

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0068329		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/16/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/25/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/15/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/25/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/10/2015

### 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: New Jersey, Alabama, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 41 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 6/25/2014. She reported injury after lifting files from her car. The injured worker was diagnosed as having neck sprain, thoracic sprain, lumbar sprain, bilateral shoulder and forearm strain and bilateral wrist tendinitis. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included medication management. In a progress note dated 3/5/2015, the injured workers complains of pain in the neck, upper, mid and lower back, bilateral shoulder, elbow, forearm and wrist pain and headaches. The treating physician is requesting 8 sessions of acupuncture and adjustable bed.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Acupuncture 2 Times A Week for 4 Weeks for The Neck and Lumbar Thoracic Spine:**  
 Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, "Acupuncture is used as an option when pain medication is reduced or not tolerated, it may be used as an adjunct to physical rehabilitation and/or surgical intervention to hasten functional recovery. It is the insertion and removal of filiform needles to stimulate acupoints (acupuncture points). Needles may be inserted, manipulated, and retained for a period of time. Acupuncture can be used to reduce pain, reduce inflammation, increase blood flow, increase range of motion, decrease the side effect of medication-induced nausea, promote relaxation in an anxious patient, and reduce muscle spasm." Furthermore and according to MTUS guidelines, "Acupuncture with electrical stimulation is the use of electrical current (microamperage or milli-amperage) on the needles at the acupuncture site. It is used to increase effectiveness of the needles by continuous stimulation of the acupoint. Physiological effects (depending on location and settings) can include endorphin release for pain relief, reduction of inflammation, increased blood circulation, analgesia through interruption of pain stimulus, and muscle relaxation. It is indicated to treat chronic pain conditions, radiating pain along a nerve pathway, muscle spasm, inflammation, scar tissue pain, and pain located in multiple sites." The patient developed chronic neck and back pain and musculoskeletal disorders. She is a candidate for treatment with acupuncture. However the frequency of the treatment should be reduced from 8 to 3 or less sessions. More sessions will be considered when functional and objective improvements are documented. Therefore this request is not medically necessary.

**Adjustable Bed:** 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 Mattress Selection. <http://www.odg-twc.com/index.html>.

**Decision rationale:** According to ODG guidelines, mattress selection is "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. (McInnes, 2011). According to the patient record, she developed chronic neck and back pain as well as

musculoskeletal pain, however as per the above guidelines, the need for an adjustable bed is not clear and the request is not medically necessary.