

Case Number:	CM15-0056403		
Date Assigned:	04/01/2015	Date of Injury:	02/09/2015
Decision Date:	05/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/18/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/24/2015

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 47-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on February 9, 2015. He reported lumbar spine pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having sprain/strain lumbar, sprain/strain cervical and sprain/strain bilateral shoulders. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, physical therapy and medications. On February 18, 2015, the injured worker complained of lumbar spine pain. The pain was described as constant, dull and moderately severe. The symptoms were noted to be lessened by rest. The treatment plan included medications, physical therapy, work restrictions, back support and a follow-up visit.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

LSO back support, and hot/cold pack/wrap for purchase: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Cold/heat packs.?(http://www.worklossdatainstitute.verioiponly.com/odgtwc/low_back.htm#SPECT).

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, lumbar supports have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond the acute phase of symptom relief. A lumbar brace is recommended for prevention and not for treatment. The patient sustained a chronic back pain and the need for lumbar support is unclear. In addition, According to ODG guidelines, cold therapy is "Recommended as an option for acute pain. At-home local applications of cold packs in first few days of acute complaint; thereafter, applications of heat packs or cold packs. (Bigos, 1999) (Airaksinen, 2003) (Bleakley, 2004) (Hubbard, 2004) Continuous low-level heat wrap therapy is superior to both acetaminophen and ibuprofen for treating low back pain. (Nadler 2003) The evidence for the application of cold treatment to low-back pain is more limited than heat therapy, with only three poor quality studies located that support its use, but studies confirm that it may be a low risk low cost option. (French-Cochrane, 2006) There is minimal evidence supporting the use of cold therapy, but heat therapy has been found to be helpful for pain reduction and return to normal function. (Kinkade, 2007) See also Heat therapy; Biofreeze cryotherapy gel." There is no evidence to support the efficacy of hot and cold therapy in this patient. There is not enough documentation relevant to the patient work injury to determine the medical necessity for cold therapy. There is no documentation that the patient needs cold therapy. Therefore, the request for LSO back support, and hot/cold pack/wrap for purchase is not medically necessary.

IF unit 1 month rental, electrodes x 2, batteries x 2, and setup and delivery (for lumbar spine): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation Page(s): 118-119.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, "Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS). 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. The randomized trials that have evaluated the effectiveness of this treatment have included studies for back pain, jaw pain, soft tissue shoulder pain, cervical neck pain and post-operative knee pain. (Van der Heijden, 1999) (Werner, 1999) (Hurley, 2001) (Hou, 2002) (Jarit, 2003) (Hurley, 2004) (CTAF, 2005) (Burch, 2008) The findings from these trials were either negative or non-interpretable for recommendation due to poor study design and/or methodologic issues." "While not recommended as an isolated intervention, Patient selection criteria if Interferential stimulation is to be used anyway: Possibly appropriate for the following conditions if it has documented and proven to be effective as directed or applied by the physician or a provider licensed to provide physical medicine: 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.)." In this case, there is no clear evidence that the patient did not respond to conservative therapies, or have pain that limit his ability to

perform physical therapy. There is no clear documentation of failure of pharmacological treatments or TENS therapy. Therefore, the prescription of IF unit 1 month rental, electrodes x 2, batteries x 2, and setup and delivery (for lumbar spine) is not medically necessary.