

Case Number:	CM15-0068599		
Date Assigned:	04/16/2015	Date of Injury:	03/08/2013
Decision Date:	05/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/10/2015

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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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:

This 54 year old female sustained an industrial injury to the cervical spine and left shoulder on 3/8/13. Previous treatment included x-rays, physical therapy and medications. In an Agreed Medical Evaluation dated 1/5/15, the injured worker complained of neck pain with radiation to the left shoulder and left shoulder pain with radiation to the left elbow, rated 3/10 on the visual analog scale. Current diagnoses included cervical spine sprain/strain, osteophytes at C3-4 through C6-7 with stenosis and left shoulder slight impingement syndrome. The physician noted that future medical treatment should consist of orthopedic evaluation, medications, a course of multi-modality physical therapy not to exceed 24 sessions per year, hydrocortisone injections and magnetic resonance imaging arthrogram is she did not respond to previous treatment.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Aquatic therapy, 3 times a week, neck and left shoulder, per 03/30/15 order Qty: 12.00:
Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines
Page(s): 22.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Aquatic Therapy, physical medicine Page(s): 22, 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Aquatic Therapy Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: MD Guidelines, Aquatic Therapy.

Decision rationale: California MTUS guidelines state that Aquatic therapy (including swimming) can minimize the effects of gravity, so it is specifically recommended where reduced weight bearing is desirable, for example extreme obesity. MD Guidelines similarly states, If the patient has subacute or chronic LBP and meets criteria for a referral for supervised exercise therapy and has co-morbidities (e.g., extreme obesity, significant degenerative joint disease, etc.) that preclude effective participation in a weight-bearing physical activity, then a trial of aquatic therapy is recommended for the treatment of subacute or chronic LBP. The medical documents provided do not indicate any concerns that patient was extremely obese. Imaging results provided do not report severe degenerative joint disease. Records provided indicate that the patient received numerous physical therapy sessions (to include home exercises). No objective clinical findings were provided, however, that delineated the outcome of those physical therapy treatments. Additionally, medical notes provided did not detail reason why the patient is unable to effectively participate in weight-bearing physical activities. Regarding the number of visits, MTUS states allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. ODG states Patients should be formally assessed after a "six-visit clinical trial" to see if the patient is moving in a positive direction, no direction, or a negative direction (prior to continuing with the physical therapy); & (6) When treatment duration and/or number of visits exceeds the guideline, exceptional factors should be noted. At the conclusion of this trial, additional treatment would be assessed based upon documented objective, functional improvement, and appropriate goals for the additional treatment. The number of requested visits is in excess of the initial six-visit trial. The treating physician does not document a reason to grant additional visits in excess of this trial. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Home interferential unit, unspecified body part, per 03/30/15 order Qty: 1.00: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 118-120.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation Page(s): 114-120. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, TENS chronic pain (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation).

Decision rationale: MTUS states regarding TENs unit, 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. For pain, MTUS and ODG recommend TENS (with caveats) for neuropathic pain, phantom limb pain and CRPSII, spasticity, and multiple sclerosis. The medical records do not indicate any of the previous conditions. ODG further outlines recommendations for specific body parts: Low back: Not recommended as an isolated

Intervention Knee: Recommended as an option for osteoarthritis as adjunct treatment to a therapeutic exercise program Neck: Not recommended as a primary treatment modality for use in whiplash-associated disorders, acute mechanical neck disease or chronic neck disorders with radicular findings Ankle and foot: Not recommended Elbow: Not recommended Forearm, Wrist and Hand: Not recommended Shoulder: Recommended for post-stroke rehabilitation Medical records do not indicate conditions of the low back, knee, neck, ankle, elbow, or shoulders that meet guidelines. Of note, medical records do not indicate knee osteoarthritis. ODG further details criteria for the use of TENS for Chronic intractable pain (for the conditions noted above): (1) Documentation of pain of at least three months duration; (2) There is evidence that other appropriate pain modalities have been tried (including medication) and failed; (3) A one-month trial period of the TENS unit should be documented (as an adjunct to ongoing treatment modalities within a functional restoration approach) with documentation of how often the unit was used, as well as outcomes in terms of pain relief and function; rental would be preferred over purchase during this trial; (4) Other ongoing pain treatment should also be documented during the trial period including medication usage; (5) A treatment plan including the specific short-and long-term goals of treatment with the TENS unit should be submitted; (6) After a successful 1 month trial, continued TENS treatment may be recommended if the physician documents that the patient is likely to derive significant therapeutic benefit from continuous use of the unit over a long period of time. At this point purchase would be preferred over rental. (7) Use for acute pain (less than three months duration) other than post-operative pain is not recommended. (8) A 2-lead unit is generally recommended; if a 4-lead unit is recommended, there must be documentation of why this is necessary. The medical records do not satisfy the several criteria for selection specifically, lack of documented 1-month trial, lack of documented short-long term treatment goals with TENS unit, and unit use for acute (less than three months) pain. Additionally, it is not clear which body part the unit is for. As such, the request is not medically necessary.