

Case Number:	CM14-0001328		
Date Assigned:	01/22/2014	Date of Injury:	12/24/2008
Decision Date:	05/29/2014	UR Denial Date:	12/27/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/03/2014

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 Neurology has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular 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:

The patient is a 63-year-old man who sustained a work-related injury on December 24, 2008. Subsequently he developed chronic low back pain with residual neck, left shoulder, and hip/groin pain. His cervical spine examination shows slight forward head posture, limited range of motion, cervical paraspinal spasm, weakly positive left cervical facet maneuver, and positive suprascapular spasm with myofascial tightness. The provider requested authorization for tempurpedic mattress.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

TEMPUR-PEDIC MATTRESS: 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)

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG)

Decision rationale: According to the Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Mattress selection, "Not recommended to use firmness as sole criteria. In a recent RCT, a waterbed (Aqva) and a body-contour foam mattress (Tempur) generally influenced back symptoms, function, and sleep more positively than a hard mattress, but the differences were small. The dominant problem in

this study was the large amount of dropouts. The predominant reason for dropping out before the trial involved the waterbed, and there was some prejudice towards this type of mattress. The hard mattress had the largest amount of test persons who stopped during the trial due to worsening LBP, as users were more likely to turn around in the bed during the night because of pressures on protruding body parts. (Bergholdt, 2008) Another clinical trial concluded that patients with medium-firm mattresses had better outcomes than patients with firm mattresses for pain in bed, pain on rising, and disability; a mattress of medium firmness improves pain and disability among patients with chronic non-specific low-back pain. (Kovacs, 2003) There are no high quality studies to support purchase of any type of specialized mattress or bedding as a treatment for low back pain. Mattress selection is subjective and depends on personal preference and individual factors. On the other hand, pressure ulcers (e.g., from spinal cord injury) may be treated by special support surfaces (including beds, mattresses and cushions) designed to redistribute pressure." Based on the above, there is no strong study to support the use of Tempur-pedic mattress in the treatment of back pain. Therefore, the prescription of Tempur-pedic mattress is not medically necessary and appropriate.