



IRO#
5068 West Plano Parkway Suite 122
Plano, Texas 75093
Phone: (972) 931-5100
Fax: (888) UMD-82TX (888-863-8289)

DATE OF REVIEW: 07/29/2009

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE:

Laminotomy (Hemilaminectomy), with Decompression of nerve root (s), including partial Facetectomy, Foraminotomy and /or Excision of Herniated Intervertebral Disc, One Interspace; Lumbar

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

This case was reviewed by a Texas licensed MD, specializing in Neurological Surgery. The physician advisor has the following additional qualifications, if applicable:

ABMS Orthopaedic Surgery

REVIEW OUTCOME:

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

Upheld

| Health Care Service(s) in Dispute | CPT Codes | Date of Service(s) | Outcome of Independent Review |
|---|--|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Laminotomy (Hemilaminectomy), with Decompression of nerve root (s), including partial Facetectomy, Foraminotomy and /or Excision of Herniated Intervertebral Disc, One Interspace; Lumbar | 20936, 22842, 22612, 63035, 63030, LOS | NA | Upheld |

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW:

| No | Document Type | Provider or Sender | Page Count | Service Start Date | Service End Date |
|----|-------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 1 | IRO Request | | 17 | | |
| 2 | File Chart Review | | 3 | 6/18/09 | 06/18/09 |
| 3 | File Chart Review | | 5 | 6/23/09 | 6/23/09 |
| 4 | Appeal Letter | Dr. | 1 | 6/10/09 | 6/10/09 |

| | | | | | |
|----|------------------|------------------|---|----------|----------|
| 5 | Clinical Records | Dr. | 7 | 3/23/09 | 4/20/09 |
| 6 | Lumbar Myelogram | Health System | 2 | 4/13/09 | 4/13/09 |
| 7 | Lumbar CT | Health System | 2 | 4/13/09 | 4/13/09 |
| 8 | Lumbar MRI | Group | 2 | 11/13/08 | 11/13/08 |
| 9 | DWC 73 | Dr. | 3 | 4/27/09 | 7/06/09 |
| 10 | MMI | Dr. | 7 | 6/4/09 | 6/4/09 |
| 11 | Clinical Records | Dr. Psychologist | 5 | 6/22/09 | 6/22/09 |
| 12 | Clinical Records | Institute | 1 | 7/6/09 | 7/6/09 |

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

IRO #:

Summary: The claimant is a xx-year-old male who was injured while working for on xx/xx/xx when he attempted to lift an oversized box and noted onset of significant lumbar and bilateral leg pain. MRI of the lumbar spine performed 11/13/08 reported impression of no lumbar compression fracture and no spondylolisthesis. Slight loss of disc space height and signal was noted at L4-5 and L5-S1. Diffuse annular bulging is noted at L4-5 and L5-S1 with superimposed midline disc protrusions. At L4-5 the protrusion indents the ventral thecal sac, but is not clearly compressed or displace nerve roots. There is mild central spinal stenosis at this level. At L5-S1 there is a 3-4 mm central disc protrusion without mass effect on the S1 nerve roots. There is left greater than right foraminal disc bulge or protrusion at L5-S1 along with endplate spurring which is projecting into the neural foramen with no obvious mass effect on the L5 nerve roots. CT myelogram of the lumbar spine was performed 04/13/09. There was no evidence of myelographic block, with ventral epidural defects demonstrated at L4-5 and L5-S1. There was a left paracentral disc protrusion/extrusion at L4-5 contributing in mild spinal canal stenosis and displacement of the exiting left L5 nerve root. At L5-S1 disc bulge lightly contacts the shoulders of the bilateral S1 nerve roots. Physical examination reported 4/5 strength in the right lower extremity. Sensation was decreased to light touch and pinprick in the right L4, L5 and S1 distribution. Gait was antalgic and the patient is noted to have difficulty walking on his heels, toes and tandem walking. The patient has been treated conservatively with medications, physical therapy and epidural steroid injections without significant improvement. The patient was recommended to undergo lumbar laminectomy and foraminotomy L4, L5 and S1, left L4-5 discectomy and L4-S1 fusion with instrumentation.

