

Case Number:	CM14-0020367		
Date Assigned:	04/25/2014	Date of Injury:	08/14/2009
Decision Date:	07/08/2014	UR Denial Date:	02/06/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/18/2014

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 Family Practice 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 injured worker is a 65 year old male who reported an injury on 08/14/09 as a result of being diagnosed with multiple actinic keratosis and skin cancers. The clinical note dated 12/29/13 indicates the injured worker presenting for an evaluation regarding the ongoing multiple basal cell carcinomas and squamous cell carcinomas. The injured worker was identified as having a lesion at the left arm and a scattered rough area on the face, the dorsal region of the hands, and the forearms. The injured worker reported ongoing itching at the scalp as well. Upon exam, the injured worker had multiple keratotic areas of the scalp and face as well as at the dorsal region of the hands and forearms. One lesion at the left arm measured approximately 5 x 6mm with a papular erythematous component. Actinic changes were identified at the face, eyelids, lips, scalp, neck, chest, back, abdomen, and both arms. The injured worker was recommended for a biopsy with a curettage and electrodesiccation of the left arm lesion. The clinical note dated 09/10/13 indicates the injured worker complaining of hearing difficulties. The injured worker was diagnosed with bilateral sensorineural hearing loss. The clinical note dated 09/05/13 indicates the injured worker complaining of low back pain. The injured worker continued with intermittent complaints of low back pain as well as bilateral hip symptoms. The injured worker was identified as having undergone bilateral hip arthroplasties. The clinical note dated 11/21/13 indicates the injured worker continuing with actinic keratosis as well as a slightly atypical nevi. Upon exam, the injured worker was identified as having multiple keratotic papules at the scalp, right ear, and dorsal region of the hands. 7 papules were identified on the scalp. The injured worker underwent treatment with liquid nitrogen to the actinic keratosis areas. The x-rays of the pelvis and hips dated 12/05/13 revealed the previous arthroplasty component. The components remained in anatomic alignment without any identified abnormalities or interval changes. The

clinical note dated 12/05/13 indicates the injured worker doing well in regards to the hips. The injured worker was continuing with efforts in the physical treatment setting.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

LABS: VAP TEST (VERTICAL AUTO PROFILE): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Evidence: www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Frank h. Wians, Jr., PHD, MT(ASCP), DABCC, FACB. Clinical Laboratory Tests: Which, Why, and What Do The Results Mean? (2009) Labmedicine, 40, 105-113.

Decision rationale: The documentation indicates the injured worker having several complaints to include a previous diagnosis of skin cancers as well as a significant history involving bilateral hip arthroplasties. The clinical notes indicate the injured worker continuing with actinic keratosis at multiple areas. Lab studies would be recommended provided the injured worker meets specific criteria to include the need to assess the ongoing pathology. No information was submitted regarding the need for further assessment of the injured worker's lab values. Additionally, no information was submitted regarding the injured worker's inadequate response to the current drug regimen. Given these factors, the request for ongoing lab studies is not indicated.

LABS: THYROID PANEL: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Medical Evidence: www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Frank h. Wians, Jr., PHD, MT(ASCP), DABCC, FACB. Clinical Laboratory Tests: Which, Why, and What Do The Results Mean? (2009) Labmedicine, 40, 105-113.

Decision rationale: The documentation indicates the injured worker having several complaints to include a previous diagnosis of skin cancers as well as a significant history involving bilateral hip arthroplasties. The clinical notes indicate the injured worker continuing with actinic keratosis at multiple areas. Lab studies would be recommended provided the injured worker meets specific criteria to include the need to assess the ongoing pathology. No information was submitted regarding the need for further assessment of the injured worker's lab values. Additionally, no information was submitted regarding the injured worker's inadequate response to the current drug regimen. Given these factors, the request for ongoing lab studies is not indicated.

LABS: OCCULT BLOOD: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Medical Evidence: www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Frank h. Wians, Jr., PHD, MT(ASCP), DABCC, FACB. Clinical Laboratory Tests: Which, Why, and What Do The Results Mean? (2009) Labmedicine, 40, 105-113.

Decision rationale: The documentation indicates the injured worker having several complaints to include a previous diagnosis of skin cancers as well as a significant history involving bilateral hip arthroplasties. The clinical notes indicate the injured worker continuing with actinic keratosis at multiple areas. Lab studies would be recommended provided the injured worker meets specific criteria to include the need to assess the ongoing pathology. No information was submitted regarding the need for further assessment of the injured worker's lab values. Additionally, no information was submitted regarding the injured worker's inadequate response to the current drug regimen. Given these factors, the request for ongoing lab studies is not indicated.