

Parker Healthcare Management Organization, Inc.

3719 N. Beltline Rd Irving, TX 75038
972.906.0603 972.255.9712 (fax)

Notice of Independent Review Decision

DATE OF REVIEW: APRIL 4, 2013

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE

Medical necessity of proposed 80 hours of Work Hardening program for the right leg

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

This case was reviewed by a chiropractor licensed by the Texas State Board of Chiropractic Examiners. The reviewer specializes in chiropractic care and is engaged in a full time practice.

REVIEW OUTCOME

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

- Upheld (Agree)
- Overturned (Disagree)
- Partially Overturned (Agree in part/Disagree in part)

Primary Diagnosis	Service being Denied	Billing Modifier	Type of Review	Units	Date(s) of Service	Amount Billed	Date of Injury	DWC Claim#	IRO Decision
844.9	97545		Prosp	80			Xx/xx/xx	T101100177151	Upheld
844.9	97546		Prosp	80			Xx/xx/xx	T101100177151	Upheld

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW

TDI-HWCN-Request for an IRO-26 pages

Respondent records- a total of 232 pages of records received to include but not limited to: letters 3.13.13-3.18.13; request for an IRO forms; letters 1.22.12-3.12.13; Pre Authorization forms 2.12.13-3.12.13; email dated 2.15.13-3.13.13; records 12.18.12-3.15.13; records 1.21.13; 12.28.12; MRI Lumbar Spine 10.31.12, NCV/EMG report 12.28.12, necessity for NCV/EMG; records, 11.2.12-2.4.13; report , 2.20.13; Pre-authorization Peer Review 3.12.13; Peer Review 1.21.13

Requestor records- a total of 78 pages of records received to include but not limited to: 2.12.13-3.5.13; letters 12.12.12-3.12.13; Notice of IRO assignment; Job description; FCE report 2.8.13; Work Hardening Health and Physical

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

This patient was injured on xx/xx/xx. The mechanism of injury is described as getting out of the bus and being run over by a car. She reportedly was taken to the Emergency Department, where x rays were taken. She was discharged to home care only. She apparently continued to have ongoing complaints of back pain, and did return to the ED on 5/30/2012. She reportedly has epidural steroid injections on 6/06/12, 6/14/12, and on 7/16/12. Reportedly, she has not had any physical therapy or rehabilitation. A work hardening program was requested and denied twice in preauthorization.

ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION INCLUDE CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT THE DECISION. IF THERE WAS ANY DIVERGENCE FROM DWC'S POLICIES/GUIDELINES OR THE NETWORK'S TREATMENT GUIDELINES, THEN INDICATE BELOW WITH EXPLANATION.

This patient does not meet several of the entry criteria as specified by the Official Disability Guidelines. Specifically, (2) **"Screening should include adequate testing to determine if the patient has attitudinal and/or behavioral issues that are appropriately addressed in a multidisciplinary work hardening program. The testing should also be intensive enough to provide evidence that there are no psychosocial or significant pain behaviors that should be addressed in other types of programs, or will likely prevent successful participation and return-to-employment after completion of a work hardening program."**

The testing indicates that this patient has significant anxiety, depression, and fear and avoidance issues, bringing into doubt the whether or not the patient will be successful in returning to work at the completion of this program. in an undated letter, "notes that the patients signs and symptoms do not seem to correspond the lumbar MRI findings." He recommends narcotic tapering and a chronic pain program. He also recommends a work hardening program. There is no individualized plan for narcotics tapering outlined or presented.

Criteria (4) ***Functional capacity evaluations (FCEs): A valid FCE should be performed, administered and interpreted by a licensed medical professional. The results should indicate consistency with maximal effort, and demonstrate capacities below an employer verified physical demands analysis (PDA). Inconsistencies and/or indication that the patient has performed below maximal effort should be addressed prior to treatment in these programs.***

This patient was documented in the recent Functional Capacity Evaluation as having refused to perform most of the lifting, carrying, and aerobic tasks, for fear of reinjury. Failing to accomplish basic baseline testing does not indicate an adequate effort on the injured employee's part, and is not congruent with ODG criteria noted above. It is also unclear why there is a significant decrease in dominant right hand grip strength versus the left. No explanation for this variation from expected norms was reported.

Criteria (9) ***"RTW plan: A specific defined return-to-work goal or job plan has been established, communicated and documented. The ideal situation is that there is a plan agreed to by the employer and employee. "***

Although the patient's job description has been provided, it is not explicit that she is eligible for rehire.

