

Case Number:	CM15-0124458		
Date Assigned:	07/09/2015	Date of Injury:	07/28/1999
Decision Date:	08/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/02/2015
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 male with an industrial injury dated 07/28/1999. The injured worker's diagnoses include status post lumbar fusion, chronic low back pain, failed back syndrome, lumbar radiculopathy left lower extremity, status post left shoulder surgery x1, left shoulder recurrent internal derangement, left shoulder rotator cuff tear, left knee internal derangement and status post left shoulder rotator cuff repair. Treatment consisted of diagnostic studies, prescribed medications, and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 04/29/2015, the injured worker reported chronic low back pain, left knee pain and left shoulder pain status post left shoulder surgery. Lumbar spine exam revealed healed lumbar surgical incision, right leg sciatica, left S1 radiculopathy, decrease range of motion with pain, positive bilateral straight leg raises, and positive bilateral Lasegue's sign. Left shoulder exam revealed painful range of motion. Left knee exam revealed positive McMurray sign, patellofemoral crepitation and mild effusion. The treating physician prescribed services for transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) unit now under review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

TENS unit: 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 TENS
Page(s): 114.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation states: TENS, chronic pain (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation) 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. While TENS may reflect the long-standing accepted standard of care within many medical communities, the results of studies are inconclusive; the published trials do not provide information on the stimulation parameters, which are most likely to provide optimum pain relief, nor do they answer questions about long-term effectiveness. (Carroll-Cochrane, 2001) Several published evidence-based assessments of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) have found that evidence is lacking concerning effectiveness. One problem with current studies is that many only evaluated single-dose treatment, which may not reflect the use of this modality in a clinical setting. Other problems include statistical methodology, small sample size, influence of placebo effect, and difficulty comparing the different outcomes that were measured. This treatment option is recommended as an adjunct to a program of evidence based functional restoration. However, it is recommended for a one-month trial to document subjective and objective gains form the treatment. There is no provided documentation of a one-month trial period with objective measurements of improvement. Therefore, criteria have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.