

Case Number:	CM15-0122583		
Date Assigned:	07/06/2015	Date of Injury:	08/06/2014
Decision Date:	07/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/24/2015

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, Alabama, 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 35 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/06/2014. He reported a slip and fall, landing on his low back and left knee. The injured worker was diagnosed as having left knee pain and low back pain. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, modified duty, left knee brace, physical therapy, and medications. Currently (progress report 4/28/2015), the injured worker complains of low back and left knee pain. His last examination showed full flexion but painful extension with the flexed position, mostly indicative of lumbar strain. It was documented that since the injury, he was placed on modified duty and had not undergone any therapy to date. Current medication was documented as Naproxen. Exam of his back noted spasm on the right side. He was able to touch his toes but pain was noted upon arising from the flexed position. Exam of his left knee noted considerable medial pain and pain with Varus-Valgus stress. Full range of motion and slight swelling were noted and McMurray's test was equivocal. It was documented that he was to continue walking and home exercise. He was placed on total temporary disability for the next 30-45 days. His medication refills included Norco and Naproxen. Urine toxicology on this date was negative for all tested substances. On 4/28/2015, the injured worker received an in-office trial of interferential unit (lumbar spine) to view effectiveness. It was documented that he had undergone conservative measures in the past, including physical therapy and chiropractic, and found little relief. 4 leads were placed for 15 minutes and he reported a decrease in pain, spasm, and tension. He was documented as only taking medication and not finding relief needed to

return back to a state of maximum functional capacity. The treatment plan included an interferential unit for 1 month trial.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Interferential unit 1 month trial: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines interferential current stimulation.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Percutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation Page(s): 97.

Decision rationale: According to MUTUS guidelines, Interferential unit is not recommended as primary treatment modality, but a one month based trial may be considered, if used as an adjunct to a functional restoration program. There is no evidence that a functional restoration program is planned for this patient. Furthermore, there is no justification for Interferential unit if there is no documentation of the patient's current functional performance and specific information of pain levels. Therefore, the request for Interferential unit 1 month trial is not medically necessary.