

Independent Resolutions Inc.

An Independent Review Organization

835 E. Lamar Blvd. #394

Arlington, TX 76011

Fax: 817-549-0310

Notice of Independent Review Decision

DATE OF REVIEW: May 13, 2008

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE

TLSO back brace

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

Board Certified in Orthopedic Surgery

REVIEW OUTCOME

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

- Upheld (Agree)
- Overturned (Disagree)
- Partially Overturned (Agree in part/Disagree in part)

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

The patient has axial low back pain with radiculopathy. He has gone extensive conservative treatment. L5-S1 fusion and decompression has been denied by the insurance company. A request for a TLSO brace has been sent for IRO review.

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

There appears to be some discrepancies in the submitted medical records. The case assignment for review is for a TLSO brace. However, the requesting physician states in his 3/28/08 note that "...his posterior L5/S1 decompression, fusion and instrumentation was denied and we will submit an appeal.". A TLSO brace alone is not indicated for this patient's condition and is not medically necessary or reasonable care in and of itself. It does not appear that the patient has undergone lumbar spinal fusion, for which, the Reviewer presumes, the TLSO is being prescribed. The denial is upheld.

Lumbar supports	Not recommended for prevention. Under study for treatment of nonspecific LBP. Recommended as an option for compression fractures and specific treatment of spondylolisthesis, documented instability, or post-operative treatment. There is strong and consistent evidence that lumbar supports were not effective in preventing neck and back pain. (Jellema-Cochrane, 2001) (van Poppel, 1997) (Linton, 2001) (Assendelft-Cochrane, 2004) (van Poppel, 2004) (Resnick, 2005) Lumbar supports do not prevent LBP. (Kinkade, 2007) Among home care workers with previous low back pain, adding patient-directed use of lumbar supports to a short course on healthy working methods may reduce the number of days when low back pain occurs, but not overall work absenteeism. (Roelofs, 2007) Acute osteoporotic vertebral compression fracture management includes bracing, analgesics, and functional restoration, and patients with chronic pain beyond 2 months may be candidates for vertebral body augmentation, ie, vertebroplasty. (Kim, 2006) See also Back brace, post operative (fusion).
Back brace, post operative (fusion)	Under study, but given the lack of evidence supporting the use of these devices, a standard brace would be preferred over a custom post-op brace, if any, depending on the experience and expertise of the treating physician. There is no scientific information on the benefit of bracing for improving fusion rates or clinical outcomes following instrumented lumbar fusion for degenerative disease. Although there is a lack of data on outcomes, there may be a tradition in spine surgery of using a brace post-fusion, but this tradition may be based on logic that antedated internal fixation, which now makes the use of a brace questionable. For long bone fractures prolonged immobilization may result in debilitation and stiffness; if the same principles apply to uncomplicated spinal fusion with instrumentation, it may be that the immobilization is actually harmful. Mobilization after instrumented fusion is logically better for health of adjacent segments, and
	routine use of back braces is harmful to this principle. There may be special circumstances (multilevel cervical fusion, thoracolumbar unstable fusion, non-instrumented fusion, mid-lumbar fractures, etc.) in which some external immobilization might be desirable. (Resnick, 2005)

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)**