



**IRO# 5356**  
**5068 West Plano Parkway Suite 122**  
**Plano, Texas 75093**  
**Phone: (972) 931-5100**

**Notice of Independent Review Decision**

**DATE OF REVIEW:** 05/10/2010

**IRO CASE #:**

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

IRO - Chronic Pain Management

**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 Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation. The physician advisor has the following additional qualifications, if applicable:

ABMS Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

**REVIEW OUTCOME:**

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

**Upheld**

<b>Health Care Service(s) in Dispute</b>	<b>CPT Codes</b>	<b>Date of Service(s)</b>	<b>Outcome of Independent Review</b>
IRO - Chronic Pain Management X 10 sessions	97799	-	<b>Upheld</b>

**INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW:**

<b>No</b>	<b>Document Type</b>	<b>Provider or Sender</b>	<b>Page Count</b>	<b>Service Start Date</b>	<b>Service End Date</b>
1	Claim File	TDI	17	04/19/2010	04/19/2010
2	First Report of Injury		2	12/11/2007	12/11/2007
3	Office Visit Report		15	07/15/2009	03/24/2010
4	Office Visit Report	MD	26	01/09/2008	01/14/2009
5	Office Visit Report		9	01/04/2009	01/18/2010
6	Office Visit Report	MDPA	4	02/11/2009	02/11/2009
7	Office Visit Report	MD	5	07/24/2008	09/10/2008

8	Office Visit Report		6	12/12/2007	01/02/2008
9	Peer Review Report		6	02/22/2010	02/22/2010
10	Psych Evaluation		7	06/23/2009	06/23/2009
11	Appeal Denial Letter	Inc	8	01/06/2010	03/17/2010
12	Appeal Request		5	12/24/2009	02/25/2010
13	Office Visit Report		63	01/11/2010	01/29/2010
14	Claim Notes	Company	1	01/27/2009	01/27/2009
15	Claim Notes	Law Firm	1	01/06/2010	01/06/2010
16	Designated Doctor Report	DO	16	05/14/2008	06/04/2008
17	Order/Settlement/Agreement	Texas Department of Insurance	6	05/30/2008	06/05/2008
18	Diagnostic Test		2	06/18/2008	06/18/2008
19	Diagnostic Test	PhD	3	01/26/2009	01/29/2009
20	Diagnostic Test		9	06/24/2008	02/11/2009
21	FCE Report		30	11/18/2009	01/27/2010
22	Impairment/Disability Rating Report		7	12/18/2009	12/18/2009
23	IRO Request		4	04/06/2010	04/20/2010
24	Lab Report		10	10/22/2009	01/06/2010
25	Archive		1	04/19/2010	04/19/2010
26	Initial Request		8	07/30/2008	12/04/2008
27	Initial Request		12	12/02/2009	02/09/2010
28	PT Notes		35	01/14/2008	12/06/2008
29	PT Notes		6	12/27/2007	12/31/2007
30	Archive		2	06/23/2008	06/24/2008
31	Claim File		2	05/02/2008	05/02/2008
32	Initial Approval Letter	Inc	2	09/30/2008	12/29/2008
33	Initial Denial Letter	Inc	5	12/08/2009	02/18/2010
34	Initial Approval Letter		3	01/05/2010	01/05/2010
35	Office Visit Report		51	10/29/2009	11/20/2009
36	Archive		372	04/22/2010	04/22/2010

**PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:**

The records available for review document that the claimant developed difficulty with pain in the left upper extremity, related to repetitive activities in the work place.

The claimant was evaluated by Dr. on 1-9-08. On that date, the claimant was diagnosed with a left wrist strain and a left hand strain.

The records available for review document that the claimant received at least nine sessions of physical therapy from 1-14-08 to 2-12-08 at Healthcare.

An electrodiagnostic assessment of the upper extremities was obtained on 2-21-08. This study disclosed findings consistent with a left radial tunnel syndrome.

Dr. evaluated the claimant on 2-27-08 at which time; it was recommended the claimant be evaluated by an orthopedic specialist.

A designated doctor evaluation was to be accomplished on 5-20-08. The records available for review indicate the claimant did not attend this appointment due to the fact that the claimant's child apparently sustained an injury at school.

