

Case Number:	CM14-0101071		
Date Assigned:	08/01/2014	Date of Injury:	03/02/2011
Decision Date:	09/30/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/31/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/30/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine, and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

There were 76 pages provided for review. The application for independent medical review was signed on June 13, 2014. The request was for durable medical equipment. The device would be the purchase of a home X-Force stimulator for the left inguinal hernia and cervical spine. Per the records provided, the claimant is described as a 54-year-old male who was injured on March 2, 2011 when he was hit by the wood that he was pulling. An MRI of the cervical spine on September 23, 2013 showed a left-sided posterolateral osteophyte noted at the C5-C6 level with associated mild to moderate narrowing of the left C6 neural foramen. In an interim evaluation dated February 1, 2014, there was an inguinal hernia. Valsalva maneuver caused inguinal mesh enlargement. On February 8, 2014, the patient underwent removal of the prior left inguinal mesh and removal of significant scar tissue. There was still a painless bulging in the top of the left inguinal hernia surgery site. He had numbness at the anterior aspect of the left thigh. The stimulator would be to combat pain found in the joint capsule and to help the recovery of healthy joint space. It was not clear what joints were being referred to in this rationale, however.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Purchase of home X force stimulator for the left inguinal hernia, cervical spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS, chronic pain (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 116 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: <http://www.sevensesdm.com/force-stimulator/>.

Decision rationale: There were 76 pages provided for review. The application for independent medical review was signed on June 13, 2014. The request was for durable medical equipment. The device would be the purchase of a home X-Force stimulator for the left inguinal hernia and cervical spine. Per the records provided, the claimant is described as a 54-year-old male who was injured on March 2, 2011 when he was hit by the wood that he was pulling. An MRI of the cervical spine on September 23, 2013 showed a left-sided posterolateral osteophyte noted at the C5-C6 level with associated mild to moderate narrowing of the left C6 neural foramen. In an interim evaluation dated February 1, 2014, there was an inguinal hernia. Valsalva maneuver caused inguinal mesh enlargement. On February 8, 2014, the patient underwent removal of the prior left inguinal mesh and removal of significant scar tissue. There was still a painless bulging in the top of the left inguinal hernia surgery site. He had numbness at the anterior aspect of the left thigh. The stimulator would be to combat pain found in the joint capsule and to help the recovery of healthy joint space. It was not clear what joints were being referred to in this rationale, however.