

# Clear Resolutions Inc.

An Independent Review Organization  
7301 RANCH RD 620 N, STE 155-199A  
Austin, TX 78726  
Phone: (512) 772-4390  
Fax: (512) 519-7316  
Email: resolutions.manager@cri-iro.com

## NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION

**DATE OF REVIEW:**

Jul/22/2009

**IRO CASE #:**

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

Right Stellate Ganglion Block, Epidurography, Sedation (64510, 72275, 99144)

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

MD, Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation  
Subspecialty Board Certified in 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**

ODG Guidelines and Treatment Guidelines

Adverse Determination Letters, 6/15/09, 6/29/09

Worker's Compensation Initial Evaluation Report, 4/22/09

FCE, 5/7/09

MD, 5/22/09, 5/8/09

MRI of the Right Shoulder, 4/30/09

Radiology, 5/11/09

MD, 6/10/09, 6/10/09, 6/23/09

Notes, 5/27/09, 5/29/09, 5/26/09, 6/6/09, 6/4/09, 4/27/09, 4/29/09, 5/1/09, 4/24/09, 7/2/09, 7/3/09, 7/1/09, 6/30/09,

Accident and Injury, 5/26/09-5/29/09, 5/4/09-5/9/09, 4/27/09-5/1/09, 4/20/09-4/24/09

Center for Pain Management, 6/9/09

IRO Summary from Carrier, 7/9/09

Employers First Report of Injury or Illness, xx/xx/xx

MD, 4/10/09  
MD, 4/11/09  
Emergency Center, 4/11/09  
4/13/09  
Prescription, 4/23/09, 5/9/09, 5/14/09  
Disability Certificates, 5/6/09-5/11/09, 5/11/09-5/29/09  
MD, 5/12/09  
MD, 5/22/09  
Lab Report, 6/10/09

## **PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY SUMMARY**

This is a xx year old reportedly injured on xx/xx/xx when a garage type door hit him on the right upper extremity. Xrays were normal, but an MRI showed a partial tear of the supraspinatus tendon. Dr. saw him and arranged treatment. He wrote on 5/7/09 that "Sensory function was observed to be normal in the Right Upper Extremity and Left Upper Extremity." This was part of an FCE. Subsequently this man was seen by Dr. Dr. wrote on 5/8 that he felt this man was developing a regional pain disorder with edema, mottling and color differences between the hands. He affirmed this on his 5/22/09 note. Dr. examined him on 6/9 and felt he had RSD. She described allodynia with severe excruciating and intractable pain with nothing making him better. Dr. continued to treat this man in May. His note as late as 5/29/09, a week after Dr. diagnosed RSD, described a deep shoulder pain, but no hand pain and that his symptoms were improving. He continued with physical therapy. The therapist did not describe intractable pain, but rather shoulder soreness. The only burning pain was described once, on 7/3/09, and was limited to the shoulder. Dr. noted he could not work due to severe low back and right hand pain.

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

Stellate blocks are a treatment for RSD. Dr. and the therapists did not describe in the medical records the intractable pain with the mottling and allodynia and edema that Dr. and Dr. described. This poses a conflict, as one group of trained professionals saw a problem and another group did not. The ODG supplies several criteria for RSD (CRPD-I). Some of these are as vague as edema at some time and the presence of an injury. The therapists and Dr. did not describe disproportionate pain and spontaneous pain during the time frame that overlaps the examinations by Dr. and Dr. The records do not demonstrate the claimant has RSD/CRPD-I. Therefore, the stellate block would not be justified as per the ODG. The reviewer finds that medical necessity does not exist for Right Stellate Ganglion Block, Epidurography, Sedation (64510, 72275, 99144).

