MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0070943		
Date Assigned:	04/20/2015	Date of Injury:	06/16/1998
Decision Date:	05/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/01/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/14/2015

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 61-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on June 16, 1998. She reported she was injured when a forklift ran into her left knee. The injured worker was diagnosed as having left knee pain and severe left knee degenerative joint disease. Treatment to date has included multiple knee surgeries, cortisone injections, chest x-ray, and medication. Currently, the injured worker complains of left knee pain. The Treating Physician's report dated August 5, 2014, noted the injured worker came in for another cortisone injection, waiting to proceed with a knee replacement for severe arthritis and pain. The Physician noted the injured worker was at risk for a fall and fracture of her hip due to her knee continuing to buckle. The injured worker was noted to have a mildly antalgic gait, with limited range of motion (ROM) secondary to pain in her knee, and mild effusion. The medial and lateral joint lines were noted to have tenderness to palpation, with crepitus with range of motion (ROM). The treatment plan was noted to include continued pain medication as prescribed by her primary physician.

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.

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 from 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 certified.

CONTINUOUS PASSIVE MOTION MACHINE: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation OFFICIAL DISABILITIES GUIDELINES.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, continuous passive motion.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested service. Per the Official Disability Guidelines section on CPM, it may offer beneficial results compared to PT alone in the short-term rehabilitation following total knee arthroplasty. Criteria for the use of CPM devices included: May be considered medically necessary for up to 21 days postoperatively for the following surgical procedures: 1. Total knee arthroplasty. 2. Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. 3. Open reduction and internal fixation of the tibial plateau or distal femur fractures involving the knee joint. The ODG states only for use up to 21 days postoperatively. The request does not define how long the device will be used for and therefore cannot be certified for indefinite periods of time.

COLD THERAPY: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation OFFICIAL DISABILITIES GUIDELINES.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, cryotherpay.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested service. The ACOEM does recommend the at home local application of cold packs the first few days after injury and thereafter the application of heat packs. The Official Disability Guidelines section on cryotherapy states: Recommended as an option after surgery but not for nonsurgical treatment. The request is for post surgical use, but the ODG places a finite period of time this is recommended for use after surgery. The request does not define how long the device will be used for and therefore cannot be certified.