffectively controlled due to diminished effectiveness of medications, pain is ineffectively controlled with medications due to side effects, history of substance abuse, significant pain for post operative conditions limiting the ability to perform exercise programs/physical therapy treatments or unresponsive to conservative methods. If the 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 review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me show that the injured worker has not met the above referenced criteria as described in the MTUS and therefore the request for interferential unit and associated supplies is not medically necessary.

Wipes, 6 months: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS) is not recommended as an isolated intervention. There is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments. If interferential treatment is to be used, it should follow very specific guidelines as described in the MTUS in cases where pain is ineffectively controlled due to diminished effectiveness of medications, pain is ineffectively controlled with medications due to side effects, history of substance abuse, significant pain for post operative conditions limiting the ability to perform exercise programs/physical therapy treatments or unresponsive to conservative methods. If the 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 review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me show that the injured worker has not met the above referenced criteria as

described in the MTUS and therefore the request for interferential unit and associated supplies is not medically necessary.

2 Leadwires: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS) is not recommended as an isolated intervention. There is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments. If interferential treatment is to be used, it should follow very specific guidelines as described in the MTUS in cases where pain is ineffectively controlled due to diminished effectiveness of medications, pain is ineffectively controlled with medications due to side effects, history of substance abuse, significant pain for post operative conditions limiting the ability to perform exercise programs/physical therapy treatments or unresponsive to conservative methods. If the 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 review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me show that the injured worker has not met the above referenced criteria as described in the MTUS and therefore the request for interferential unit and associated supplies is not medically necessary.