CRPS, diagnostic criteria

Recommend using a combination of criteria as indicated below. There are no objective gold-standard diagnostic criteria for CRPS I or II. A comparison between three sets of diagnostic criteria for CRPS I concluded that there was a substantial lack of agreement between different diagnostic sets. (Perez, 2007

### **A. CRPS-I (RSD)**

The IASP (International Association for the Study of Pain) has defined this diagnosis as a variety of painful conditions following injury which appear regionally having a distal predominance of abnormal findings, exceeding in both magnitude and duration the expected clinical course of the inciting event and often resulting in significant impairment of motor function, and showing variable progression over time. (Stanton-Hicks, 1995) Diagnostic criteria defined by IASP in 1995 were the following: (1) The presence of an initiating noxious event or cause of immobilization that leads to development of the syndrome; (2) Continuing pain, allodynia, or hyperalgesia which is disproportionate to the inciting event and/or spontaneous pain in the absence of external stimuli; (3) Evidence at some time of edema, changes in skin blood flow, or abnormal sudomotor activity in the pain region; & (4) The diagnosis is excluded by the existence of conditions that would otherwise account for the degree of pain or dysfunction. Criteria 2-4 must be satisfied to make the diagnosis.

These criteria were found to be able to pick up a true positive with few false negatives (sensitivity 99% to 100%), but their use resulted in a large number of false positives (specificity range of 36% to 55%). (Bruehl, 1999) (Galer, 1998) Up to 37% of patients with painful diabetic neuropathy may meet the clinical criteria for CRPS using the original diagnostic criteria. (Quisel, 2005) To improve specificity the IASP suggested the following criteria: (1) Continuing pain disproportionate to the inciting event; (2) A report of one symptom from each of the following four categories and one physical finding from two of the following four categories: (a) Sensory: hyperesthesia, (b) Vasomotor: temperature asymmetry or skin color changes or asymmetry, (c) Sudomotor/edema: edema or sweating changes or sweating asymmetry, or (d) Motor/trophic: reports of decreased range of motion or motor dysfunction (weakness/tremor or dystonia) or trophic changes: hair, nail, skin. This decreased the number of false positives (specificity 94%) but also decreased the number of true positives (sensitivity of 70%). (Bruehl, 1999)

The Harden Criteria have updated these with the following four criteria: (1) Continuing pain, which is disproportionate to any inciting event; & (2) Must report at least one symptom in three of the four following categories: (a) Sensory: Reports of hyperesthesia and/or allodynia; (b) Vasomotor: Reports of temperature asymmetry and/or skin color changes and/or skin color asymmetry; (c) Sudomotor/Edema: Reports of edema and/or sweating changes and/or sweating asymmetry; (d) Motor/Trophic: Reports of decreased range of motion and/or motor dysfunction (weakness, tremor, dystonia) and/or trophic changes (hair, nail, skin); & (3) Must display at least one sign at time of evaluation in two or more of the following categories: (a) Sensory: Evidence of hyperalgesia (to pinprick) and/or allodynia (to light touch and/or temperature sensation and/or deep somatic pressure and/or joint movement); (b) Vasomotor: Evidence of temperature asymmetry ( $>1^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) and/or skin color changes and/or asymmetry; (c) Sudomotor/Edema: Evidence of edema and/or sweating changes and/or sweating asymmetry; (d) Motor/Trophic: Evidence of decreased range of motion and/or motor dysfunction (weakness, tremor, dystonia) and/or trophic changes (hair, nail, skin); & 4. There is no other diagnosis that better explains the signs and symptoms (Harden, 2007)

The Washington State Department of Labor and Industries guidelines include the presence of four of the following physical findings: (1) Vasomotor changes: temperature/color change; (2) Edema; (3) Trophic changes: skin, hair, and/or nail growth abnormalities; (4) Impaired motor function (tremor, abnormal limb positioning and/or diffuse weakness that can't be explained by neuralgic loss or musculoskeletal dysfunction); (5) Hyperpathia/allodynia; or (6) Sudomotor changes: sweating. Diagnostic tests (only needed if four physical findings were not present): 3-phase bone scan that is abnormal in pattern characteristics for CRPS. (Washington, 2002)