The patient was seen on 06/04/09 by Dr. for a second opinion. On examination Dr. reported negative straight leg raise bilaterally. Deep Tendon Reflexes were 2+ and symmetric in the bilateral lower extremities. There was no clonus and Babinski was plantar bilaterally. The patient was able to heel walk bilaterally but could not toe walk on the right more symptomatic side. Trendelenburg was positive on the right side. There was give way weakness apparently from apprehension. Sensory examination was normal to light touch in all dermatomes. AP lateral and flexion extension x-rays were obtained by Dr. who noted no evidence of spondylolysis or spondylolisthesis. Dr. disagreed with the requesting physician regarding the need for 2 level fusion, and recommended lumbar laminectomy through minimal access approach L4-5, L5-S1.

A utilization review by Dr. performed on 06/18/09 noted that it appeared that decompression surgery rather than fusion surgery may be appropriate and further noted that a pre surgical psychological evaluation had not been completed. Dr. recommended independent assessment by RME or second surgical opinion.

A pre-surgical psych evaluation was completed on 06/22/09, and no psychological contraindications to surgery were found.

An appeal utilization review was performed by Dr. on 06/23/09. Dr. determined that the proposed surgical procedure including 2 level lumbar fusion at L4-S1 with instrumentation was not indicated as medically necessary. Dr. noted that the patient had failed conservative treatment, noting that the requesting provider reported that the patient would require an extra wide decompression at L5-S1 resulting in iatrogenic instability. There was no documentation that the patient has undergone a preoperative psychological evaluation.

Items in Dispute: Medical necessity for L4-5, L5-S1 laminectomy, left L4-5 discectomy and L4-S1 fusion with instrumentation.

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

In my opinion, the previous denials of the proposed surgical procedure should be upheld. The clinical data presented does not establish medical necessity for 2 level lumbar fusion as noted by previous reviewers. Moreover, the patient underwent independent medical examination by Dr. who recommended lumbar laminectomy through minimal access approach L4-5, L5-S1 without the need for fusion.

Low Back Chapter: Spinal Fusion.