A benefit review conference was conducted on 5-27-08 which indicated the claimant was deemed to have sustained an injury in the work place on the above noted date of injury.

A designated doctor evaluation was conducted on 6-4-08. This evaluation was performed by Dr. This physician indicated there was no objective evidence of an anatomic or physiologic derangement. This physician did not feel there was a compensable injury sustained in the work place to the left upper extremity.

A left wrist MRI was obtained on 6-18-08 and this study was found to be essentially, unremarkable.

An electrodiagnostic assessment of the left upper extremity was obtained on 6-24-08. This study was described as an "essentially normal study."

The claimant was evaluated by Dr. on 7-24-08. This physician indicated the claimant was with symptoms of pain in the left wrist and indicated there appeared to be symptoms consistent with a left radial tunnel syndrome.

Dr. re-evaluated the claimant on 9-10-08. This physician recommended the claimant receive access to treatment in the form of physical therapy services and it was also felt the claimant should utilize a brace on the left wrist at night. The claimant was also provided a prescription for Celebrex.

The claimant received at least seven sessions of supervised therapy services from 10-2-08 to 10-16-08.

Dr. re-evaluated the claimant on 11-17-08. It was recommended the claimant be referred to Dr. for re-evaluation. Dr. indicated the claimant appeared to be near a level of clinical maximum medical improvement.

The claimant was evaluated by Dr. on 12-15-08. At that time, Dr. indicated "there is very little to offer her at this time."

The claimant was evaluated by Dr. on 1-4-09. On this date, the claimant received an injection of a local anesthetic and steroid around the medial nerve under the carpal tunnel and around the radial nerve at the wrist level.

Dr. evaluated the claimant on 1-14-09. On that date, the claimant was provided a two month supply of prescription medications for management of pain symptoms. The note did not document specifically what type of medications the claimant was prescribed.

The claimant was evaluated by Dr. on 2-11-09. This physician indicated the claimant appeared to be with non-physiological signs of break way weakness and increased sensitivity to temperature and vibration in the left upper extremity. There were no findings on physical examination consistent with reflex sympathetic dystrophy in this physician's opinion.

An electrodiagnostic assessment was accomplished on 3-11-09. This study was accomplished on the left upper extremity and was described as a normal study.

A psychological evaluation was conducted on 6-23-09. This evaluation was notable for the fact that the claimant was with the employer for approximately 2 ½ months prior to sustaining an injury in the work place. It was noted the claimant had a previous history of mental health treatment related to marital conflict.

The records available for review document the claimant was a participant in a work hardening program from

10-29-09 to 11-20-09. The records available for review would appear to indicate the claimant received access to approximately twenty sessions of treatment in the form of a work hardening program. The records available for review indicate the claimant did not feel there was any significant change in functional capabilities.

A functional capacity evaluation was accomplished on 11-18-09. It was noted there was not a job description available for review. After this assessment was completed, it was felt the claimant was in need of additional treatment in the form of a four to six week work hardening program.

The claimant was evaluated by Dr. on 12-7-09. On that date, it was noted the claimant was on the following medications: Cymbalta and Tylenol.

The claimant was evaluated by Dr. on 12-31-09. On this date, the claimant was provided a prescription for the following medications: Flexeril and Cymbalta.

The records available for review would appear to indicate the claimant was a participant in a comprehensive pain management program from 1-11-10 to 1-19-10.

The claimant was evaluated by Dr. on 1-18-10. It was recommended the claimant receive an evaluation with Dr. on an as needed basis.

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

An extensive amount of documentation was available for review. After careful review, Official Disability Guidelines would not support medical necessity for treatment in the form of a comprehensive/chronic pain management program for the following reasons:

- 1). It did not appear the claimant was on any type of narcotic medication for management of pain symptoms.
- 2). There was a lack of benefit from previous attempts at medical treatment to support an expectation that there would be any type of a positive response from treatment in the form of a comprehensive pain management program.
- 3). The length of time the claimant was removed from the date of injury would be considered a poor prognostic sign per Official Disability Guidelines for participation in a comprehensive pain management program.
- 4). An extensive amount of diagnostic testing was obtained after the date of injury which did not correlate with the documented symptoms and physical examination findings.
- 5). The claimant was noted to have been employed with the employer for only 2 ½ months prior to sustaining an injury in the work place.