The State of Colorado Division of Workers' Compensation Medical Treatment Guidelines adopted the following diagnostic criteria in 2006: (1) The patient complains of pain (usually diffuse burning or aching); (2) Physical findings of at least vasomotor and/or sudomotor signs, allodynia and/or trophic findings add strength to the diagnosis; (3) At least two diagnostic testing procedures are positive and these procedures include the following: (a) Diagnostic imaging: Plain film radiography/triple phase bone scan, (b) Injections: Diagnostic sympathetic blocks, (c) Thermography: Cold water stress test/warm water stress test, or (d) Autonomic Test Battery. The authors provide the following caveat: Even the most sensitive tests can have false negatives, and the patient can still have CRPS-I, if clinical signs are strongly present. In patients with continued signs and symptoms of CRPS-I, further diagnostic testing may be appropriate. (Colorado, 2006)

Other authors have questioned the usefulness of diagnostic testing over and above history and physical findings. (Quisel, 2005) (Yung, 2003) (Perez2, 2005) A negative diagnostic test should not question a clinically typical presentation of CRPS and should not delay treatment. (Birklein, 2005)

## B. CRPS-II (causalgia)

Nerve damage can be detected by EMG but pain is not contained to that distribution. (Stanton-Hicks, 1995) CRPS I and II appear to be clinically similar. (Bruehl, 1999) CRPS-II is defined by the IASP as: (1) The presence of continuing pain, allodynia, or hyperalgesia after a nerve injury, not necessarily limited to the distribution of the injured nerve; (2) Evidence at some time of edema, changes in skin blood flow, and/or abnormal sudomotor activity in the region of pain; & (3) The diagnosis is excluded by the existence of conditions that would otherwise account for the degree of pain and dysfunction. The state of Colorado also uses the above criteria but adds that there must be documentation of peripheral nerve injury with pain initially in the distribution of the injured nerve. (Colorado, 2006)

## C. Differential Diagnoses of CRPS

These need to include local pathology, peripheral neuropathies, infectious processes, inflammatory and vascular disorders. (Quisel2, 2005) (Stanton-Hicks, 2006) Also include the following conditions: pain dysfunction syndrome; cumulative trauma syndrome; repetitive strain syndrome; overuse syndrome; tennis elbow; shoulder-hand syndrome; nonspecific thoracic outlet syndrome; fibromyalgia; posttraumatic vasoconstriction; undetected fracture; post-herpetic neuralgia; diabetic neuropathy. (Stanton-Hicks, 2004) See also Treatment for CRPS; Sympathetically maintained pain (SMP); CRPS, medications; CRPS, prevention; CRPS, sympathetic and epidural blocks.

## CRPS, treatment

Recommended hierarchy of options as indicated below. The goal is to improve function. Multiple pathophysiological mechanisms are responsible including neuropathic (sympathetic and independently-maintained pain), and immunologic (regional inflammation and altered human leukocyte antigens). Both peripheral sensitization and central sensitization have been proposed. (Ribbers, 2003) (Stanton-Hicks, 2006) There are no evidence-based treatment guidelines but several groups have begun to organize treatment algorithms.  
Recommendations

1. Rehabilitation: (a) Early stages: Build a therapeutic alliance. Analgesia, encouragement and education are key. Physical modalities include desensitization, isometric exercises, resisted range of motion, and stress loading. If not applied appropriately, PT can actually be detrimental. (b) Next steps: Increase flexibility with introduction of gentle active ROM and stretching (to treat accompanying myofascial pain syndrome). Other modalities may include muscle relaxants, trigger point injections and electrical stimulation (based on anecdotal evidence). Edema control may also be required (elevation, retrograde sympathetic blocks, diuretics and adrenoceptor blockers when sympathetically maintained pain-SMP is present). (c) Continued steps: Continue active ROM; stress loading; scrubbing techniques; isotonic strengthening; general aerobic conditioning; and postural normalization. (d) Final steps: Normalization of use; assessment of ergonomics, posture and modifications at home and work. In some cases increased requirements of analgesic medications, psychotherapy, invasive anesthetic techniques and SCS may be required. See CRPS, spinal cord stimulators

