

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM15-0088448 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 05/12/2015 | Date of Injury: | 02/18/2014 |
| Decision Date: | 06/12/2015 | UR Denial Date: | 04/14/2015 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 05/08/2015 |

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 56 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on February 18, 2014. He has reported lower back pain and has been diagnosed with back pain, hand, myofasciitis, and lumbar discopathy. Treatment has included medications, medical imaging, injection, hydrotherapy, and physical therapy. There was decreased range of motion to the lumbosacral spine and tenderness to palpation over LS, S1 paravertebral musculature with spasm. MRI showed multilevel discopathy L4-5, L5 root. The treatment request included a TENS unit with supplies.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

GSM HD combo TENS W/HAN purchase: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation, Transcutaneous electrotherapy Page(s): 54, 114-116, 118-120.

Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, TENS chronic pain (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation).

Decision rationale: MTUS states regarding TENS unit, "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." For pain, MTUS and ODG recommend TENS (with caveats) for neuropathic pain, phantom limb pain and CRPSII, spasticity, and multiple sclerosis. The medical records do not indicate any of the previous conditions. ODG further outlines recommendations for specific body parts: Low back: Not recommended as an isolated intervention Knee: Recommended as an option for osteoarthritis as adjunct treatment to a therapeutic exercise program Neck: Not recommended as a primary treatment modality for use in whiplash-associated disorders, acute mechanical neck disease or chronic neck disorders with radicular findings Ankle and foot: Not recommended Elbow: Not recommended Forearm, Wrist and Hand: Not recommended Shoulder: Recommended for post-stroke rehabilitation Medical records do not indicate conditions of the low back, knee, neck, ankle, elbow, or shoulders that meet guidelines. Of note, medical records do not indicate knee osteoarthritis. ODG further details criteria for the use of TENS for Chronic intractable pain (for the conditions noted above): (1) Documentation of pain of at least three months duration; (2) There is evidence that other appropriate pain modalities have been tried (including medication) and failed; (3) A one-month trial period of the TENS unit should be documented (as an adjunct to ongoing treatment modalities within a functional restoration approach) with documentation of how often the unit was used, as well as outcomes in terms of pain relief and function; rental would be preferred over purchase during this trial; (4) Other ongoing pain treatment should also be documented during the trial period including medication usage; (5) A treatment plan including the specific short and long-term goals of treatment with the TENS unit should be submitted; (6) After a successful 1-month trial, continued TENS treatment may be recommended if the physician documents that the patient is likely to derive significant therapeutic benefit from continuous use of the unit over a long period of time. At this point purchase would be preferred over rental. (7) Use for acute pain (less than three months duration) other than post-operative pain is not recommended. (8) A 2-lead unit is generally recommended; if a 4-lead unit is recommended, there must be documentation of why this is necessary. The medical records do not satisfy the several criteria for selection specifically, lack of documented 1-month trial, lack of documented short-long term treatment goals with TENS unit, and unit use for acute (less than three months) pain. As such, the request for GSM HD combo TENS W/HAN purchase is not medically necessary.

12 Month Supplies: Electrodes X8/mth x1mth, AAA batteries x6mth x1mth: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Durable Medical Equipment (DME) and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines Medicare.gov, durable medical equipment.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ACOEM are silent regarding the medical necessity of 12 Month Supplies: Electrodes X8/mth x1mth, AAA batteries x6mth x1mth, but does address TENS unit. ODG does state regarding durable medical equipment (DME), "Recommended generally if there is a medical need and if the device or system meets Medicare's definition of durable medical equipment (DME) below" and further details "Exercise equipment is considered not primarily medical in nature". Medicare details DME as: durable and can withstand repeated use; used for a medical reason; not usually useful to someone who isn't sick or injured; appropriate to be used in your home. While TENs patches do meet criteria as durable medical equipment, the medical documentation provided do not warrant the usage of TENs unit requested and therefore the associated supplies also do not appear to be indicated. As such, the request for 12 Month Supplies: Electrodes X8/mth x1mth, AAA batteries x6mth x1mth is not medically necessary.