Based upon the records available for review and per criteria set forth by Official Disability Guidelines, the above noted reference would not support medical necessity for medical treatment in the form of a comprehensive pain management program.

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

ODG; Pain Chapter

Chronic pain programs (functional restoration programs)	Recommended where there is access to programs with proven successful outcomes (i.e., decreased pain and medication use, improved function and return to work, decreased utilization of the health care system), for patients with conditions that have resulted in " <a href="#">Delayed recovery</a> ." There should be evidence that a complete diagnostic assessment has been made, with a detailed treatment plan of how to address physiologic, psychological and sociologic components that are considered components of the patient's pain. Patients should show evidence of motivation to improve and return to work, and meet the patient selection criteria outlined below. While these programs are recommended (see criteria below), the research remains ongoing as to (1) what is considered the "gold-standard" content for treatment; (2) the group of patients that benefit most from this treatment; (3) the ideal timing of
---	--

when to initiate treatment; (4) the intensity necessary for effective treatment; and (5) cost-effectiveness. It has been suggested that interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary care models for treatment of chronic pain may be the most effective way to treat this condition. ([Flor, 1992](#)) ([Gallagher, 1999](#)) ([Guzman, 2001](#)) ([Gross, 2005](#)) ([Sullivan, 2005](#)) ([Dysvik, 2005](#)) ([Airaksinen, 2006](#)) ([Schonstein, 2003](#)) ([Sanders, 2005](#)) ([Patrick, 2004](#)) ([Buchner, 2006](#)) These treatment modalities are based on the biopsychosocial model, one that views pain and disability in terms of the interaction between physiological, psychological and social factors. ([Gatchel, 2005](#)) See [Biopsychosocial model of chronic pain](#).

**Types of programs:** There is no one universal definition of what comprises interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary treatment. These pain rehabilitation programs (as described below) combine multiple treatments, and at the least, include psychological care along with physical and/or occupational therapy (including an active exercise component as opposed to passive modalities). The most commonly referenced programs have been defined in the following general ways ([Stanos, 2006](#)):

(1) **Multidisciplinary programs:** Involves one or two specialists directing the services of a number of team members, with these specialists often having independent goals. These programs can be further subdivided into four levels of pain programs:

(a) Multidisciplinary pain centers (generally associated with academic centers and include research as part of their focus)

(b) Multidisciplinary pain clinics

(c) Pain clinics

(d) Modality-oriented clinics

(2) **Interdisciplinary pain programs:** Involves a team approach that is outcome focused and coordinated and offers goal-oriented interdisciplinary services. Communication on a minimum of a weekly basis is emphasized. The most intensive of these programs is referred to as a Functional Restoration Program, with a major emphasis on maximizing function versus minimizing pain. See [Functional restoration programs](#).

**Types of treatment:** Components suggested for interdisciplinary care include the following services delivered in an integrated fashion: (a) physical treatment; (b) medical care and supervision; (c) psychological and behavioral care; (d) psychosocial care; (e) vocational rehabilitation and training; and (f) education.

**Outcomes measured:** Studies have generally evaluated variables such as pain relief, function and return to work. More recent research has begun to investigate the role of comorbid psychiatric and substance abuse problems in relation to treatment with pain programs. Recent literature has begun to suggest that an outcome of chronic pain programs may be to “demedicalize” treatment of a patient, and encourage them to take a more active role in their recovery. These studies use outcomes such as use of the medical care system post-treatment. The role of the increasing use of opioids and other medications (using data collected over the past decade) on outcomes of functional restoration is in the early stages, and it is not clear how changes in medication management have affected outcomes, if at all. (See [Opioids for chronic pain](#).)

