

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0015345		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/02/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/07/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/24/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/12/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	01/26/2015

### 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 & Gen Prev Med

### 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 58 year old female with an industrial injury dated November 7, 2014. The injured worker diagnoses include cervical sprain and strain, lumbar sprain and strain, shoulder contusion, headache, sleep disturbance and post-traumatic stress disorder. She has been treated with diagnostic studies, prescribed medications, myofascial release, consultation and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 12/10/2014, the injured worker reported pain in left region of the neck, left shoulder joint pain, pain in the left arm, constant pain in the left wrist, pain in left hand with numbness, constant lower lumber pain bilaterally and pain in the left hip joint. The treating physician prescribed services for hot/cold therapy unit purchase with pad/wrap purchase for cervical and lumbar spine now under review. UR determination on January 12, 2015 denied the request for hot/cold therapy unit purchase with pad/wrap purchase for cervical and lumbar spine, citing Non-MTUS guidelines.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Hot/cold therapy unit purchase with pad/wrap purchase for cervical and lumbar spine:**

Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Aetna

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Neck and Upper Back (Acute & Chronic), Low Back (Lumbar and Thoracic)

<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 have not been shown to provide a significant benefit over ice packs or heating pads. As such the request for Hot/cold therapy unit purchase with pad/wrap purchase for cervical and lumbar spine is not medically necessary.