

Case Number:	CM13-0020584		
Date Assigned:	02/10/2014	Date of Injury:	05/27/2013
Decision Date:	04/22/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/15/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/05/2013

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 Dermatology, and is licensed to practice in New York. 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 issue involves the coverage for 2 biopsies to be performed on the L dorsal hand of nevi following an occupational burn due to exposure to coffee. The claimant accidentally had hot coffee spill on the L hand in an area where she previously had 2 moles. She was treated for the burn. She is now requesting coverage for 2 biopsies of the moles after having recovered from the burn injury.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

OUTPATIENT SKIN BIOPSIES TO THE LEFT HAND: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation NON MTUS. Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: Kishikova L, Smith MD, Cubison TC. Evidence based management for paediatric burn: New approaches and improved scar outcomes. Burns. 2014 Mar 11.

Decision rationale: The claimant is requesting coverage for biopsy of two possibly atypical nevi (moles) on the L dorsal hand after sustaining a burn injury at work. The nevi were not caused by the burn and would not be expected to have been altered by the burn. She has healed from the

burn injury. Whether the nevi require biopsy or not (as determined by her dermatologist), it is a separate issue from the burn injury and should not be treated as part of the injury case. It is a separate medical issue that would not fall under the Worker's Compensation benefit.