**Outcomes (in terms of body parts)**

**Neck and Shoulder:** There are limited studies about the efficacy of chronic pain

programs for neck, shoulder, or upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders. ([Karjalainen, 2003](#)) This may be because rates of cervical claims are only 20-25% of the rates of lumbar claims. In addition, little is known as to chronicity of outcomes. Researchers using PRIDE Program (Progressive Rehabilitation Institute of Dallas for Ergonomics) data compared a cohort of patients with cervical spine disorders to those with lumbar spine disorders from 1990-1995 and found that they had similar outcomes. Cervical patients were statistically less likely to have undergone pre-rehabilitative surgery. ([Wright, 1999](#))

***Multidisciplinary back training:*** (involvement of psychologists, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, and/or medical specialists). The training program is partly based on physical training and partly on behavioral cognitive training. Physical training is performed according to the "graded activity" principle. The main goal is to restore daily function. A recent review of randomized controlled studies of at least a year's duration found that this treatment modality produced a positive effect on work participation and possibly on quality of life. There was no long-term effect on experienced pain or functional status (this result may be secondary to the instrument used for outcome measure). Intensity of training had no substantial influence on the effectiveness of the treatment. ([van Geen, 2007](#)) ([Bendix, 1997](#)) ([Bendix, 1998](#)) ([Bendix2, 1998](#)) ([Bendix, 2000](#)) ([Frost, 1998](#)) ([Harkapaa, 1990](#)) ([Skouen, 2002](#)) ([Mellin, 1990](#)) ([Haldorsen, 2002](#))

***Intensive multidisciplinary rehabilitation of chronic low back pain:*** The most recent Cochrane study was withdrawn from the Cochrane (3/06) as the last literature search was performed in 1998. Studies selected included a physical dimension treatment and at least one other treatment dimension (psychological, social, or occupational). Back schools were not included unless they included the above criteria. There was strong evidence that intensive multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation with functional restoration improved function when compared to inpatient or outpatient nonmultidisciplinary rehabilitation. Intensive (> 100 hours), daily interdisciplinary rehabilitation was moderately superior to noninterdisciplinary rehabilitation or usual care for short- and long-term functional status (standardized mean differences, -0.40 to -0.90 at 3 to 4 months, and -0.56 to -1.07 at 60 months). There was moderate evidence of pain reduction. There was contradictory evidence regarding vocational outcome. Less intensive programs did not show improvements in pain, function, or vocational outcomes. It was suggested that patients should not be referred to multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation without knowing the actual content of the program. ([Guzman, 2001](#)) ([Guzman-Cochrane, 2002](#)) ([van Geen, 2007](#)) ([Bendix, 1997](#)) ([Bendix, 1998](#)) ([Bendix2, 1998](#)) ([Bendix, 2000](#)) ([Frost, 1998](#)) ([Harkapaa, 1990](#)) ([Skouen, 2002](#)) ([Mellin, 1990](#)) ([Haldorsen, 2002](#))

***Multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation for subacute low back pain among working age adults:*** The programs described had to include a physical component plus either a psychological, social and/or vocational intervention. There was moderate evidence of positive effectiveness for multidisciplinary rehabilitation for subacute low back pain and that a workplace visit increases effectiveness. The trials included had methodological shortcomings, and further research was suggested. ([Karjalainen, 2003](#))

***Role of opioid use:*** See [Chronic pain programs, opioids](#).

***Role of comorbid psych illness:*** Comorbid conditions, including psychopathology, should be recognized as they can affect the course of chronic pain treatment. In a recent analysis, patients with panic disorder, antisocial personality disorder and dependent personality disorder were > 2 times more likely to not complete an interdisciplinary program. Personality disorders in particular appear to hamper the ability to successfully complete treatment. Patients diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder were 4.2 times more likely to have additional surgeries to the original site of injury. ([Dersh, 2007](#)) The prevalence of depression and anxiety in patients with chronic pain is similar. Cohort studies indicate that the added morbidity of

depression and anxiety with chronic pain is more strongly associated with severe pain and greater disability. ([Poleshuck, 2009](#)) ([Bair, 2008](#))

