

**ReviewTex. Inc.**  
1818 Mountjoy Drive  
San Antonio, TX 78232  
(phone) 210-598-9381 (fax) 210-598-9382  
reviewtex@hotmail.com

**Notice of Independent Review Decision**

**Date:** 8/13/2012

**IRO CASE #:**

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

80 hours of chronic pain management program

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

Board Certified Family Practice

**REVIEW OUTCOME:**

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

X Upheld (Agree)

Provide a description of the review outcome that clearly states whether medical necessity exists for each of the health care services in dispute.

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

Clinical note Dr. 05/23/11

MRI left elbow 06/01/11

Clinical records DC 06/07/11-06/21/12

Clinical records Dr. 06/27/11-01/16/12

Utilization review determination 08/28/11

Functional capacity evaluation 11/30/11

Utilization review determination 01/06/12

Functional capacity evaluation 01/13/12

Clinical records Dr. 02/13/12-07/24/12

Functional capacity evaluation 03/01/12

Behavioral evaluation report 03/01/12

Functional capacity evaluation 03/12/12

Functional capacity evaluation 04/11/12

Utilization review determination 04/20/12

Work hardening discharge report 05/21/12

Work capacity evaluation 05/31/12

Behavioral evaluation report 05/31/12  
Impairment evaluation 07/06/12  
Utilization review determination 06/12/12  
Utilization review determination 07/12/12

**PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:**

The claimant is a male who's reported to have sustained an injury to his left upper extremity on xx/xx/xx. On this date he was reported to be lifting a swimming pool when he felt and heard something pop in his left arm. The claimant was seen by Dr. on the date of injury. The claimant was noted to be unable to flex the left arm and the elbow joint secondary to pain. He has palpable dimple approximately three inches proximal to the elbow over the biceps muscle groove. The claimant was subsequently provided oral medications placed in an arm sling and was referred for orthopedics.

On 06/01/11 an MRI of the left elbow was performed this study notes a complete disruption of the biceps tendon from its attachment in the radius. Retraction of the tendon is seen approximately 4.5cm. Records indicate that the claimant subsequently sought care from DC on 06/07/11 he was subsequently then referred to Dr..

On 06/27/11, the claimant was evaluated by Dr.. It is reported that the claimant is five weeks status post injury to the left biceps as a result of lifting a heavy box. On physical examination he's noted to be tender over the distal biceps tendon has reduced range of motion he was subsequently referred or recommended to undergo surgical intervention.

The claimant was ultimately taken to surgery on 07/12/11 at which time Dr. performed reinsertion of the left distal biceps with tendon allograft with debridement of tendon. Post-operatively the claimant was referred for physical therapy the claimant was noted to have made slow progress.

On 09/19/11, the claimant was seen in follow up by Dr. he's reported to have improvement be improving but still has weak strength he has excellent range of motion he was allowed to perform sedentary level activities. Records indicate a functional capacity evaluation was performed on 11/30/11. It was noted that the claimant requires a heavy physical demand level and he is currently performing at a light physical demand level. Records indicate that the claimant underwent additional functional capacity evaluations on 03/01/12. The claimant was noted to be at a light physical demand level. The claimant was further seen by Dr. and was referred for behavioral evaluation for participation in a work hardening program. Records indicate the claimant was ultimately approved and began a work hardening program on 03/26/12. He subsequently plateaued in the program a functional capacity evaluation prior to this reports that the claimant was at a light medium physical demand level

The claimant was subsequently recommended to participate in a chronic pain management program. The initial review of this request was performed on 06/12/12. At this time Dr. PhD non-certified the request she notes that the claimant most recently underwent 169 hours of a work hardening program the claimant continues to take the medications Lortab, Celebrex and Zoloft and is not working. She notes that the discharge notes from the work hardening program state that the claimant could not safely continue in the program. She subsequently non-certified the request.

The appeal request was reviewed by Dr. on 07/12/12. He notes that the claimant participated in 169 hours of work hardening and that the claimant was making good progress until the closing visits of therapy and backslid significantly thereafter. He notes that if there was true psychopathology involved it should have been identified early in the work hardening program and a referral for a chronic pain management program at that time.

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

The request for 80 hours of chronic pain management program is not supported by the submitted clinical information and the prior utilization review determinations have been upheld. The submitted records indicate that the claimant is status post a biceps repair. Post-operatively the claimant had slow recovery in physical therapy and was ultimately referred to a work hardening program. The claimant subsequently participated in a work hardening program and advanced from a light physical demand level to a light medium physical demand level. It is noted in the work hardening discharge report; that the claimant could not safely continue in a work hardening program until his complication has been addressed. However this is not expounded upon. There's no data regarding whether or not this represents mechanical issue with the upper extremity or a psychological issue. Given that the claimant has failed to progress and is reported to potentially have mechanical issues with the extremity he would not be a candidate for participation in a chronic pain management program per the Official Disability Guidelines

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

**x MEDICAL JUDGEMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE, AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS**

**x ODG- OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT GUIDELINES**

**The 2012 Official Disability Guidelines, 17th edition, The Work Loss Data Institute. Online edition.**

**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](#).