

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0090298		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	05/14/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/14/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/04/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/23/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/11/2015

### 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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 50 year old female patient who sustained an industrial injury on 01/14/2013. The accident had no descriptive narrative within the provided documentation. On 03/26/2015 she underwent a lumbar spine magnetic resonance imaging study that revealed at L5-s1 broad-based posterior disc protrusion effacing the ventral surface of the thecal sac without evidence of stenosis or narrowing. The patient reported subjective complaint of having low back pain radiating to right hip, thigh, and knee. She is participating in acupuncture therapy under the treating diagnoses of lumbago, radiculitis and lumbar spine herniated disc.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Stimulator unit plus supplies times (5) months:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of TENS.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Interferential Current Stimulation, Transcutaneous electrotherapy Page(s): 54, 114-116, 118-120.

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. As such, the request for Stimulator unit plus supplies times (5) months is not medically necessary.

**Hot/Cold Purchase:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Cryotherapy.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back (Lumbar and Thoracic), Lumbar Support and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines

<http://www.deroyal.com/medicalproducts/orthopedics/product.aspx?id=pc-temptherapy-coldtherunit>.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS is silent on the use of cold therapy units. ODG for heat/cold packs states "Recommended as an option for acute pain. At-home local applications of cold packs in first few days of acute complaint; thereafter, applications of heat packs or cold packs. (Bigos, 1999) (Airaksinen, 2003) (Bleakley, 2004) (Hubbard, 2004) Continuous low-level heat wrap therapy is superior to both acetaminophen and ibuprofen for treating low back pain. (Nadler 2003) The evidence for the application of cold treatment to low-back pain is more limited than heat therapy, with only three poor quality studies located that support its use, but studies confirm that it may be a low risk low cost option. (French-Cochrane, 2006) There is minimal evidence supporting the use of cold therapy, but heat therapy has been found to be helpful for pain reduction and return to normal function. (Kinkade, 2007)" The use of devices that continually circulate a cooled solution via a refrigeration machine have not been shown to provide a significant benefit over ice packs. As such the request for Hot/Cold Purchase is not medically necessary.