Not recommended for patients who have less than six months of failed recommended conservative care unless there is objectively demonstrated severe structural instability and/or acute or progressive neurologic dysfunction, but recommended as an option for spinal fracture, dislocation, spondylolisthesis or frank neurogenic compromise, subject to the selection criteria outlined in the section below entitled, "[Patient Selection Criteria for Lumbar Spinal Fusion](#)," after 6 months of conservative care. For workers' comp populations, see also the heading, "[Lumbar fusion in workers' comp patients](#)." After screening for psychosocial variables, outcomes are improved and fusion may be recommended for degenerative disc disease with spinal segment collapse with or without neurologic compromise after 6 months of compliance with recommended [conservative therapy](#). [For spinal instability criteria, see AMA Guides ([Andersson, 2000](#))] For complete references, see separate document with all studies focusing on [Fusion \(spinal\)](#). There is limited scientific evidence about the long-term effectiveness of fusion for degenerative disc disease compared with natural history, placebo, or conservative treatment. Studies conducted in order to compare different surgical techniques have shown success for fusion in carefully selected patients. ([Gibson-Cochrane, 2000](#)) ([Savolainen, 1998](#)) ([Wetzel, 2001](#)) ([Molinari, 2001](#)) ([Bigos, 1999](#)) ([Washington, 1995](#)) ([DeBarard-Spine, 2001](#)) ([Fritzell-Spine, 2001](#)) ([Fritzell-Spine, 2002](#)) ([Deyo-NEJM, 2004](#)) ([Gibson-Cochrane/Spine, 2005](#)) ([Soegaard, 2005](#)) ([Glassman, 2006](#)) ([Atlas, 2006](#)) According to the recently released AANS/NASS Guidelines, lumbar fusion is recommended as a treatment for carefully selected patients with disabling low back pain due to one- or two-level degenerative disc disease after failure of an appropriate period of conservative care. This recommendation was based on one study that contained numerous flaws, including a lack of standardization of conservative care in the control group. At the time of the 2-year follow up it appeared that pain had significantly increased in the surgical group from year 1 to 2. Follow-up post study is still pending publication. In addition, there remains no direction regarding how to define the "carefully selected patient." ([Resnick, 2005](#)) ([Fritzell, 2004](#)) A recently published well respected international guideline, the "European Guidelines," concluded that fusion surgery for nonspecific chronic LBP cannot be recommended unless 2 years of all other recommended conservative treatments – including multidisciplinary approaches with combined programs of cognitive intervention and exercises – have failed, or such combined programs are not available, and only then in carefully selected patients with maximum 2-level degenerative disc disease. ([Airaksinen, 2006](#)) For chronic LBP, exercise and cognitive intervention may be equivalent to lumbar fusion without the potentially high surgical complication rates. ([Ivar Brox-Spine, 2003](#)) ([Keller-Spine, 2004](#)) ([Fairbank-BMJ, 2005](#)) ([Brox, 2006](#)) In acute spinal cord injury (SCI), if the spine is unstable following injury, surgical fusion and bracing may be necessary. ([Bagnall-Cochrane, 2004](#)) ([Siebenga, 2006](#)) A study on improving quality through identifying inappropriate care found that use of guideline-based Utilization Review (UR) protocols resulted in a denial rate for lumbar fusion 59 times as high as denial rates using non-guideline based UR. ([Wickizer, 2004](#)) The profit motive and market medicine have had a significant impact on clinical practice and research in the field of spine surgery. ([Weiner-Spine, 2004](#)) ([Shah-Spine, 2005](#)) ([Abelson, 2006](#)) Data on geographic variations in medical procedure rates suggest that there is significant variability in spine fusion rates, which may be interpreted to suggest a poor professional consensus on the appropriate indications for performing spinal fusion. ([Deyo-Spine, 2005](#)) ([Weinstein, 2006](#)) Outcomes from complicated surgical fusion techniques (with internal fixation) may be no better than the traditional posterolateral fusion. ([van Tulder, 2006](#)) ([Maghout-Juratli, 2006](#)) Despite the new technologies, reoperation rates after lumbar fusion have become higher. ([Martin, 2007](#)) According to the recent Medicare Coverage Advisory Committee Technology Assessment, the evidence for lumbar spinal fusion does not conclusively demonstrate short-term or long-term benefits compared with nonsurgical treatment for elderly patients. ([CMS, 2006](#)) When lumbar fusion surgery is performed, either with lateral fusion alone or with interbody fusion, unlike cervical fusion, there is no absolute contraindication to patients returning even to contact sports after complete recovery from surgery. Like patients with a thoracic injury, those with a lumbar injury should be pain free, have no disabling neurological deficit, and exhibit evidence of bone fusion on x-ray films before returning. ([Burnett, 2006](#)) A recent randomized controlled trial comparing decompression with decompression and instrumented fusion in patients with foraminal stenosis and single-level degenerative disease found that patients universally improved with surgery, and this improvement was maintained at 5 years. However, no obvious additional benefit was noted by combining decompression with an instrumented fusion. ([Hallett, 2007](#)) Discography may be supported if the decision has already been made to do a spinal fusion, and a negative discogram could rule out the need for fusion on that disc (but a positive discogram in itself would not justify fusion). Discography may help distinguish asymptomatic discs

