

Case Number:	CM15-0124475		
Date Assigned:	07/09/2015	Date of Injury:	02/21/2014
Decision Date:	08/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/03/2015
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: 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 38 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 2/21/2014. Diagnoses include herniated lumbar disc with radiculitis/radiculopathy right greater than left and status post lumbar sprain/strain 2008 with full recovery. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, physical therapy, epidural injections and medications. Per the Primary Treating Physician's Progress Report dated 1/30/2015, the injured worker reported pain in the lower back with radicular symptoms into the right and left leg. Physical examination of the lumbar spine revealed tightness and spasm in the lumbar paraspinal musculature bilaterally with reduced ranges of motion. There was hypoesthesia along the anterior lateral aspect of the foot and ankle there was weakness with big toe dorsi flexion and big toe plantar flexion bilaterally. The plan of care included epidural steroid injections and authorization was requested for PRIME interferential (IF) unit.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective Interferential unit: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation Page(s): 118-119.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, "Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS): Not recommended as an isolated intervention. 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. The randomized trials that have evaluated the effectiveness of this treatment have included studies for back pain, jaw pain, soft tissue shoulder pain, cervical neck pain and post-operative knee pain. (Van der Heijden, 1999) (Werner, 1999) (Hurley, 2001) (Hou, 2002) (Jarit, 2003) (Hurley, 2004) (CTAF, 2005) (Burch, 2008) The findings from these trials were either negative or non-interpretable for recommendation due to poor study design and/or methodologic issues. While not recommended as an isolated intervention, Patient selection criteria if Interferential stimulation is to be used anyway: Possibly appropriate for the following conditions if it has documented and proven to be effective as directed or applied by the physician or a provider licensed to provide physical medicine: Pain is ineffectively controlled due to diminished effectiveness of medications; or Pain is ineffectively controlled with medications due to side effects; or History of substance abuse; or Significant pain from postoperative conditions limits the ability to perform exercise programs/physical therapy treatment; or Unresponsive to conservative measures (e.g., repositioning, heat/ice, etc.)." In this case, there is no clear evidence that the patient did not respond to conservative therapies. There is no clear documentation of failure of pharmacological treatments or TENS therapy. Therefore, the IF unit is not medically necessary.