

# IRO Express 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:** 10/16/08

**IRO CASE #:**

**DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE**

Individual psychotherapy 1X6

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

Clinical psychologist; Member American Academy of Pain Management

**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)

**INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW**

OD Guidelines

Denial Letters 8/26/08 and 9/22/08

Records from 7/31/08 thru 9/22/08

OP Report 5/12/08

Record from Dr. 5/27/08 and 4/29/08

MRI 4/23/08

Record from 6/26/07 thru 8/31/08

Pathology Report 5/12/08

PPE 7/25/08

9/5/08

**PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:**

The claimant is a xx year-old male who was injured at work on xx/xx/xx. At the time, he was performing his usual job duties as a for . He was in the process of picking up a pallet when he felt pain in his low back. On or around June 2007, patient exacerbated the original injury when he lifted a heavy box, and began experiencing increased low back pain with new symptoms of radiating pain to his right foot and numbness in his foot and leg.

Over the course of his treatment, patient has received x-rays, MRI, physical therapy 2x2, lumbar spinal surgery, and medications management. Patient required surgery on 5/12/08 for large (9mm) right posterior paracentral disc extrusion at L4-5 with prominent annular tear, producing sever thecal compression and central stenosis. Current medications include hydrocodone bid for pain.

On 07-31-08, patient was interviewed and evaluated by , in order to make psychological treatment recommendations. Patient was administered the BDI and BAI, along with an initial interview and mental status exam. At the time of the interview, patient reported an average pain level of 6/10 with elevations to 10/10. His BDI was an 8 and BAI was a 15, although examiner opined that these were under-representative of the patient's true mental status. Patient stated his pain interferes at a 10/10 level with recreational, social, work, and familial activities. Patient rates money problems at 10/10, nervousness and worry at 9/10, and muscular spasms/tension at 8/10. Patient was appropriately diagnosed with r/o pain disorder and adjustment disorder with anxiety, both injury-related. Goals are to increase coping skills, improve mood, and decrease muscle tension and nervousness through cognitive behavioral and relaxation strategies. Current request is for 6 individual therapy sessions.

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

A diagnostic interview with mental status evaluation and recommendations has been requested by the patient's treating doctor, and has been conducted. The results indicate that patient could benefit from intervention aimed at teaching coping skills and encouraging reducing pain, disability mindset, and associated fears in order to keep the patient productive and at work. A stepped-care approach to treatment has been followed, as per ODG, and the requested 6 sessions appear reasonable and necessary to treat the issues arising from the patient's injury-related pain and off-work status with a goal of increased overall physical and emotional functioning.

**ODG Work Loss Data, 2008, Texas**

**Psychological evaluations:** Recommended. Psychological evaluations are generally accepted, well-established diagnostic procedures not only with selected use in pain problems, but also with more widespread use in subacute and chronic pain populations. Diagnostic evaluations should distinguish between conditions that are preexisting, aggravated by the current injury or work related. Psychosocial evaluations should determine if further psychosocial interventions are indicated. The interpretations of the evaluation should provide clinicians with a better understanding of the patient in their social environment,

thus allowing for more effective rehabilitation. ([Main-BMJ, 2002](#)) ([Colorado, 2002](#)) ([Gatchel, 1995](#)) ([Gatchel, 1999](#)) ([Gatchel, 2004](#)) ([Gatchel, 2005](#))

**Bruns D. Colorado Division of Workers' Compensation, Comprehensive Psychological Testing: Psychological Tests Commonly Used in the Assessment of Chronic Pain Patients. 2001**

This comprehensive review shows test name; test characteristics; strengths and weaknesses; plus length, scoring options & test taking time. The following 26 tests are described and evaluated:

- 1) 1) BHI™ 2 (Battery for Health Improvement – 2nd edition)
- 2) 2) MBHI™ (Millon Behavioral Health Inventory)
- 3) 3) MBMD™ (Millon Behavioral Medical Diagnostic)
- 4) 4) PAB (Pain Assessment Battery)
- 5) 5) MCMI-111™ (Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory, 3rd edition)
- 6) 6) MMPI-2™ (Minnesota Inventory- 2nd edition™)
- 7) 7) PAI™ (Personality Assessment Inventory)
- 8) 8) BBHI™ 2 (Brief Battery for Health Improvement – 2nd edition)
- 9) 9) MPI (Multidimensional Pain Inventory)
- 10) 10) P-3™ (Pain Patient Profile)
- 11) 11) Pain Presentation Inventory
- 12) 12) PRIME-MD (Primary Care Evaluation for Mental Disorders)
- 13) 13) PHQ (Patient Health Questionnaire)
- 14) 14) SF 36™
- 15) 15) (SIP) Sickness Impact Profile
- 16) 16) BSI® (Brief Symptom Inventory)
- 17) 17) BSI® 18 (Brief Symptom Inventory-18)
- 18) 18) SCL-90-R® (Symptom Checklist –90 Revised)
- 19) 19) BDI®-II (Beck Depression Inventory-2nd edition)
- 20) 20) CES-D (Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale)
- 21) 21) PDS™ (Post Traumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale)
- 22) 22) Zung Depression Inventory
- 23) 23) MPQ (McGill Pain Questionnaire)
- 24) 24) MPQ-SF (McGill Pain Questionnaire – Short Form)
- 25) 25) Oswestry Disability Questionnaire
- 26) 26) Visual Analogue Pain Scale (VAS)

