

Case Number:	CM15-0041050		
Date Assigned:	03/11/2015	Date of Injury:	08/01/2011
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/04/2015

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 38-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 08/01/2011. She reported pain in her right knee. The injured worker was diagnosed with knee sprain and leg not otherwise specified. Treatment to date has included knee support, MRI, surgery and physical therapy. Physical therapy notes, operative reports and radiographic imaging reports were not submitted for review. Currently, the injured worker complains of right knee and low back pain. Diagnoses included chronic lumbar sprain/strain and lateral meniscus tear right knee-surgical repair. The request for TENS unit and electrodes combo pack x 1 and foam roll x 1 was denied by Utilization Review on 02/20/2015.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

TENS unit and electrodes combo pack x 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS, Chronic Pain Page(s): 114-116.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS Page(s): 114.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation states: Not recommended as a primary treatment modality, but a one-month home-based TENS trial may be considered as a noninvasive conservative option, if used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based functional restoration, for the conditions described below. While TENS may reflect the long-standing accepted standard of care within many medical communities, the results of studies are inconclusive; the published trials do not provide information on the stimulation parameters which are most likely to provide optimum pain relief, nor do they answer questions about long-term effectiveness. (Carroll-Cochrane, 2001) Several published evidence-based assessments of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) have found that evidence is lacking concerning effectiveness. One problem with current studies is that many only evaluated single-dose treatment, which may not reflect the use of this modality in a clinical setting. Other problems include statistical methodology, small sample size, influence of placebo effect, and difficulty comparing the different outcomes that were measured. This treatment option is recommended as an adjunct to a program of evidence based functional restoration. However, it is recommended for a one-month trial to document subjective and objective gains from the treatment. There is no provided documentation of a one-month trial period with objective measurements of improvement. Therefore, criteria have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.

Foam roll x 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain chapter. DME.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, durable medical equipment.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested item. Per the Official Disability Guidelines section on durable medical equipment, DME is primarily and customarily used to serve a medical purpose and generally not useful to a person in the absence of illness or injury. DME equipment is defined as equipment that can withstand repeated use i.e. can be rented and used by successive patients, primarily serves a medical function and is appropriate for use in a patient's home. The request does not meet criteria as cited above and therefore is not medically necessary.