



Southwestern Forensic
Associates, Inc.

DATE OF REVIEW: 11/06/09

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE:

Work conditioning, ten additional sessions, times eight hours

DESCRIPTION OF QUALIFICATIONS OF REVIEWER:

D.C., for seventeen years, currently practicing in the area of therapeutic rehabilitation

REVIEW OUTCOME:

“Upon independent review, I find that the previous adverse determination or determinations should be (check only one):

Upheld (Agree)

Overturned (Disagree)

Partially Overturned (Agree in part/Disagree in part)

The patient has completed extensive therapeutic exercise and work conditioning without improvement sufficiently to return to work. It is unlikely that the patient will improve significantly over the course of ten days, given his current PDL and that of his job's PDL. Medical necessity is not met, according to the ODG, since the injured worker must be able to benefit from the program. Therapeutic exercise in work hardening or work conditioning notes range from 01/20/09 through 09/09/09. The gap between the job PDL and his current PDL remains significant, in spite of these months of therapy. Therefore, the decision is upheld.

INFORMATION PROVIDED FOR REVIEW:

1. 10/19/09, TDI assignment of case to Southwest Forensics, one page
2. 10/19/09, fax cover, Utilization Management, one page
3. 10/19/09, confirmation of receipt of request for review by an IRO, one page
4. 10/19/09, company request for IRO, seven pages
5. 09/03/09, Utilization Review for work hardening/conditioning, adverse determination, three pages
6. 10/08/09, Utilization Appeal Review, assignment of peer reviewer, two pages
7. 10/09/09, Utilization Review for appeal of adverse determination, two pages

8. 10/19/09, TDI assignment to Southwestern Forensics, one page
9. 01/21/09, Healthcare Centers, initial report and exam, seven pages
10. 05/27/09, Healthcare Center, interim report and exam, seven pages
11. 08/14/09, Functional Capacity Evaluation, seventeen pages
12. 09/22/09, PPE, fourteen pages
13. 10/24/09, Imaging, MRI scan of left knee, one page
14. 05/07/09, Specialty Hospital surgical report of D.O., ten pages
15. 03/07/09, Orthopedic Surgery Group and Center for Sports Injury, D.O., evaluation, two pages
16. 03/06/09, DWC-73, D.O., one page
17. 08/12/09, D.O., evaluation, two pages
18. 08/07/08 through 01/14/09, Transcription progress note, AMP, twelve pages
19. 07/24/08, Transcription progress note, R.N., five pages
20. 06/20/08, Group Transcription, M.D., initial orthopedic consult, two pages
21. 05/27/08 through 06/17/08, Transcription, M.D., four pages
22. 05/19/08 through 06/04/08, Transcription, AMP, two pages
23. 05/19/08, Imaging Consultants, three-view x-ray of the left knee, one page
24. 06/22/09 through 09/09/09, Health Centers, therapeutic exercise, work hardening, work conditioning notes and assessment sheet, 26 pages
25. 06/22/09 through 07/29/09, Health Center pain sheets, therapeutic exercise sheets, second page, 33 pages
26. Undated Health Center pain sheet, one page
27. Undated assessment sheet, one page
28. 01/20/09 through 06/17/09, assessment and therapeutic exercise sheets, 27 pages
29. 10/14/09, change of doctor request to D.O., one page
30. 10/15/09, approved change of doctor request, one page
31. 01/22/09 to 01/10/14/09, DWC-73, twelve pages
32. Undated request for work conditioning from D.O., one page
33. 09/03/09, Institute of America, peer review contact note, four pages
34. 10/09/09, Institute of America, peer review contact note, four pages
35. Undated fax cover, preauthorization request for work hardening, one page
36. Undated preauthorization request form for ten sessions of work hardening times eight hours, one page
37. 09/11/09, Orthopedic Surgery Group and Center for Sports Medicine, therapy referral for FCE and work conditioning, one page

INJURED EMPLOYEE CLINICAL HISTORY (Summary):

The injured employee was injured on xx/xx/xx. He was hit by a forklift and pinned between it and other materials. He has had left knee surgery, therapeutic exercise, and work conditioning, which stems from 01/20/09 through 09/09/09 without regaining the

ability to return to work. Ten additional sessions of work conditioning have been requested.

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

The ODG Guidelines establish that for approval of work conditioning, the injured employee must be able to benefit from the program significantly enough to improve his condition and to facilitate an eventual return to work. The patient is currently at a sedentary/light PDL, and his job PDL is light medium. The current PDL requires constant lifting negligible, frequent lifting negligible, occasional fifteen pounds. The job PDL requires constant lifting of seven pounds, frequent eighteen pounds, and occasional 35 pounds. It is not likely that ten additional sessions of work conditioning would significantly benefit him, given the period of time he has already participated in therapeutic exercise and work hardening or work conditioning dating from 01/20/09 through 09/09/09.

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

(Check any of the following that were used in the course of your review.)

- 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 judgment, 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 national accepted medical literature (provide a description).
- Other evidence-based, scientifically valid, outcome-focused guidelines (provide a description.)