***Predictors of success and failure:*** As noted, one of the criticisms of interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary rehabilitation programs is the lack of an appropriate screening tool to help to determine who will most benefit from this treatment. Retrospective research has examined decreased rates of completion of functional restoration programs, and there is ongoing research to evaluate screening tools prior to entry. ([Gatchel, 2006](#)) There is need for research in terms of necessity and/or effectiveness of counseling for patients considered to be “at-risk” for post-discharge problems. ([Proctor, 2004](#)) The following variables have been found to be negative predictors of efficacy of treatment with the programs as well as negative predictors of completion of the programs: (1) a negative relationship with the employer/supervisor; (2) poor work adjustment and satisfaction; (3) a negative outlook about future employment; (4) high levels of psychosocial distress (higher pretreatment levels of depression, pain and disability); (5) involvement in financial disability disputes; (6) greater rates of smoking; (7) increased duration of pre-referral disability time; (8) higher prevalence of opioid use; and (9) elevated pre-treatment levels of pain. ([Linton, 2001](#)) ([Bendix, 1998](#)) ([McGeary, 2006](#)) ([McGeary, 2004](#)) ([Gatchel2, 2005](#)) ([Dersh, 2007](#))

***Role of duration of disability:*** There is little research as to the success of return to work with functional restoration programs in long-term disabled patients (> 24 months).

***Studies supporting programs for patients with long-term disability:*** Long-term disabled patients (at least 18 months) vs. short-term disabled (4 to 8 months) were evaluated using Pride data (1990-1993). No control was given for patients that did not undergo a program. During the time studied program dropouts averaged 8% to 12%. (It does appear that at the time of this study, participants in the program were detoxified from opioids prior to beginning.) The long-term disabled group was more likely to have undergone spinal surgery, with this likelihood increasing with time. Return to work was statistically different between the short-term disabled (93%) and the long-term disabled-18 months (80%). The long-term disabled-24 months group had a 75% return to work. Long-term disabled-18 month patients were statistically more likely to visit new health providers than short-term disabled patients (34% and 25% respectively). Work retention at one year in groups up to 24 months duration of disability was 80%. This dropped to 66% in the group that had been disabled for > 24 months. The percentage of recurrent lost time injury claims increased from around 1% in the groups disabled for < 35 months to 8.3% in the groups disabled for > 36 months. A main criterion for success appeared to be the decision of the patient to actively participate in the program rehabilitation goals. ([Jordan, 1998](#))

***Studies suggesting limited results in patients with long-term disability:*** While early studies have suggested that time out-of-work is a predictor of success for occupational outcomes, these studies have flaws when an attempt is made to apply them to chronic pain programs. ([Gallagher, 1989](#)) ([Beals, 1972](#)) ([Krause, 1994](#)) Washington State studied the role of duration of work injury on outcome using a statistical model that allowed for a comparison of patients that participated in a multidisciplinary pain program (using data from 1991-1993) vs. those that were evaluated and not treated. This was not an actual study of time of disability, but of duration of injury (mean years from injury to evaluation of 2.6 years for the treated group and 4.0 years for the evaluated only group). The original statistical analysis allowed for a patient to be included in a “treated group” for those individuals that both completed and did not complete the program. Data was collected from 10 sites. Each of the centers was CARF approved and included Psych/behavioral treatment, vocation counseling and physical therapy. A sub-study evaluated a comparison of patients that were treatment completers vs. those that did not participate (78.6%, N=963). No information was given in terms of surgical procedures or medications. The primary outcome was time loss status of subjects 2 years after they had undergone the index pain center evaluation. In the 2001 study, if chronicity of

duration of injury was controlled for, there was no significant benefit produced in terms of patients that were receiving time-loss benefits at 2-years post treatment between the two groups. Approximately 60% of both groups were not receiving benefits at the two-year period. As noted, the “treated patient” was only guaranteed to have started a program. A repeat analysis of only the patients who completed the study did not significantly change the results of the study. In a 2004 survey follow-up no significant difference was found between treated and untreated groups, although the treated group had better response. The survey response was 50%, and the treatment responders were more likely to be disabled at the time of the survey. The authors suggest that the results indicated early intervention was a key to response of the programs, and that modest goals (improvement, not cure) be introduced. ([Robinson, 2004](#)) ([Robinson, 2001](#)) [The authors also concluded that there was no evidence that pain center treatment affects either disability status or clinical status of injured workers.]

**Timing of use:** Intervention as early as 3 to 6 months post-injury may be recommended depending on identification of patients that may benefit from a multidisciplinary approach (from programs with documented positive outcomes). See [Chronic pain programs, early intervention](#).

