

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0129998		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/16/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/26/2007
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/12/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/09/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/06/2015

### 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 56-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on October 26, 2007. She reported cumulative trauma along with pain and dyesthesias in her right wrist /hand and pain in her right elbow. The injured worker was diagnosed as having right wrist, hand and elbow overuse strain and exacerbation of previous injury. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, medications and transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation unit. On April 20, 2015, the injured worker complained of discomfort in her right elbow area, wrist and some pain in the proximal shoulder. Physical examination revealed a positive Phalen's and carpal compression test. Notes stated that her transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation unit had stopped working and she was at the exam to obtain a new machine. The treatment plan included a transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation unit. On June 9, 2015, Utilization Review non-certified the request for transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation unit and supplies (rental or purchase), citing California MTUS Guidelines.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Durable medical equipment (DME) transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) unit and supplies (rental or purchase):** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS, chronic pain (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. The provided clinical documentation meets these criteria and the request is medically necessary.