SENT VIA EMAIL OR FAX ON
Apr/21/2010

True Decisions Inc.

An Independent Review Organization
835 E. Lamar Blvd. #394
Arlington, TX 76011
Phone: (214) 717-4260
Fax: (214) 594-8608
Email: rm@truedecisions.com

NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION

DATE OF REVIEW:
Apr/13/2010

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE:
Work Conditioning X 10 sessions, 8 hours a day

DESCRIPTION OF THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH PHYSICIAN OR OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER WHO REVIEWED THE DECISION:
Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Subspecialty Board Certified in Pain Management
Subspecialty Board Certified in Electrodiagnostic Medicine
Residency Training PMR and ORTHOPAEDIC SURGERY

REVIEW OUTCOME:

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

[X] Upheld (Agree)
[ ] Overturned (Disagree)
[ ] Partially Overturned (Agree in part/Disagree in part)

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW
OD Guidelines
Denial Letters 1/28/10 and 2/25/10
IRO Summary 4/6/10
Country 8/24/09 thru 11/19/09
Advantage 8/26/09
Dr. 10/17/2000 thru 10/6/09
MRIs 12/13/99 thru 10/2/09
FCE 10/3/2000 thru 9/16/09
6/21/00
OP Report 3/30/00
Dr. 6/14/01
Dr. 12/13/09
Dr. and 6/21/00
Dr. 9/22/00
PT Notes 120/19/2000 thru 11/1/2000
X-Rays 10/28/1999 thru 9/8/09

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY SUMMARY
This is a man injured in xx/xx. He had a history of a prior back injury. He underwent a fusion from L4 to S1 in 2000. He was found to be at MMI in 2001. He has ongoing back pain, but

worsening in 2009. An MRI in 2009 showed a solid fusion, congenital stenosis and post-op scars about the lumbar roots. He received ESIs. He had FCEs showing severe functional loss, but with some improvement. The examiner noted that he needed active physical therapy and this could include work hardening and conditioning. His self-perception on the Oswetry went from 64% (perceived crippling) to 52% (perceived severe disability). He had a psychological assessment by Mr. who advised work conditioning as treatment for his pain disorder.

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

This man is not at work and has no job to return to. While Work Hardening dominates the ODG description, it and work conditioning embrace the need for work. The program of work hardening addresses job demands. Work Conditioning is considered an intense therapy program. The IRO reviewer did not see that he had any recent therapies to get an idea how he will respond. He has an attitudinal barrier that he is crippled or disabled. That has not been addressed or resolved and remains a contraindication to the Work Conditioning program. Further, it can be performed in conjunction with work. Again, he is not at work. Therefore he does not meet the ODG criteria for work conditioning.

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

[X] MEDICAL JUDGEMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS

[ ] MERCY CENTER CONSENSUS CONFERENCE GUIDELINES

[ ] MILLIMAN CARE GUIDELINES

[X] 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)