**Role of post-treatment care (as an outcome):** Three variables are usually examined; (1) New surgery at the involved anatomic site or area; (2) Percentage of patients seeking care from a new provider; (3) Number of visits to the new provider over and above visits with the health-care professional overseeing treatment. It is suggested that a “new provider” is more likely to reorder diagnostic tests, provide invasive procedures, and start long-term analgesics. In a study to determine the relationship between post-treatment healthcare-seeking behaviors and poorer outcomes (using prospectively analyzed PRIDE data on patients with work-related musculoskeletal injuries), patients were compared that accessed healthcare with a new provider following functional restoration program completion (approximately 25%) to those that did not. The former group was significantly more likely to have an attorney involved with their case (22.7% vs. 17.1%, respectively), and to have had pre-rehabilitation surgery (20.7% vs. 12.1%, respectively). Return to work was higher in the group that did not access a new provider (90% vs. 77.6% in the group that did access). The group that did not access new providers also was more likely to be working at one year (88% vs. 62.2% in the group that accessed new providers). It should be noted that 18% of the patients that entered the program dropped out or were asked to leave. The authors suggested monitoring of additional access of healthcare over and above that suggested at the end of the program, with intervention if needed. ([Proctor, 2004](#))

See also [Chronic pain programs, intensity](#); [Chronic pain programs, opioids](#); [Functional restoration programs](#); & [Chronic pain programs, early intervention](#).

**Criteria for the general use of multidisciplinary pain management programs:**

Outpatient pain rehabilitation programs may be considered medically necessary in the following circumstances:

- (1) The patient has a chronic pain syndrome, with evidence of loss of function that persists beyond three months and has evidence of three or more of the following:
  - (a) Excessive dependence on health-care providers, spouse, or family;
  - (b) Secondary physical deconditioning due to disuse and/or fear-avoidance of physical activity due to pain;
  - (c) Withdrawal from social activities or normal contact with others, including work, recreation, or other social contacts;
  - (d) Failure to restore preinjury function after a period of disability such that the physical capacity is insufficient to pursue work, family, or recreational needs;
  - (e) Development of psychosocial sequelae that limits function or recovery after the initial incident, including anxiety, fear-avoidance, depression, sleep disorders, or nonorganic illness behaviors (with a reasonable probability to respond to treatment intervention);
  - (f)

The diagnosis is not primarily a personality disorder or psychological condition without a physical component; (g) There is evidence of continued use of prescription pain medications (particularly those that may result in tolerance, dependence or abuse) without evidence of improvement in pain or function.

(2) Previous methods of treating chronic pain have been unsuccessful and there is an absence of other options likely to result in significant clinical improvement.

(3) An adequate and thorough multidisciplinary evaluation has been made. This should include pertinent validated diagnostic testing that addresses the following: (a) A physical exam that rules out conditions that require treatment prior to initiating the program. All diagnostic procedures necessary to rule out treatable pathology, including imaging studies and invasive injections (used for diagnosis), should be completed prior to considering a patient a candidate for a program. The exception is diagnostic procedures that were repeatedly requested and not authorized. Although the primary emphasis is on the work-related injury, underlying non-work related pathology that contributes to pain and decreased function may need to be addressed and treated by a primary care physician prior to or coincident to starting treatment; (b) Evidence of a screening evaluation should be provided when addiction is present or strongly suspected; (c) Psychological testing using a validated instrument to identify pertinent areas that need to be addressed in the program (including but not limited to mood disorder, sleep disorder, relationship dysfunction, distorted beliefs about pain and disability, coping skills and/or locus of control regarding pain and medical care) or diagnoses that would better be addressed using other treatment should be performed; (d) An evaluation of social and vocational issues that require assessment.

(4) If a goal of treatment is to prevent or avoid controversial or optional surgery, a trial of 10 visits (80 hours) may be implemented to assess whether surgery may be avoided.

