

Case Number:	CM14-0185184		
Date Assigned:	11/13/2014	Date of Injury:	01/27/2014
Decision Date:	12/19/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/27/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/06/2014

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 Ophthalmology 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 patient is a 55 year-old female with a date of injury of 1/27/2014. Under consideration is a prospective request for 1 right eye pterygium excision with graft and 1 prescription of Mitomycin C. Per encounter dated 10/15/2014, the patient complains that the pterygium in the right eye bothers her. Visual acuity is 20/20 in the right eye, and slit lamp exam is significant for a 3-4mm pterygium on the right eye that is not inflamed. On encounter dated 9/24/14, the provider states that "there is no indication for pterygium surgery. I explained to the patient that pterygium preexisted the injury and there is no indication for that."

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Prospective request for 1 right eye pterygium excision with graft: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 487.

Decision rationale: The current ACOEM guidelines state that pterygium surgery is indicated when the pterygium encroaches on the visual axis. In this case, the pterygium does not encroach on the visual axis, as the patient's visual acuity is 20/20. Additionally, the provider states that the

surgery is not indicated on encounter 9/24/14: "there is no indication for pterygium surgery. I explained to the patient that pterygium preexisted the injury and there is no indication for that."

Prospective request for unknown prescription of Mitomycin: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 487.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM states that pterygium surgery is indicated when the pterygium encroaches the visual axis. Since in this case the pterygium does not encroach on the visual axis and the surgery is not medically necessary, then Mitomycin C (a medication used during pterygium surgery) is also not indicated.