among morphologically abnormal discs in patients without psychosocial issues. Precise prospective categorization of discographic diagnoses may predict outcomes from treatment, surgical or otherwise. ([Derby, 2005](#)) ([Derby2, 2005](#)) ([Derby, 1999](#)) New research shows that healthcare expenditures for back and neck problems have increased substantially over time, but with little improvement in healthcare outcomes such as functional disability and work limitations. Rates of imaging, injections, opiate use, and spinal surgery have increased substantially over the past decade, but it is unclear what impact, if any, this has had on health outcomes. ([Martin, 2008](#)) The efficacy of surgery for nonspecific back pain is uncertain. There may be some patients for whom surgery, fusion specifically, might be helpful, but it is important for doctors to discuss the fact that surgery doesn't tend to lead to huge improvements on average, about a 10- to 20-point improvement in function on a 100-point scale, and a significant proportion of patients still need to take pain medication and don't return to full function. ([Chou, 2008](#)) This study showed that fusion for chronic lower back pain was the least successful common orthopaedic surgery. The study compared the gains in quality of life achieved by total hip replacement, total knee replacement, surgery for spinal stenosis, disc excision for lumbar disc herniation, and arthrodesis for chronic low back pain. For chronic lower back pain, improvements were statistically significant but clinically negligible. Although pain was reduced and function improved slightly, outcomes remained in the moderately affected range, quality of life was not improved and rendered worse, on average. While surgery for spinal stenosis and for disc herniation compare well with archetypical orthopaedic operations, the outcomes of surgery for chronic lower back pain do not even approach those of other orthopaedic procedures, and the data show that patients with back pain are rendered worse off by surgery. ([Hansson, 2008](#)) Recent studies document a 220% increase in lumbar spinal fusion surgery rates, without demonstrated improvements in patient outcomes or disability rates. ([Devo, 2009](#)) In a study of 2,378 Washington State workers' compensation claimants who underwent fusion to assess the frequency, timing, and causes of death, the 3-year cumulative mortality rate post-fusion was 1.93% and analgesic-related deaths were responsible for 21% of all deaths and 31.4% of all potential life lost. ([Juratli, 2009](#)) A study to compare the surgical experience, clinical outcomes, and effect on body weight between obese and morbidly obese patients undergoing lumbar spine fusion surgery concluded that clinical outcomes were independent of the BMI of the patient, but the incidence of postoperative complications was significant in 45% of morbidly obese and 44% of obese patients. The authors proposed that morbidly obese patients should undergo bariatric surgery before spine surgery in no emergent situations. ([Vaidya, 2009](#)) For nonradicular low back pain with common degenerative changes, there is fair evidence that fusion is no better than intensive rehabilitation with a cognitive-behavioral emphasis for improvement in pain or function, and less than half of patients experience optimal outcomes (defined as no more than sporadic pain, slight restriction of function, and occasional analgesics) following fusion. ([Chou, 2009](#)) Posterolateral bone-grafting fusion is not necessary when a Denis type-B thoracolumbar burst fracture associated with a load-sharing score of ≤ 6 is treated with short-segment pedicle screw fixation. ([Dai, 2009](#)) Lumbar spinal fusion surgeries use bone grafts, and are sometimes combined with metal devices, to produce a rigid connection between two or more adjacent vertebrae. The therapeutic objective of spinal fusion surgery for patients with low back problems is to prevent any movement in the intervertebral spaces between the fused vertebrae, thereby reducing pain and any neurological deficits. See also [Adjacent segment disease/degeneration \(fusion\)](#) & [Iliac crest donor-site pain treatment](#).

Lumbar fusion in workers' comp patients: In cases of workers' compensation, patient outcomes related to fusion may have other confounding variables that may affect overall success of the procedure, which should be considered. Until further research is conducted there remains insufficient evidence to recommend fusion for chronic low back pain in the absence of stenosis and spondylolisthesis, and this treatment for this condition remains "under study." It appears that workers' compensation populations require particular scrutiny when being considered for fusion for chronic low back pain, as there is evidence of poorer outcomes in subgroups of patients who were receiving compensation or involved in litigation. ([Fritzell-Spine, 2001](#)) ([Harris-JAMA, 2005](#)) ([Maghout-Juratli, 2006](#)) ([Atlas, 2006](#)) Despite poorer outcomes in workers' compensation patients, utilization is much higher in this population than in group health. ([Texas, 2001](#)) ([NCCI, 2006](#)) Presurgical biopsychosocial variables predict patient outcomes from lumbar fusion, which may help improve patient selection. Workers' compensation status, smoking, depression, and litigation were the most consistent presurgical predictors of poorer patient outcomes. Other predictors of poor results were number of prior low back operations, low household income, and older age. ([DeBerard-Spine, 2001](#)) ([DeBerard, 2003](#)) ([Devo, 2005](#)) ([LaCaille, 2005](#)) ([Trief-Spine, 2006](#)) Obesity and litigation in workers' compensation cases predict high costs associated with interbody cage lumbar fusion. ([LaCaille, 2007](#)) A recent study of 725 workers' comp patients in Ohio who had lumbar fusion found only 6% were able to go back to work a year later, 27% needed another operation, and over 90% were in enough pain that they were still taking narcotics at follow-up. ([Nguyen, 2007](#))

