

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0114818		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/04/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/02/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/14/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/08/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/21/2014

### 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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 38-year-old female with a 5/2/11 date of injury. At the time (6/2/14) of the request for authorization for LSO back brace and Meds-4 Interferential Unit with Garment (Purchase), there is documentation of subjective (low back pain remains constant, right buttock and leg pain is intermittent) and objective (positive straight leg raise right leg, -5/5 strength of right hamstrings and peroneals, sensation remains diminished in the right S1 dermatome) findings, current diagnoses (displacement lumbar disc without myelopathy and postlaminectomy syndrome lumbar region), and treatment to date (medication). Regarding LSO back brace, there is no documentation of compression fractures, spondylolisthesis, or documented instability.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**LSO Back Brace:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines Lumbar Supports

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Lumbar Support

**Decision rationale:** MTUS reference to ACOEM identifies that lumbar support have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond acute phase of symptom relief. ODG identifies documentation of compression fractures, spondylolisthesis, or documented instability, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of lumbar support. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of displacement lumbar disc without myelopathy and postlaminectomy syndrome lumbar region. However, there is no documentation of compression fractures, spondylolisthesis, or documented instability. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for LSO back brace is not medically necessary.

**Meds-4 Interferential Unit with Garment (Purchase): Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation (NMES devices).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS) Page(s): 118-120.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies that interferential current stimulation is not recommended as an isolated intervention and that 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. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Meds-4 Interferential Unit with Garment (Purchase) is not medically necessary.