



Medwork Independent Review

5840 Arndt Rd., Ste #2
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701-9729
1-800-426-1551 | 715-552-0746
Fax: 715-552-0748
Independent.Review@medworkiro.com
www.medwork.org



NOTICE OF MEDWORK INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION WORKERS' COMPENSATION - WC

DATE OF REVIEW: 8/30/2013

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE

Repeat Diagnostic Interview (1 hour) and Psychological Testing (3 hours)

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

Texas State Licensed Psychologist.

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)

Provide a description of the review outcome that clearly states whether or not medical necessity exists for each of the health care services in dispute.

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW

1. Dept of Insurance Assignment to Medwork 8/13/2013,
2. Notice of assignment to URA 8/8/2013,
3. Confirmation of Receipt of a Request for a Review by an IRO 8/13/2013
4. Company Request for IRO Sections 1-4 undated
5. Request For a Review by an IRO patient request 8/12/2013

Letter to IRO from attorney office 8/16/2013, letter to Department of Insurance from attorney office 8/12/2013, letter requesting repeat psychiatric diagnostic interview 7/31/2013, 7/2/2013, behavioral health preauthorization request 7/2/2013, letter from physician referring patient for a formal psychological evaluation 6/24/2013, psychological testing and assessment report 9/11/2012, initial behavioral medicine consultation 8/14/2012, patient face sheet, peer review 6/20/2012.

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY:

The patient is a female who complains of left arm and left shoulder pain. The patient reportedly sustained an injury on xx/xx/xx. She experienced pain in her left arm and left shoulder. She has had diagnostics, physical therapy, surgery on 4/24/12, and medications for her injury. Apparently, she recently completed a chronic pain management program although no records



Medwork Independent Review

5840 Arndt Rd., Ste #2
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701-9729
1-800-426-1551 | 715-552-0746
Fax: 715-552-0748
Independent.Review@medworkiro.com
www.medwork.org



from that program are submitted for review. A Psychological Testing and Assessment Report dated 9/11/12 is submitted and recommends she participate in individual psychotherapy and an Initial Behavioral Medicine Consultation dated 8/14/12 recommends she participate in a Work Hardening program. A letter from her physician dated 6/24/13 notes that he has been treating the patient since 2/24/12 and she has struggled with depression and anxiety since then. He stated that he is referring the patient “for a formal psychological evaluation with testing so as treating doctor I may objectively determine their current level of psychological functioning so that any additional treatment planning or future care may be outlined.” He notes the ODG Guidelines state that a patient who falls into an “at risk for delayed recovery” category “should be considered for behavioral intervention, which may only be accurately assessed through a formal psychological evaluation with objective psychometric testing.” The tests requested include the MMPI2-RF and BHI 2. The reconsideration request notes that the evaluation is “for the specific purpose of establishing a psychiatric/psychological Impairment Rating.” This is different than what is noted in the letter from the physician.

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

The information submitted is largely from 2012 with the exception of an appeal letter and a note from the physician both from 2013. There is little information to account for the time since the last psychological evaluation to the present time. Previous reports recommended individual psychotherapy and Work Hardening but it is noted in a previous denial that it was stated the patient just completed a CPP program. There would need to be clear information about what treatment and interventions the patient has had since the injury. If she has completed a chronic pain management program she would be known to the requester and should not require a repeat evaluation. Either way, the note from her physician who referred her for the evaluation notes that it is to assist in treatment planning and to determine her current level of functioning. There is insufficient rationale to establish necessity for a repeat diagnostic interview and psychological testing, per ODG guidelines.

The denial of these services is upheld.

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
- DWC- DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION POLICIES OR GUIDELINES
- EUROPEAN GUIDELINES FOR MANAGEMENT OF CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN
- INTERQUAL CRITERIA



Medwork Independent Review

5840 Arndt Rd., Ste #2
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701-9729
1-800-426-1551 | 715-552-0746
Fax: 715-552-0748
Independent.Review@medworkiro.com
www.medwork.org



- MEDICAL JUDGEMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS**
- MERCY CENTER CONSENSUS CONFERENCE GUIDELINES**
- MILLIMAN CARE GUIDELINES**
- 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)**

REFERENCES:

1. Sanders SH, Harden RN, Vicente PJ. Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines for Interdisciplinary Rehabilitation of Chronic Nonmalignant Pain Syndrome Patients. World Institute of Pain, *Pain Practice*, Volume 5, Issue 4, 2005 303–315.
2. Doleys DM, Dinoff BL. Psychological aspects of interventional therapy. *Anesthesiol Clin North America*. 2003 Dec;21(4):767-83.
3. Main CJ, Williams AC, Clinical review ABC of psychological medicine Musculoskeletal pain, *BMJ* 2002;325:534-537
4. Gatchel R., Polatin P. and Kinney R. Predicting Outcome of Chronic Back Pain Using Clinical Predictors of Psychopathology: A Prospective Analysis. *Health Psychology* 1995;14 (5);415-20.
5. Gatchel RJ; Gardea MA. Psychosocial issues: their importance in predicting disability, response to treatment, and search for compensation. *Neurologic Clinics*. 01-Feb-1999; 17(1): 149-66
6. Gatchel RJ. Psychosocial factors that can influence the self-assessment of function. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2004 Sep;14(3):197-206.
7. Gatchel RJ, Mayer TG, Kidner CL, McGearry DD. Are gender, marital status or parenthood risk factors for outcome of treatment for chronic disabling spinal disorders? *J Occup Rehabil*. 2005 Jun; 15(2):191-201.