

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0058580		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/29/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/05/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/19/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/27/2015

### 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 male, who sustained an industrial injury on September 29, 2010. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbosacral radiculopathy. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date have included cervical discopathy, lumbar surgery and medication. A qualified medical report dated June 13, 2014 notes the injured worker was prescribed a Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) unit. A progress report dated November 13, 2014 provides the injured worker complains of persistent pain. Physical exam notes cervical and lumbar tenderness. The plan includes continued psychiatric care, transdermal and oral medication.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**H-Wave Home Care System Purchase/Indefinite:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Transcutaneous Electrotherapy.

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

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS guidelines recommend a one-month HWT rental trial to be appropriate to permit the physician and provider licensed to provide physical therapy to study the effects and benefits, and it should be documented (as an adjunct to ongoing treatment modalities within a functional restoration approach) as to how often the unit was used, as well as outcomes in terms of pain relief and function. Trial periods of more than one month should be justified by documentation submitted for review; however, there is no documentation the patient has underwent trial use nor is there any documented consistent pain relief in terms of decreasing medication dosing and clear specific objective functional improvement in ADLs demonstrated. No trial treatment of TENS unit has occurred nor any outcome from functional restoration approach been identified. The H-Wave Home Care System Purchase/Indefinite is not medically necessary and appropriate.