All tests were judged to have acceptable evidence of validity and reliability except as noted. Tests published by major publishers are generally better standardized, and have manuals describing their psychometric characteristics and use. Published tests are also generally more difficult to fake, as access to test materials is restricted to qualified professionals. Third party review (by journal peer review or Buros Institute) supports the credibility of the test. Test norms provide a benchmark to which an individual's score can be compared. Tests with patient norms detect patients who are having unusual psychological reactions, but may overlook psychological conditions common to patients. Community norms are often more sensitive to detecting psychological conditions common to patients, but are also more prone to false positives. Double normed tests (with both patient and community norms) combine the advantages of both methods. Preference should be given to psychological tests designed and normed for the population you need to assess. Psychological tests designed for medical patients often assess syndromes unique to medical patients, and seek to avoid common pitfalls in the psychological assessment of medical patients. Psychological tests designed for psychiatric patients are generally more difficult to interpret when administered to medical patients, as they tend to assume that all physical symptoms present are psychogenic in nature (i.e. numbness and tingling may be assumed to be a sign of somatization). This increases the risk of false positive psychological findings. Tests sometimes undergo revision and features may change. When a test is updated, the use of the newer version of the test is strongly encouraged. Document developed by Daniel Bruns, PsyD and accepted after review and revisions by the Chronic Pain Task Force, June 2001. Dr. Bruns is the coauthor of the BHI 2 and BBHI 2 tests.

Rating: 7a

**Comorbid psychiatric disorders: Recommend screening for psychiatric disorders.** Comorbid psychiatric disorders commonly occur in chronic pain patients. In a study of chronic disabling occupational spinal disorders in a large tertiary referral center, the overall prevalence of psychiatric disorders was 65% (not including pain disorder) compared to 15% in the general population. These included major depressive disorder (56%), substance abuse disorder (14%), anxiety disorders (11%), and axis II personality disorders (70%). ([Dersh, 2006](#)) When examined more specifically in an earlier study, results showed that 83% of major depression cases and 90% of opioid abuse cases developed after the musculoskeletal injury. On the other hand, 74% of substance abuse disorders and most anxiety disorders developed before the injury. This topic was also studied using the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R), a national face-to-face household survey. ([Dersh, 2002](#)) See also [Psychological evaluations](#).

**Psychological treatment:** Recommended for appropriately identified patients during treatment for chronic pain. Psychological intervention for chronic pain includes setting goals, determining appropriateness of treatment, conceptualizing a patient's pain beliefs and coping styles, assessing psychological and cognitive function, and addressing co-morbid mood disorders (such as depression, anxiety, panic disorder, and posttraumatic stress disorder). Cognitive behavioral therapy and self-regulatory treatments have been found to be particularly effective. Psychological treatment incorporated into pain treatment has been found to have a positive short-term effect on pain interference and long-term effect on return to work. The following "stepped-care" approach to pain management that involves psychological intervention has been suggested:

**Step 1:** Identify and address specific concerns about pain and enhance interventions that emphasize self-management. The role of the psychologist at this point includes education and training of pain care providers in how to screen for patients that may need early psychological intervention.

**Step 2:** Identify patients who continue to experience pain and disability *after the usual time of recovery*. At this point a consultation with a psychologist allows for screening, assessment of goals, and further treatment options, including brief individual or group therapy.

**Step 3:** Pain is sustained in spite of continued therapy (including the above psychological care). Intensive care may be required from mental health professions allowing for a multidisciplinary treatment approach. See also [Multi-disciplinary pain programs](#). See also [ODG Cognitive Behavioral Therapy \(CBT\) Guidelines for low back problems](#). ([Otis, 2006](#)) ([Townsend, 2006](#)) ([Kerns, 2005](#)) ([Flor, 1992](#)) ([Morley, 1999](#)) ([Ostelo, 2005](#))

**CBT:** Recommended. Cognitive behavior therapy for depression is recommended based on meta-analyses that compare its use with pharmaceuticals. Cognitive behavior therapy fared as well as antidepressant medication with severely depressed outpatients in four major comparisons. Effects may be longer lasting (80% relapse rate with antidepressants versus 25% with psychotherapy). ([Paykel, 2006](#)) ([Bockting, 2006](#)) ([DeRubeis, 1999](#)) ([Goldapple, 2004](#)) It also fared well in a meta-analysis comparing 78 clinical trials from 1977 -1996. ([Gloaguen, 1998](#)) In another study, it was found that combined therapy (antidepressant plus psychotherapy) was found to be more effective than psychotherapy alone. ([Thase, 1997](#)) A recent high quality study concluded that a substantial number of adequately treated patients did not respond to antidepressant therapy. ([Corey-Lisle, 2004](#)) A recent meta-analysis concluded that psychological treatment combined with antidepressant therapy is associated with a higher improvement rate than drug treatment alone. In longer therapies, the addition of psychotherapy helps to keep patients in treatment. ([Pampallona, 2004](#)) For panic disorder, cognitive behavior therapy is more effective and more cost-effective than medication. ([Royal Australian, 2003](#)) The gold standard for the evidence-based treatment of MDD is a combination of medication (antidepressants) and psychotherapy. The primary forms of psychotherapy that have been most studied through research are: Cognitive Behavioral Therapy and Interpersonal Therapy. ([Warren, 2005](#))

#### **ODG Psychotherapy Guidelines:**

Initial trial of 6 visits over 6 weeks

With evidence of objective functional improvement, total of up to 13-20 visits over 13-20 weeks (individual sessions)

Education (to reduce stress related to illness): Recommended. Patient education consisting of concrete, objective information on symptom management, including disease and treatment information, has been

found to help reduce patient stress, especially when combined with emotional support and counseling.  
(Rawl, 2002)

Psychological screening: Recommended as an option prior to surgery, or in cases with expectations of delayed recovery.

**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
- AHCP- 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)