

Case Number:	CM15-0030649		
Date Assigned:	02/24/2015	Date of Injury:	11/07/2011
Decision Date:	04/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/18/2015

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: California, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

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 66 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on November 7, 2011. The diagnoses have included melanoma of the skin. Treatment to date was documented in the medical record as imaging studies. A progress note dated January 27, 2015 indicates that the injured worker had no new signs or symptoms. Physical examination noted no evidence of recurrence of the melanoma. Abdominal examination noted a protrusion of the left abdomen. The treating physician noted that it was likely a hernia but felt that an additional scan to rule out a melanoma was needed. The treating physician is requesting a Positron Emission Tomography/computed tomography scan. On February 5, 2015, Utilization Review denied the request citing non-California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine Guidelines. On February 18, 2015, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR of a request for Positron Emission Tomography/computed tomography scan.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

PET-SCAN- CT: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ncbi-nlm-nlh-gov-pubmed-24375280 J surg Oncol. 2014 Jun109-7-726-9. Epub 2013 Dec 30.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/726754_13.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG are silent on this imaging modality. Guidelines and current standards indicate that FDG-PET/CT is the current standard staging method for clinically stage III patients, but this modality has no role in further staging patients presenting with localized (stage I and II) melanoma. The injured employee has a known history of melanoma that has been staged and treated with no apparent follow-up issues. The UR physician opined that considering the absence of any current melanoma, a repeat CAT scan CT is not medically necessary. However, since a recurrence would possibly change the staging, the request is medically necessary.