

Case Number:	CM15-0109560		
Date Assigned:	06/16/2015	Date of Injury:	04/29/1990
Decision Date:	07/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/08/2015

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: 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 58 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 04/29/1990. The injured worker is currently working full duty with no limitations or restrictions. The injured worker is currently diagnosed as having lower leg osteoarthritis and knee pain. Treatment and diagnostics to date has included unremarkable left knee x-rays, Supartz injections, and medications. In a progress note dated 04/22/2015, the injured worker presented for a follow up examination of her left knee and reports she is doing well. Objective findings include no increase of osteoarthritis in the left knee and left tibia per x-rays. The treating physician reported requesting authorization for interferential unit rental.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

IF unit rental for 60 days: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The MTUS guidelines recommend a one-month rental trial of TENS unit 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; however, there are no documented failed trial of TENS unit or functional improvement such as increased ADLs, decreased medication dosage, increased pain relief or improved functional status derived from any transcutaneous electrotherapy to warrant an interferential unit for home use for this chronic injury of 1990. Additionally, IF unit may be used in conjunction to a functional restoration process with improved work status and exercises not demonstrated here. The IF unit rental for 60 days is not medically necessary and appropriate.