



IMED, INC.

11625 Custer Road • Suite 110-343 • Frisco, Texas 75035
Office 972-381-9282 • Toll Free 1-877-333-7374 • Fax 972-250-4584
e-mail: imeddallas@msn.com

Notice of Independent Review Decision

DATE OF REVIEW: 02/16/11

IRO CASE NO.:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE:

Item in dispute: UNLISTED PHYSICAL MEDICINE/REHABILITATION SERVICE OR PROCEDURE

DATES OF SERVICE FROM 12/14/2010 TO 12/28/2010

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

Texas Licensed Psychologist

REVIEW OUTCOME

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

Denial Upheld

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY (SUMMARY):

The employee is a xx year old male. The employee was carrying material when one of the objects slipped off the employee's hand, and when he tried to catch the object he felt a sudden sharp pain in his lower back.

A peer review dated 08/03/09 indicated that treatment to date included physical therapy, medication management, diagnostic testing, lumbar epidural steroid injections, and lumbar fusion in 2000 followed by second lumbar surgery in 2001 for hardware removal. The extent of the employee's compensable injury was listed as cervical sprain/strain, lumbar sprain/strain, lumbar radiculopathy, and failed back surgery syndrome.

Physical performance evaluation dated 09/21/10 indicated that the employee's current physical demand level was light and required PDL was very heavy.

Request for services dated 12/10/10 indicated that the employee underwent a course of individual psychotherapy and had been recommended for chronic pain management

program. The employee was noted to make minimal progress in IPT due in large part to poor coping skills, anxiety, depression and pain complaints. BDI was 39 and BAI was 19.

The initial request for ten sessions of chronic pain management program was non-certified on 12/16/10, noting that clinic was not known to be a high-quality multidisciplinary rehabilitation pain program with known positive functional outcomes as recommended by the **Official Disability Guidelines** or to be CARF accredited. There was no evidence that this program was medically supervised or had a Medical Director or a Pain Psychologist as recommended by CARF. Evidence was not submitted that the claimant has been evaluated psychologically by a clinical psychologist with high quality validated psychological instruments such as the MMPI-2-RF. To date, only screening inventories and symptom inventories with poor psychometric qualities, low specificity and low sensitivity for this population had been administered. Psychological testing providing a differential diagnosis for somatoform disorder, symptom magnification and other differential diagnoses had not been completed. A medical treatment program for decreasing the employee's utilization of daily oral narcotics was not documented. The employee was injured approximately years ago and return to work as a goal was not discussed.

Request for reconsideration dated 12/23/10 indicated that the employee had exhausted all lower levels of care and was pending no additional procedures.

The request was again non-certified on appeal on 12/29/10. Dr. noted that the psychological evaluation was limited in assessing the employee's psychological condition. Only BAI and BDI testing was performed and these are of questionable validity. No valid psychological testing was performed. The employee's date of injury is concerning as it is approximately years old, and this continued state of disability would indicate a possible poor outcome with a chronic pain management program that was not adequately addressed in the clinical notes provided for review.

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

Based on the clinical information provided, the request for unlisted medicine/rehab services 12/14/10-12/28/10 is not recommended as medically necessary. The employee's injury is approximately years old and this continued state of disability would indicate a poor prognosis for significant and sustainable outcomes with a chronic pain management program. The requestor did not adequately address this issue in the clinical notes provided for review. Given the current clinical data, the request is not indicated as medically necessary.

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

***Official Disability Guidelines* Pain Chapter**

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. This cautionary statement should not preclude patients off work for over two years from being admitted to a multidisciplinary pain management program with demonstrated positive outcomes in this population.

(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, out-patient 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). See [Chronic pain programs, opioids](#); [Functional restoration programs](#).