

Case Number:	CM15-0124343		
Date Assigned:	07/08/2015	Date of Injury:	05/15/2014
Decision Date:	08/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/18/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/29/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 66 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 5/15/2014. She reported cumulative trauma injuries to the hands, back and right leg. Diagnoses include lumbar disc displacement, facet hypertrophy, lumbar muscle spasm, stenosis, left knee chondromalacia and internal derangement. Treatments to date include medication therapy, chiropractic therapy, acupuncture treatment, and physical therapy. Currently, she complained of pain to the low back and left knee. On 6/11/15, the physical examination documented tenderness and muscle spasms to the lumbar region. The straight leg raise was positive on the left side. The plan of care included an additional three (3) physical therapy sessions to treat the lumbar spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Additional LINT (localized intense neuro stim therapy), 3 sessions to lumbar region:

Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines neurostimulation Page(s): 121.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS section on neuromuscular stimulation states: Not recommended. NMES is used primarily as part of a rehabilitation program following stroke and there is no evidence to support its use in chronic pain. There are no intervention trials suggesting benefit from NMES for chronic pain. (Moore, 1997) (Gaines, 2004) The scientific evidence related to electromyography (EMG)-triggered electrical stimulation therapy continues to evolve, and this therapy appears to be useful in a supervised physical therapy setting to rehabilitate atrophied upper extremity muscles following stroke and as part of a comprehensive PT program. Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation Devices (NMES), NMES, through multiple channels, attempts to stimulate motor nerves and alternately causes contraction and relaxation of muscles, unlike a TENS device which is intended to alter the perception of pain. NMES devices are used to prevent or retard disuse atrophy, relax muscle spasm, increase blood circulation, maintain or increase range-of-motion, and re-educate muscles. Functional neuromuscular stimulation (also called electrical neuromuscular stimulation and EMG-triggered neuromuscular stimulation) attempts to replace stimuli from destroyed nerve pathways with computer-controlled sequential electrical stimulation of muscles to enable spinal cord-injured or stroke patients to function independently, or at least maintain healthy muscle tone and strength. Also used to stimulate quadriceps muscles following major knee surgeries to maintain and enhance strength during rehabilitation. (BlueCross BlueShield, 2005) (Aetna, 2005) Review of the clinical documentation does not show the patient to have the diagnosis of stroke. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.