Lumbar fusion for spondylolisthesis: Recommended as an option for spondylolisthesis. Patients with increased instability of the spine after surgical decompression at the level of degenerative spondylolisthesis

are candidates for fusion. ([Eckman, 2005](#)) This study found only a 27% success from spinal fusion in patients with low back pain and a positive single-level low-pressure provocative discogram, versus a 72% success in patients having a well-accepted single-level lumbar pathology of unstable spondylolisthesis. ([Carragee, 2006](#)) Unilateral instrumentation used for the treatment of degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis is as effective as bilateral instrumentation. ([Fernandez-Fairen, 2007](#)) Patients with degenerative spondylolisthesis and spinal stenosis who undergo standard decompressive laminectomy (with or without fusion) showed substantially greater improvement in pain and function during a period of 2 years than patients treated nonsurgically, according to the recent results from the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT). ([Weinstein-spondylolisthesis, 2007](#)) ([Devo-NEJM, 2007](#)) For degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, spinal fusion may lead to a better clinical outcome than decompression alone. No conclusion about the clinical benefit of instrumenting a spinal fusion can be made, but there is moderate evidence that the use of instrumentation improves the chance of achieving solid fusion. ([Martin, 2007](#)) A recent systematic review of randomized trials comparing lumbar fusion surgery to nonsurgical treatment of chronic back pain associated with lumbar disc degeneration, concluded that surgery may be more efficacious than unstructured nonsurgical care but may not be more efficacious than structured cognitive-behavior therapy. Methodological limitations of the randomized trials prevented firm conclusions. ([Mirza, 2007](#))

Lumbar fusion for Scheuermann's kyphosis: Recommended as an option for adult patients with severe deformities (e.g. more than 70 degrees for thoracic kyphosis), neurological symptoms exist, and pain cannot be adequately resolved non-operatively (e.g. physical therapy, back exercises). Good outcomes have been found in a relatively large series of patients undergoing either combined anterior-posterior or posterior only fusion for Scheuermann's kyphosis. ([Lonner, 2007](#))

Patient Selection Criteria for Lumbar Spinal Fusion:

For chronic low back problems, fusion should not be considered within the first 6 months of symptoms, except for fracture, dislocation or progressive neurologic loss. Indications for spinal fusion may include: (1) Neural Arch Defect - Spondylolytic spondylolisthesis, congenital neural arch hypoplasia. (2) Segmental Instability (objectively demonstrable) - Excessive motion, as in degenerative spondylolisthesis, surgically induced segmental instability and mechanical intervertebral collapse of the motion segment and advanced degenerative changes after surgical disectomy. [For excessive motion criteria, see AMA Guides, 5th Edition, page 384 (relative angular motion greater than 20 degrees). ([Andersson, 2000](#)) ([Luers, 2007](#))] (3) Primary Mechanical Back Pain (i.e., pain aggravated by physical activity)/Functional Spinal Unit Failure/Instability, including one or two level segmental failure with progressive degenerative changes, loss of height, disc loading capability. In cases of workers' compensation, patient outcomes related to fusion may have other confounding variables that may affect overall success of the procedure, which should be considered. There is a lack of support for fusion for mechanical low back pain for subjects with failure to participate effectively in active rehab pre-op, total disability over 6 months, active psych diagnosis, and narcotic dependence. [For spinal instability criteria, see AMA Guides, 5th Edition, page 379 (lumbar inter-segmental movement of more than 4.5 mm). ([Andersson, 2000](#))] (4) Revision Surgery for failed previous operation(s) if significant functional gains are anticipated. Revision surgery for purposes of pain relief must be approached with extreme caution due to the less than 50% success rate reported in medical literature. (5) Infection, Tumor, or Deformity of the lumbosacral spine that cause intractable pain, neurological deficit and/or functional disability. (6) After failure of two disectomies on the same disc, fusion may be an option at the time of the third disectomy, which should also meet the ODG criteria. (See [ODG Indications for Surgery -- Disectomy.](#))

