

## IRO REVIEWER REPORT TEMPLATE -WC

---

Independent Reviewers of Texas  
4100 West Eldorado Pkwy #100-373  
McKinney TX 75070  
[independentreviewers@hotmail.com](mailto:independentreviewers@hotmail.com)  
Phone: 469-218-1010  
Fax#: 469-374-5862

Notice of Independent Review Decision

**[Date notice sent to all parties]:**

**08/19/2013**

**IRO CASE #:**

**DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE:** Work conditioning program x 80 hours/units-Lumbar 97545 97645

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

**REVIEW OUTCOME:**

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

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:**

1. Medical report dated 06/22/13
2. Work conditioning plan dated 06/24/13
3. Report of work duties, unknown author, dated 06 (Forsyth 13
4. Report dated 06/25/13
5. FCE report dated 6/24/13
6. Preauthorization request dated 06/27/13

**PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:**

Report was dated June 20, 2013. The report references work conditioning program. The patient was described as a female with low back injury on xx/xx/xx. The mechanism of injury was a lifting and tripping incident. The report summarizes prior treatment including x-ray,

physical therapy, and medication with continued symptoms. History is significant for bipolar disorder and post traumatic stress disorder. Examination findings were brief noting limitation of motion and neurologically intact. opined that she was a good candidate for a work conditioning program.

The record includes a handwritten job description dated June 24, 2013. There was, however, no reference regarding sources the aforementioned

The record includes a report dated June 25, 2013. The complaint was continued low back pain. After completing a brief evaluation, the provider recommended a work conditioning program. Functional capacity evaluation of the same date revealed the patient was functioning with light physical capabilities. Return to work requirements were described as medium.

There was no documentation of absence of modified duty availability or a physical demands analysis from the employer.

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

The submitted documentation was insufficient to establish medical necessity for the requested work conditioning program. ODG has provision for return work programs for appropriately selected patients. However, guidelines state that the best way to get a motor back to work is with a modified duty return to work program. However, when the lawyer not provide this, a work program specific to the job goal may be helpful. The evidence for real work is reportedly stronger than the evidence for similar work. The submitted documentation was missing evidence that modified duty is unavailable. Moreover, there was no documentation from the employer regarding critical task required for return work. Finally, request is for 80 hours of work conditioning. Guidelines have provision for up to 30 hours over 4 weeks for appropriately selected patients. As such, request is inconsistent with evidence – based recommendations.

## IRO REVIEWER REPORT TEMPLATE -WC

---

## IRO REVIEWER REPORT TEMPLATE -WC

---

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

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

ODG, low back chapter, online version

Criteria for admission to a Work Hardening (WH) Program:

(1) Prescription: The program has been recommended by a physician or nurse case manager, and a prescription has been provided.

(2) Screening Documentation: 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.

(3) Job demands: A work-related musculoskeletal deficit has been identified with 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

## **IRO REVIEWER REPORT TEMPLATE -WC**

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.