
Envoy Medical Systems, L.P.
1726 CRICKET HOLLOW DR.
AUSTIN, TX 78758

PH: (512) 248-9020
FAX: (512) 491-5145

Notice of Independent Review Decision

August 20, 2008; August 22, 2008 (Amended for change in requested services)

AUGUST 20, 2008

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE

Work Hardening 20 Sessions

A DESCRIPTION OF THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH PHYSICIAN OR OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER WHO REVIEWED THE DECISION

M.D. Board Certified in Orthopaedic Surgery

REVIEW OUTCOME

Upon independent review the reviewer finds that the previous adverse determination/adverse determinations should be:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Upheld	(Agree)
<input type="checkbox"/> Overturned	(Disagree)
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Overturned	(Agree in part/Disagree in part)

Provide a description of the review outcome that clearly states whether or not medical necessity exists for each of the health care services in dispute.

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW

Table of Disputed Services
Medical Determination Letters – SRS: 6/26/08; 7/10/08
FCE – 6/17/08

Pre-auth Request for extension of work conditioning program – 4/2/07; 5/14/07; 7/2/08

Letter for MDR: 6/1/07; 7/22/08

Patient History Letter – D.C.: 7/25/07

Clinical Records – M.D. 5/7/08

Chronic Pain Evaluation – 6/13/08

ODG Guidelines

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY: SUMMARY OF EVENTS:

This case involves a female who was injured while on the job . This patient suffered an upper extremity injury that resulted in surgery for TFCC tear at the wrist and ulnar nerve transposition at the elbow. During the work hardening program this patient was lifting a heavy 30-pound box and sprained her lower back. This patient needed 20 work conditioning visits, however 20 more have been requested due to the injury to the lower back. These have been denied by the insurance company as medically unnecessary. The patient did demonstrate both objective and subjective improvements during the working hardening visits prior to the injury to the lower back.

ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION INCLUDE CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT THE DECISION.

I agree with the benefit company's decision to deny the additional 20 sessions of the work hardening program. In light of the injury that occurred during the work hardening program, more visits would be medically reasonable and necessary in order to allow the patient to return to the work force. There have been objective and subjective improvements in the patient's symptoms and findings. However, the ODG guidelines only permit 10 additional sessions at a time.

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

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 NATIONALLY ACCEPTED MEDICAL LITERATURE (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)**
- OTHER EVIDENCE BASED, SCIENTIFICALLY VALID, OUTCOME FOCUSED GUIDELINES (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)**