



REVIEWER'S REPORT

DATE OF REVIEW: 06/29/2007

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OF SERVICES IN DISPUTE: Work hardening program from 09/18/2006 through 10/27/2006.

QUALIFICATIONS:

This reviewer is a chiropractor with 22 years of practice experience. This reviewer is a Designated Doctor for the Texas Department of Insurance, Impairment Rating certified by AADEP, FCE/RTW certified by AADEP, peer reviewer, and an independent medical examiner.

REVIEW OUTCOME:

“Upon independent review, I find that the previous adverse determination or determinations should be:

Upheld.

INFORMATION PROVIDED FOR REVIEW:

- 1) Peer Review reports of 11/03/2006 and 01/15/2007 performed by .., 7 pages.
- 2) Reconsideration appeal and request for a review by an independent review organization; dates 12/19/2006 and 03/27/2007; by.; 8 pages.
- 3) Work Hardening Treatment Records from 09/18/2006 through 11/10/2006; of Rehabilitation Center/ Chronic Pain Management Center; 436 pages.
- 4) Letter of Medical Necessity dated 01/23/2007, 7 pages, by.
- 5) Medical Examination report, 7 pages, by DO.
- 6) Medical claims, 8 pages, by, DC of Rehab, Inc.
- 7) Explanation of payment, 16 pages, by.
- 8) Clinical Interview and Review of Records, 5 pages, by, / Chronic Pain Management Center.
- 9) Functional Abilities Evaluation/ Physical Performance Evaluations,; 123 pages; of Rehabilitation Center.

INJURED EMPLOYEE CLINICAL HISTORY (Summary):

According to review of medical documentation, the injured employee was involved in an industrial-related incident. The employee, a forklift operator, moved a table and felt a pop in the lower back. He was initially evaluated at Clinic. He reported additional symptoms of right groin pain. Complaints were reported as 8-9/10. The employee was then evaluated by Dr. , who documented lumbar pain and hypertonicity. An MRI of 07/05/2006 showed L5-S1 disc desiccation, transitional segment at the lumbosacral junction, and mild foraminal encroachment due to congenitally short pedicles. Electrophysiologic studies on 07/24/2006 showed bilateral L5-S1 nerve root irritation, right greater than left. The Injured Employee entered a Work Hardening program on 09/18/2006 and concluded the program on 11/10/2006 at Rehabilitation Center/ Chronic Pain Management Center.

ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION, INCLUDING CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT DECISION:

According to reviewed documentation, the employee job requirements are Medium-Heavy. The initial PPE established that the employee was functioning at a Medium level. After three weeks of work hardening, the employee was functioning at the job-required level of Medium-Heavy. The Goal and rationale for continued work hardening beyond the three week point was to perform at Medium-Heavy with pain less than 3-4/10. According to the ACOEM Guides page 113, section C, "Intervention for treating pain should be time limited and goal oriented". Further, treatment should be appropriate for the diagnosed condition, and should not be performed *simply because of continued reports of pain*". Continued treatment beyond three weeks is not supported.

DESCRIPTION AND SOURCE OF THE SCREENING CRITERIA OR OTHER CLINICAL BASIS USED TO MAKE YOUR DECISION:

(Check any of the following that were used in the course of your review.)

- ACOEM-American College of Occupational & Environmental Medicine UM Knowledgebase.
- AHCPR-Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality Guidelines.
- DWC-Division of Workers' Compensation Policies or Guidelines.
- European Guidelines for Management of Chronic Low Back Pain.
- Interqual Criteria.
- Medical judgement, clinical experience and expertise in accordance with accepted medical standards.
- Mercy Center Consensus Conference Guidelines.
- Milliman Care Guidelines.
- ODG-Official Disability Guidelines & Treatment Guidelines.
- Pressley Reed, The Medical Disability Advisor.
- Texas Guidelines for Chiropractic Quality Assurance & Practice Parameters.
- Texas TACADA Guidelines.
- TMF Screening Criteria Manual.
- Peer reviewed national accepted medical literature (provide a description).
- Other evidence-based, scientifically valid, outcome-focused guidelines (provide a description.)