

Case Number:	CM15-0035417		
Date Assigned:	03/03/2015	Date of Injury:	04/23/2009
Decision Date:	04/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/25/2015

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: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 4/23/09. The injured worker reported symptoms in the back. The diagnoses included Sprain of sacroiliac ligament and cervicobrachial syndrome (diffuse). Treatments to date include oral pain medications, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation unit, physical therapy, chiropractic treatment, acupuncture treatment and injections. In a progress note dated 1/22/15 the treating provider reports the injured worker "reported a decrease in the need for oral medication due to the use of the H-wave device." On 2/11/15 Utilization Review non-certified the request for Home H-Wave Device, quantity of 1. The MTUS, ACOEM Guidelines, (or ODG) was cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Home H-Wave Device, quantity: 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines H-wave stimulation (HWT).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Transcutaneous Electrotherapy, H-Wave Stimulation, pages 115-118.

Decision rationale: There is no documented failed trial of TENS use. Per guidelines, H-wave is not recommended as an isolated intervention, but a one-month home-based trial of H-Wave stimulation may be considered as a noninvasive conservative option for diabetic neuropathic pain or chronic soft tissue inflammation if used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based functional restoration, and only following failure of initially recommended conservative care, including recommended physical therapy (i.e., exercise) and medications, plus transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) which have not been demonstrated. There is no clinical exam documented with neurological deficits nor are there specifics of what subjective complaints, limitations in ADL, or failed attempts with previous conservative treatments to support for the H-wave unit, not recommended as a first-line approach. Submitted reports have not demonstrated having met these criteria nor is the patient participating in any therapy as part of the functional restoration program. The Home H-Wave Device, quantity: 1 is not medically necessary and appropriate.