2. Psychological treatment: Focused on improved quality of life, development of pain coping skills, cognitive-behavioral therapy, and improving facilitation of other modalities. (a) Early stages: education. (b) Next steps: clinical psychological assessment (after 6 to 8 weeks): identification of stressors; identification of comorbid Axis I psychiatric disorders (depression, anxiety, panic and post-traumatic stress)

3. Pain management: (a) Pharmacological: antidepressants (particularly amitriptyline); anticonvulsants (particularly gabapentin); steroids; NSAIDs; opioids; calcitonin; bisphosphonates;  $\alpha_1$  adrenoceptor antagonists (terazosin or phenoxybenzamine). The latter class of drugs has been helpful in SMP. Clonidine has been given transdermally and epidurally. (See CRPS, medications.) Bisphosphonates have some literature support in the presence of osteopenia. (Rho, 2002) (b) Minimally invasive: depends on degree of SMP, stage of rehabilitation (passive or active movement), and response to blocks. (See CRPS, sympathetic blocks.) Responders to sympathetic blocks (3 to 6 blocks with concomitant PT) may be all that is required. For non-responders somatic block or epidural infusion may be required to optimize analgesia for PT. (c) More invasive: After failure of progression or partial relief, consider tunneled epidural catheters for prolonged sympathetic or somatic blocks or neurostimulation with SCS in CRPS-I and II. See CRPS, spinal cord stimulators. Also consider peripheral nerve stimulation in CRPS-II and intrathecal drug delivery in patients with dystonia, failed neurostimulation, long-standing disease, multi-limb involvement and requirement of palliative care. (d) Surgical: Sympathectomy is not generally recommended, but has been considered in patients that respond to sympathetic blocks. Pre-procedure the patient should have outcomes assessed with radiofrequency and neurolytic procedures. (See CRPS, sympathectomy.) Motor Cortex Stimulation has been considered

Outcome measures for all treatments of CRPS: Objective measures such as the Beck Depression Inventory, the State Trait Anxiety Inventory, McGill Pain Questionnaire-Short Form, the Pain Disability Index, & the Treatment Outcomes in Pain Survey (the last three may not meet the APA standards for standardized test in clinical use). See Psychological evaluations. See also CRPS, diagnostic criteria; CRPS, medications; CRPS, prevention; CRPS, sympathetic blocks; & Sympathetically maintained pain (SMP). See also Spinal cord stimulators (SCS).

CRPS, sympathetic and epidural block

Recommended only as indicated below, for a limited role, primarily for diagnosis of sympathetically mediated pain and as an adjunct to facilitate physical therapy. Detailed information about stellate ganglion blocks, thoracic sympathetic blocks, and lumbar sympathetic blocks is found in Regional sympathetic blocks. Recommendations for the use of sympathetic blocks are listed below. They are recommended for a limited role, primarily for diagnosis of sympathetically mediated pain and as an adjunct to facilitate physical therapy. It should be noted that sympathetic blocks are not specific for CRPS. See Sympathetically maintained pain (SMP). Repeated blocks are only recommended if continued improvement is observed. Systematic reviews reveal a paucity of published evidence supporting the use of local anesthetic sympathetic blocks for the treatment of CRPS and usefulness remains controversial. Less than 1/3 of patients with CRPS are likely to respond to sympathetic blockade. No controlled trials have shown any significant benefit from sympathetic blockade. (Varrassi, 2006) (Cepeda, 2005) (Hartrick, 2004) (Grabow, 2005) (Cepeda, 2002) (Forouzanfar, 2002) (Sharma, 2006) Predictors of poor response: Long duration of symptoms prior to intervention; Elevated anxiety levels; Poor coping skills; Litigation. (Hartrick, 2004) (Nelson, 2006) Alternatives to regional sympathetic blocks: may be necessary when there is evidence of coagulopathy, systemic infection, and/or post-surgical changes. These include peripheral nerve and plexus blocks and epidural administration of local anesthetics. Mixed conduction blocks (central neural blocks): suggested when analgesia is insufficient by pharmacologic means to support physical therapy: (1) Implanted catheters at the brachial or lumbosacral plexus: allows for 1 to 2 weeks of therapy. Side effects include technical failure and infection; & (2) Epidural tunneled catheters: allows for long-term therapy: Side effects: same as above.