Pre-Operative Surgical Indications Recommended: Pre-operative clinical surgical indications for spinal fusion should include all of the following: (1) All pain generators are identified and treated; & (2) All physical medicine and manual therapy interventions are completed; & (3) X-rays demonstrating spinal instability and/or myelogram, CT-myelogram, or discography (see [discography criteria](#)) & MRI demonstrating disc pathology; & (4) Spine pathology limited to two levels; & (5) [Psychosocial screen](#) with confounding issues addressed. (6) For any potential fusion surgery, it is recommended that the injured worker refrain from smoking for at least six weeks prior to surgery and during the period of fusion healing. ([Colorado, 2001](#)) ([BlueCross BlueShield, 2002](#))

Disectomy/ laminectomy

ODG Indications for Surgery™ -- Disectomy/laminectomy --

Required symptoms/findings; imaging studies; & conservative treatments below:

I. Symptoms/Findings which confirm presence of radiculopathy. Objective findings on examination need to be present. For unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, see AMA Guides, 5th Edition, page 382-383.

([Andersson, 2000](#)) Straight leg raising test, crossed straight leg raising and reflex exams should correlate with symptoms and imaging.

Findings require ONE of the following:

- A. L3 nerve root compression, requiring ONE of the following:
 - 1. Severe unilateral quadriceps weakness/mild atrophy
 - 2. Mild-to-moderate unilateral quadriceps weakness
 - 3. Unilateral hip/thigh/knee pain
- B. L4 nerve root compression, requiring ONE of the following:
 - 1. Severe unilateral quadriceps/anterior tibialis weakness/mild atrophy
 - 2. Mild-to-moderate unilateral quadriceps/anterior tibialis weakness
 - 3. Unilateral hip/thigh/knee/medial pain
- C. L5 nerve root compression, requiring ONE of the following:
 - 1. Severe unilateral foot/toe/dorsiflexor weakness/mild atrophy
 - 2. Mild-to-moderate foot/toe/dorsiflexor weakness
 - 3. Unilateral hip/lateral thigh/knee pain
- D. S1 nerve root compression, requiring ONE of the following:
 - 1. Severe unilateral foot/toe/plantar flexor/hamstring weakness/atrophy
 - 2. Moderate unilateral foot/toe/plantar flexor/hamstring weakness
 - 3. Unilateral buttock/posterior thigh/calf pain

([EMGs](#) are optional to obtain unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy but not necessary if radiculopathy is already clinically obvious.)

II. Imaging Studies, requiring ONE of the following, for concordance between radicular findings on radiologic evaluation and physical exam findings:

- A. Nerve root compression (L3, L4, L5, or S1)
- B. Lateral disc rupture
- C. Lateral recess stenosis

Diagnostic imaging modalities, requiring ONE of the following:

- 1. [MR](#) imaging
- 2. [CT](#) scanning
- 3. [Myelography](#)
- 4. [CT myelography](#) & X-Ray

III. Conservative Treatments, requiring ALL of the following:

- A. [Activity modification](#) (not bed rest) after [patient education](#) (\geq 2 months)
- B. Drug therapy, requiring at least ONE of the following:
 - 1. [NSAID](#) drug therapy
 - 2. Other analgesic therapy
 - 3. [Muscle relaxants](#)
 - 4. [Epidural Steroid Injection](#) (ESI)
- C. Support provider referral, requiring at least ONE of the following (in order of priority):
 - 1. [Physical therapy](#) (teach home exercise/stretching)
 - 2. [Manual therapy](#) (chiropractor or massage therapist)
 - 3. [Psychological screening](#) that could affect surgical outcome
- 4. [Back school](#) ([Fisher, 2004](#))

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

ODG: Low Back Chapter

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE COMPLAINT PROCESS: The Texas Department of Insurance requires Independent Review Organizations to be licensed to perform Independent Review in Texas. To contact the Texas Department of Insurance regarding any complaint, you may call or write the Texas Department of Insurance. The telephone number is 1-800-578-4677 or in writing at: Texas Department of Insurance, PO Box 149104 Austin TX, 78714. In accordance with Rule 102.4(h), a copy of this Independent Review Organization (IRO) Decision was sent to the carrier, the requestor and claimant via facsimile or U.S. Postal Service from the office of the IRO on 07/29/2009.