Criteria(18) ***Post-injury cap: The worker must be no more than 2 years past date of injury. Workers that have not returned to work by two-years post injury generally do not improve from intensive work hardening programs. If the worker is greater than one-year post injury a comprehensive multidisciplinary program may be warranted if there is clinical***

suggestion of psychological barrier to recovery (but these more complex programs may also be justified as early as 8-12 weeks, see [Chronic pain programs](#)).

This patient is at the end of the two year window outlined by the ODG. This criteria alone is not the basis for upholding the denial for these services, but taken as a whole, this patient's extremely poor performance on functional testing, along with the psychological barriers that have been explicitly documented, do provide a preponderance of evidence that the Work Hardening program is highly likely to be unsuccessful at returning the injured worker back to work.

ODG-OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT GUIDELINES, Knee and Leg, version 3/13/13:

<p>Work conditioning, work hardening</p>	<p>Recommended as an option, depending on the availability of quality programs, and should be specific for the job individual is going to return to. (Schonstein-Cochrane, 2003) There is limited literature support for multidisciplinary treatment and work hardening for the neck, hip, knee, shoulder and forearm. (Karjalainen, 2003) Work Conditioning should restore the client's physical capacity and function. Work Hardening should be work simulation and not just therapeutic exercise, plus there should also be psychological support. Work Hardening is an interdisciplinary, individualized, job specific program of activity with the goal of return to work. Work Hardening programs use real or simulated work tasks and progressively graded conditioning exercises that are based on the individual's measured tolerances. (CARF, 2006) (Washington, 2006) The need for work hardening is less clear for workers in sedentary or light demand work, since on the job conditioning could be equally effective, and an examination should demonstrate a gap between the current level of functional capacity and an achievable level of required job demands. As with all intensive rehab programs, measurable functional improvement should occur after initial use of WH. It is not recommended that patients go from work conditioning to work hardening to chronic pain programs, repeating many of the same treatments without clear evidence of benefit. (Schonstein-Cochrane, 2008) For more information and references, see the Low Back Chapter. The Low Back WH & WC Criteria are copied below.</p> <p>Criteria for admission to a Work Hardening (WH) Program:</p> <p>(1) <i>Prescription:</i> The program has been recommended by a physician or nurse case manager, and a prescription has been provided.</p> <p>(2) <i>Screening Documentation:</i> Approval of the program should include evidence of a screening evaluation. This multidisciplinary examination should include the following components: (a) History including demographic information, date and description of injury, history of previous injury, diagnosis/diagnoses, work status before the injury, work status after the injury, history of treatment for the injury (including medications), history of previous injury, current employability, future employability, and time off work; (b) Review of systems including other non work-related medical conditions; (c) Documentation of musculoskeletal, cardiovascular, vocational, motivational, behavioral, and cognitive status by a physician, chiropractor, or physical and/or occupational therapist (and/or assistants); (d) Diagnostic interview with a mental health provider; (e) Determination of safety issues and accommodation at the place of work injury. Screening should include adequate testing to determine if the patient has attitudinal and/or behavioral issues that are appropriately addressed in a multidisciplinary work hardening program. The testing should also be intensive enough to provide evidence that there are no psychosocial or significant pain behaviors that should be addressed in other types of programs, or will likely prevent successful participation and return-to-employment after completion of a work hardening program. Development of the patient's program should reflect this assessment.</p> <p>(3) <i>Job demands:</i> A work-related musculoskeletal deficit has been identified with</p>
--	--

the addition of evidence of physical, functional, behavioral, and/or vocational deficits that preclude ability to safely achieve current job demands. These job demands are generally reported in the medium or higher demand level (i.e., not clerical/sedentary work). There should generally be evidence of a valid mismatch between documented, specific essential job tasks and the patient's ability to perform these required tasks (as limited by the work injury and associated deficits).

(4) *Functional capacity evaluations (FCEs)*: A valid FCE should be performed, administered and interpreted by a licensed medical professional. The results should indicate consistency with maximal effort, and demonstrate capacities below an employer verified physical demands analysis (PDA). Inconsistencies and/or indication that the patient has performed below maximal effort should be addressed prior to treatment in these programs.

(5) *Previous PT*: There is evidence of treatment with an adequate trial of active physical rehabilitation with improvement followed by plateau, with evidence of no likely benefit from continuation of this previous treatment. Passive physical medicine modalities are not indicated for use in any of these approaches.

(6) *Rule out surgery*: The patient is not a candidate for whom surgery, injections, or other treatments would clearly be warranted to improve function (including further diagnostic evaluation in anticipation of surgery).

(7) *Healing*: Physical and medical recovery sufficient to allow for progressive reactivation and participation for a minimum of 4 hours a day for three to five days a week.

