

Case Number:	CM15-0106856		
Date Assigned:	06/11/2015	Date of Injury:	08/03/2010
Decision Date:	07/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/21/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/03/2015

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: Texas, New York, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 applicant is a represented 49-year-old who has filed a claim for actinic keratosis reportedly associated with cumulative trauma from excessive sun exposure reportedly claimed on August 3, 2010. In a utilization review report dated May 21, 2015, the claims administrator partially approved a request for 10 laser treatments as 5 laser treatments. The claims administrator referenced a May 14, 2015 RFA form in its determination. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. In an RFA form dated May 13, 2015, three separate biopsies and the 10 laser treatments at issue were sought. In an associated progress note dated May 11, 2015, the attending provider noted that the applicant had multiple issues with actinic keratosis about the arm, trunk, and hand. Twenty lesions were identified. The lesions in question were treated with liquid nitrogen. The applicant had a history of skin cancer, it was reported. The attending provider proposed biopsying the lesions, performing cryosurgery, and performing multiple laser treatments.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

V-Laser Beam treatments, once every four weeks, ten treatments in total: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pulsed Dye Laser.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.uptodate.com/contents/treatment-of-actinic-keratosis>.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not address the topic. However, the comprehensive literature review performed by Uptodate.com notes that photodynamic therapy (a.k.a. V-Beam laser treatments) does represent an effective therapy for actinic keratosis, the diagnosis reportedly present here. Here, the attending provider's progress note of May 11, 2015, while at times difficult to follow, did suggest that the applicant had widespread actinic keratosis about the arm, trunk, hand, and face. Multiple lesions were identified. The widespread nature of the applicant's lesions, thus, did make the laser treatments (a.k.a. photodynamic therapy) at issue a preferable option to cryotherapy, which would have been comparatively difficult to administer, given the widespread nature and extent of the applicant's lesions. Moving forward with the 10 V-Beam laser treatments was, thus, indicated. Therefore, the request is medically necessary.