

Case Number:	CM15-0095440		
Date Assigned:	05/22/2015	Date of Injury:	03/18/2009
Decision Date:	07/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/18/2015

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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This 64-year-old male sustained an industrial injury on 3/18/09. He subsequently reported skin disorder. Diagnoses include contact dermatitis and eczema. Treatments to date include prescription medications. The injured worker continues to experience erythema over the right anterior shoulder. The treating physician, 8 sessions made a request for Intense Pulse Light.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Intense Pulse Light, 8 sessions: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation
<http://www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/Safety/AlertsandNotices/TipsandArticlesonDeviceSafety/ucm294084.htm>.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation
www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3390232/www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/Safety/AlertsandNotices/TipsandArticlesonDeviceSafety/ucm294084.htmncbi.com.

Decision rationale: Intense pulsed technology is a highly versatile, safe, and effective modality for the treatment of vascular and pigmented lesions, hypertrichosis, and epidermal and dermal atrophy associated with photo aging, as well as acne, rosacea, actinic keratoses, and non-melanoma skin cancers. As our understanding of the biological efficacy of various wavelength distributions evolves so, too will the range of IPL technology, particularly with regard to different wavelength filters, pulse durations, pulse frequencies, and cooling modalities to protect from side effects. The result will be a widening domain of IPL's clinical applications and indications. It will be incumbent on clinicians who use these devices with regularity for such new and emerging indications to report their clinical experiences in order to sustain our continued understanding of the technology's long-term safety and efficacy profile. www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/Safety/AlertsandNotices/TipsandArticlesonDeviceSafety/ucm294084.htm "INTENSE PULSED LIGHT (IPL) therapy is indicated for use in surgical, aesthetic, and cosmetic applications. 1 IPLs use flash lamps, computer-controlled power supplies, and bandpass filters to generate light pulses of prescribed duration, intensity, and spectral distribution. The light energy is converted to heat energy to treat skin conditions such as age spots, sun-damaged skin, cutaneous lesions (such as warts, scars, and striae), benign pigmented epidermal lesions (such as freckles and melasma), and vascular lesions (such as spider veins). 2-4 It's also commonly used to reduce undesired hair growth." "The FDA received several reports of patients sustaining second-degree burns after IPL therapy. The manufacturer's investigation of those reports determined the probable root cause for the adverse events to be improper device calibration or failure of the user facilities to clean the device as directed in the device labeling." Progress report with the request was not provided. Per 03/04/15 report, treater requests authorization for patient to "undergo an infectious disease specialist consultation with an MPN physician for evaluation and treatment considerations of the vasculitis/infection about the right shoulder." Treater has not provided medical rationale for the request. MTUS, ACOEM and ODG do not address the request. However, ncbi.com states Intense pulsed technology is indicated for "vascular and pigmented lesions, hypertrichosis, and epidermal and dermal atrophy associated with photo aging, as well as acne, rosacea, actinic keratoses, and non-melanoma skin cancers." This patient does not present with any of these. Furthermore, per ncib.com, this treatment technology's long-term safety and efficacy profile" is "incumbent on clinicians who use these devices." Moreover, the FDA received several reports of patients sustaining second-degree burns after IPL therapy, and there is no current guideline support. Therefore, this request IS NOT medically necessary.