(8) *Other contraindications*: There is no evidence of other medical, behavioral, or other comorbid conditions (including those that are non work-related) that prohibits participation in the program or contradicts successful return-to-work upon program completion.

(9) *RTW plan*: A specific defined return-to-work goal or job plan has been established, communicated and documented. The ideal situation is that there is a plan agreed to by the employer and employee. The work goal to which the employee should return must have demands that exceed the claimant's current validated abilities.

(10) *Drug problems*: There should be documentation that the claimant's medication regimen will not prohibit them from returning to work (either at their previous job or new employment). If this is the case, other treatment options may be required, for example a program focused on detoxification.

(11) *Program documentation*: The assessment and resultant treatment should be documented and be available to the employer, insurer, and other providers. There should be documentation of the proposed benefit from the program (including functional, vocational, and psychological improvements) and the plans to undertake this improvement. The assessment should indicate that the program providers are familiar with the expectations of the planned job, including skills necessary. Evidence of this may include site visitation, videotapes or functional job descriptions.

(12) *Further mental health evaluation*: Based on the initial screening, further evaluation by a mental health professional may be recommended. The results of this evaluation may suggest that treatment options other than these approaches may be required, and all screening evaluation information should be documented prior to further treatment planning.

(13) *Supervision*: Supervision is recommended under a physician, chiropractor, occupational therapist, or physical therapist with the appropriate education, training and experience. This clinician should provide on-site supervision of daily activities, and participate in the initial and final evaluations. They should design the treatment plan and be in charge of changes required. They are also in charge of direction of the staff.

(14) *Trial*: Treatment is not supported for longer than 1-2 weeks without evidence of patient compliance and demonstrated significant gains as documented by subjective and objective improvement in functional abilities. Outcomes should be presented that reflect the goals proposed upon entry, including those specifically

addressing deficits identified in the screening procedure. A summary of the patient's physical and functional activities performed in the program should be included as an assessment of progress.

(15) *Concurrently working*: The patient who has been released to work with specific restrictions may participate in the program while concurrently working in a restricted capacity, but the total number of daily hours should not exceed 8 per day while in treatment.

(16) *Conferences*: There should be evidence of routine staff conferencing regarding progress and plans for discharge. Daily treatment activity and response should be documented.

(17) *Voc rehab*: Vocational consultation should be available if this is indicated as a significant barrier. This would be required if the patient has no job to return to.

(18) *Post-injury cap*: The worker must be no more than 2 years past date of injury. Workers that have not returned to work by two-years post injury generally do not improve from intensive work hardening programs. If the worker is greater than one-year post injury a comprehensive multidisciplinary program may be warranted if there is clinical suggestion of psychological barrier to recovery (but these more complex programs may also be justified as early as 8-12 weeks, see [Chronic pain programs](#)).

(19) *Program timelines*: These approaches are highly variable in intensity, frequency and duration. APTA, AOTA and utilization guidelines for individual jurisdictions may be inconsistent. In general, the recommendations for use of such programs will fall within the following ranges: These approaches are necessarily intensive with highly variable treatment days ranging from 4-8 hours with treatment ranging from 3-5 visits per week. The entirety of this treatment should not exceed 20 full-day visits over 4 weeks, or no more than 160 hours (allowing for part-day sessions if required by part-time work, etc., over a longer number of weeks). A reassessment after 1-2 weeks should be made to determine whether completion of the chosen approach is appropriate, or whether treatment of greater intensity is required.

(20) *Discharge documentation*: At the time of discharge the referral source and other predetermined entities should be notified. This may include the employer and the insurer. There should be evidence documented of the clinical and functional status, recommendations for return to work, and recommendations for follow-up services. Patient attendance and progress should be documented including the reason(s) for termination including successful program completion or failure. This would include noncompliance, declining further services, or limited potential to benefit. There should also be documentation if the patient is unable to participate due to underlying medical conditions including substance dependence.

(21) *Repetition*: Upon completion of a rehabilitation program (e.g., work conditioning, work hardening, outpatient medical rehabilitation, or chronic pain/functional restoration program) neither re-enrollment in nor repetition of the same or similar rehabilitation program is medically warranted for the same condition or injury.

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
- XX DWC- DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION POLICIES OR GUIDELINES
- EUROPEAN GUIDELINES FOR MANAGEMENT OF CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN
- INTERQUAL CRITERIA
- XX MEDICAL JUDGEMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS
- MERCY CENTER CONSENSUS CONFERENCE GUIDELINES
- MILLIMAN CARE GUIDELINES
- XX 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)