Clonidine has also been effective epidurally. (Stanton-Hicks, 2006) Baclofen has been demonstrated to be effective intrathecally to reduce dystonia. (van Hilten, 2000) IV regional sympathetic blocks: controversial due to varying success. Guanethadine was used, but is no longer available in the US. Bretylium and reserpine require daily blocks, and have potential side effects of transient syncope with apnea, orthostatic hypotension, pain with administration, nausea and vomiting. Bretylium provided more than 30% pain relief for a mean of 20 days compared to placebo. (Hord, 1992) Due to modest benefits and the invasiveness of the therapies, epidural clonidine injection and intravenous regional sympathetic block with bretylium should be offered only after careful counseling, and they should be followed by intensive physical therapy. Intravenous regional sympathetic block (Bier's block) with guanethidine and lidocaine resulted in excellent pain relief and full restoration of both function and range of movement of the affected extremity in patients suffering from CRPS-I of the hand. (Paraskevas, 2005) Local or systemic parecoxib combined with lidocaine/clonidine IV regional analgesia is an effective treatment for CRPS-I in a dominant upper limb. (Frade, 2005) See also Sympathetically maintained pain (SMP); & Regional sympathetic blocks

Recommendations (based on consensus guidelines) for use of sympathetic blocks: (1) In the initial diagnostic phase if less than 50% improvement is noted for the duration of the local anesthetic, no further blocks are recommended. (2) In the initial therapeutic phase, maximum sustained relief is generally obtained after 3 to 6 blocks. These blocks are generally given in fairly quick succession in the first two weeks of treatment with tapering to once a week. Continuing treatment longer than 2 to 3 weeks is unusual. (3) In the therapeutic phase repeat blocks should only be undertaken if there is evidence of increased range of motion, pain and medication use reduction and increased tolerance of activity and touch (decreased allodynia) in physical therapy/occupational therapy. (4) There should be evidence that physical or occupational therapy is incorporated with the duration of symptom relief of the block during the therapeutic phase. (5) In acute exacerbations, 1 to 3 blocks may be required for treatment. (5) A formal test of the block should be documented (preferably using skin temperature). (6) Documentation of motor and/or sensory block should occur. This is particularly important in the diagnostic phase to avoid overestimation of the sympathetic component of pain. (Burton, 2006) (Stanton-Hicks, 2004) (Stanton-Hicks, 2006) (International Research Foundation for RSD/CRPS, 2003) (Colorado, 2006) (Washington, 2002) (Rho, 2002)

Regional sympathetic blocks (stellate ganglion block, thoracic sympathetic block, & lumbar sympathetic block

Recommendations are generally limited to diagnosis and therapy for CRPS. See CRPS, sympathetic and epidural blocks for specific recommendations for treatment. Also see CRPS, diagnostic criteria; CRPS, medications; & CRPS

Stellate ganglion block (SGB) (Cervicothoracic sympathetic block): There is limited evidence to support this procedure, with most studies reported being case studies. The one prospective double-blind study (of CRPS) was limited to 4 subjects. Anatomy: Sympathetic flow to the head, neck and most of the upper extremities is derived from the upper five to seven thoracic spinal segments. The stellate ganglion is formed by a fusion of the inferior and first thoracic sympathetic ganglia in 80% of patients. In the other 20%, the first thoracic ganglion is labeled the stellate ganglion. The upper extremity may also be innervated by branches for Kuntz's nerves, which may explain inadequate relief of sympathetic related pain. Proposed Indications: This block is proposed for the diagnosis and treatment of sympathetic pain involving the face, head, neck, and upper extremities. Pain: CRPS; Herpes Zoster and post-herpetic neuralgia; Frostbite. Circulatory insufficiency: Traumatic/embolic occlusion; Post-reimplantation; Post-embolic vasospasm; Raynaud's disease; Vasculitis; Scleroderma. Testing for an adequate block: Adequacy of a sympathetic block should be recorded.