(5) If a primary reason for treatment in the program is addressing possible substance use issues, an evaluation with an addiction clinician may be indicated upon entering the program to establish the most appropriate treatment approach (pain program vs. substance dependence program). This must address evaluation of drug abuse or diversion (and prescribing drugs in a non-therapeutic manner). In this particular case, once drug abuse or diversion issues are addressed, a 10-day trial may help to establish a diagnosis, and determine if the patient is not better suited for treatment in a substance dependence program. Addiction consultation can be incorporated into a pain program. If there is indication that substance dependence may be a problem, there should be evidence that the program has the capability to address this type of pathology prior to approval.

(6) Once the evaluation is completed, a treatment plan should be presented with specifics for treatment of identified problems, and outcomes that will be followed.

(7) There should be documentation that the patient has motivation to change, and is willing to change their medication regimen (including decreasing or actually weaning substances known for dependence). There should also be some documentation that the patient is aware that successful treatment may change compensation and/or other secondary gains. In questionable cases, an opportunity for a brief treatment trial may improve assessment of patient motivation and/or willingness to decrease habituating medications.

(8) Negative predictors of success (as outlined above) should be identified, and if present, the pre-program goals should indicate how these will be addressed.

(9) If a program is planned for a patient that has been continuously disabled for greater than 24 months, the outcomes for the necessity of use should be clearly

identified, as there is conflicting evidence that chronic pain programs provide return-to-work beyond this period. These other desirable types of outcomes include decreasing post-treatment care including medications, injections and surgery.

(10) Treatment is not suggested for longer than 2 weeks without evidence of compliance and significant demonstrated efficacy as documented by subjective and objective gains. (Note: Patients may get worse before they get better. For example, objective gains may be moving joints that are stiff from lack of use, resulting in increased subjective pain.) However, it is also not suggested that a continuous course of treatment be interrupted at two weeks solely to document these gains, if there are preliminary indications that they are being made on a concurrent basis.

(11) Integrative summary reports that include treatment goals, compliance, progress assessment with objective measures and stage of treatment, must be made available upon request at least on a bi-weekly basis during the course of the treatment program.

(12) Total treatment duration should generally not exceed 20 full-day (160 hours) sessions (or the equivalent in part-day sessions if required by part-time work, transportation, childcare, or comorbidities). ([Sanders, 2005](#)) Treatment duration in excess of 160 hours requires a clear rationale for the specified extension and reasonable goals to be achieved. Longer durations require individualized care plans explaining why improvements cannot be achieved without an extension as well as evidence of documented improved outcomes from the facility (particularly in terms of the specific outcomes that are to be addressed).

(13) At the conclusion and subsequently, neither re-enrollment in repetition of the same or similar rehabilitation program (e.g. work hardening, work conditioning, outpatient medical rehabilitation) is medically warranted for the same condition or injury (with possible exception for a medically necessary organized detox program). Prior to entry into a program the evaluation should clearly indicate the necessity for the type of program required, and providers should determine upfront which program their patients would benefit more from. A chronic pain program should not be considered a "stepping stone" after less intensive programs, but prior participation in a work conditioning or work hardening program does not preclude an opportunity for entering a chronic pain program if otherwise indicated.

(14) Suggestions for treatment post-program should be well documented and provided to the referral physician. The patient may require time-limited, less intensive post-treatment with the program itself. Defined goals for these interventions and planned duration should be specified.

(15) Post-treatment medication management is particularly important. Patients that have been identified as having substance abuse issues generally require some sort of continued addiction follow-up to avoid relapse.

Inpatient pain rehabilitation programs: These programs typically consist of more intensive functional rehabilitation and medical care than their outpatient counterparts. They may be appropriate for patients who: (1) don't have the minimal functional capacity to participate effectively in an outpatient program; (2) have medical conditions that require more intensive oversight; (3) are receiving large amounts of medications necessitating medication weaning or detoxification; or (4) have complex medical or psychological diagnosis that benefit from more intensive observation and/or additional consultation during the rehabilitation process. ([Keel, 1998](#)) ([Kool, 2005](#)) ([Buchner, 2006](#)) ([Kool, 2007](#)) As with outpatient pain rehabilitation programs, the most effective programs combine intensive, daily biopsychosocial rehabilitation with a functional restoration approach. If a primary focus is drug treatment, the initial evaluation should attempt to identify the most appropriate treatment plan (a drug treatment /detoxification approach vs. a multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary treatment program).

**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)

**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 05/10/2010.