A Horner's sign (ipsilateral ptosis, miosis, anhydrosis conjunctival engorgement, and warmth of the face) indicates a sympathetic block of the head and face. It does not indicate a sympathetic block of the upper extremity. The latter can be measured by surface temperature

difference (an increase in temperature on the side of the block). Somatic block of the arm should also be ruled out (the incidence of brachial plexus nerve block is ~ 10%). Complete sympathetic blockade can be measured with the addition of tests of abolition of sweating and of the sympathogalvanic response. Documentation of motor and/or sensory block should occur. Complications: Incidental recurrent laryngeal nerve block or superior laryngeal nerve block, resulting in hoarseness and subjective shortness of breathe; Brachial plexus block; Intravascular injection; Intrathecal, subdural or epidural injection; Puncture of the pleura with pneumothorax; Bleeding and hematoma. There appears to be a positive correlation between efficacy and how soon therapy is initiated (as studied in patients with CRPS of the hand). Duration of symptoms greater than 16 weeks before the initial SGB and/or a decrease in skin perfusion of 22% between the normal and affected hands adversely affected the efficacy of SGB therapy. (Ackerman, 2006) (Sayson, 2004) (Grabow, 2005) (Colorado, 2006) (Price, 1998) (Day, 2008) (Nader, 2005) See also Stellate ganglion block

**Thoracic Sympathetic Blocks:** Not recommended due to a lack of literature to support effectiveness. Utilized for sympathetic blocks of the upper extremity in the 20% of individuals with innervation of the upper extremity by Kuntz's nerves (nerves from the 2nd and 3rd thoracic sympathetic ganglia bypass the stellate ganglion and directly join the brachial plexus). Proposed Indications: CRPS, peripheral neuropathy, brachial plexalgia, sympathetically maintained pain and vascular disorders. (Day, 2008) Complications: neuraxial injection; intravascular injection; nerve injury; pneuemothorax

**Lumbar Sympathetic Blocks:** There is limited evidence to support this procedure, with most studies reported being case studies. Anatomy: Consists of several ganglia between the L1 and L5 vertebra. Proposed Indications: Circulatory insufficiency of the leg: (Arteriosclerotic disease; Claudication: Rest pain; Ischemic ulcers; Diabetic gangrene; Pain following arterial embolus). Pain: Herpes Zoster; Post-herpetic neuralgia; Frostbite; CRPS; Phantom pain. These blocks can be used diagnostically and therapeutically. Adjunct therapy: sympathetic therapy should be accompanied by aggressive physical therapy to optimize success. Complications: Back pain; Hematuria; Somatic block; Segmental nerve injury; Hypotension (secondary to vasodilation); Bleeding; Paralysis: Renal puncture/trauma. Genitofemoral neuralgia can occur with symptoms of burning dysesthesia in the anteromedial upper thigh. It is advised to not block at L4 to avoid this complication. Adequacy of the block: This should be determined, generally by measure of skin temperature (with an increase noted on the side of the block). Complete sympathetic blockade can be measured with the addition of tests of abolition of sweating and of the sympathogalvanic response. (Day, 2008) (Sayson, 2004) (Nader, 2005)

### Stellate ganglion block

Recommendations are generally limited to diagnosis and therapy for CRPS. See CRPS, sympathetic and epidural blocks for specific recommendations for treatment. Detailed information about stellate ganglion blocks, thoracic sympathetic blocks, and lumbar sympathetic blocks is found in Regional sympathetic blocks.

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

ACOEM-AMERICA 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)