

Health Decisions, Inc.

4517 Coconino Court
Fort Worth, TX 76137
P 972-800-0641
F 888-349-9735

Notice of Independent Review Decision

July 7, 2014

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE:

Additional 30 Hours of Work Conditioning

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

American Board Certified Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation with over 16 years of experience

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:

03-05-14: FCE by FNP
03-05-14 to 04-01-14: Physical Therapy Notes
04-23-14: FCE
05-05-14: URA
05-07-14: Letter of Physical Therapy
05-20-14: URA

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

The claimant is a male has had low back pain since xx/xx/xx. The claimant has changes to S1 nerve and bulging disc. Conservative treatment that he has tried has been nerve stimulator, pain management, epidurals, PT and has received at least 30 hours of work conditioning previously. However, he still cannot work d/t limitations.

03-05-14: FCE. Limitations noted were primarily repeated tasks (sitting – 60min, standing – 80min, bending/stooping – $\frac{3}{4}$ ROM, occasional), static strength – grip R-118 lbs., L-125 lbs., push – 71 lbs. and pull 106 lbs., and manual material handling strength – 53 lbs. off floor, 78 lbs. 1 foot off floor and 80 lbs. carry. The primary limiting factor noted was the onset of weakness at the low back. Pain was not a significant limiting factor. Lumbar Inclination: Flexion – 80, extension – 25, R side bend – 25, L side bend – 25. The patient best qualifies for heavy work with modifications. The patient lacks strength from lifting off the floor and endurance for prolonged climbing and/or running.

03-05-14 to 04-01-14: Physical Therapy Notes. 03-05-14: The claimant reports an increase in strength and endurance at this time. Pain 3/10 and improved mobility and flexibility. 03-18-14: Claimant making slow but steady progress and rates pain 0-1/10. He continues to c/o pain, however, objective signs are improving. 04-01-14: The claimant states that he has an increase in strength, symptoms, improved function and endurance. He continues to lack full functional movement/AROM to perform all ADLs w/o limitations in mobility and strength.

04-23-14: FCE. The primary limiting factor was the onset of fatigue and muscle weakness. Lumbar Inclination: Flexion – 60, extension – 25, R side bend – 25, and L side bend – 25. The patient demonstrates improved stooping flexibility, increased walking speed and improved manual material handling strength. The claimant will benefit from additional work conditioning to continue to build muscle strength and endurance in order to be able to meet the physical demands of his job. I recommend an additional 30 hours of work conditioning.

05-05-14: URA. Rationale: At the present time, for the described medical situation, Official Disability Guidelines would not support this specific request to be one of medical necessity. The above noted reference supports up to 30 hours of a work conditioning program for the described medical situation. It is documented that 30 hours of a work conditioning program were previously provided. As a result, presently, medical necessity for this request is not established in this specific case, based upon the records currently available for review.

05-20-14: URA. Rationale: Diagnosis: Low back pain, post physical therapy, Epidural Steroid injections, spinal cord stimulator and 30 hours of work conditioning. Based on the medical records submitted for review on the above referenced claimant, 30 additional hours of WC is NON-AUTHORIZED. Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) recommends maximum 30 hours, 30 hours of WC has been approved. My opinion is based upon the medical records as described above. My opinions are within the realm of reasonable medical probability. I have made every attempt to provide a reasonable and fair opinion based upon the information available.

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

Denial of 30 additional hours of work conditioning is UPHeld/Agreed upon. The request exceeds ODG recommended number of hours of work conditioning, and clinically there is lack of information. There is report of completion of 30 hours of work conditioning, but there is lack of documentation regarding attendance or progress with treatment. There is serious doubt regarding the appropriate level of rehabilitation, and history of Pain Management, so far as to include, a spinal cord stimulator. There is no documentation regarding current medications, particularly opioid analgesics that may require weaning. There is no documentation regarding psychological barriers such as anxiety, depression, sleep disturbance, fear avoidance that often accompany chronicity in work related injuries. There is an obvious social/vocational barrier to recovery in a large gap between current lifting capabilities of 53 to 78 lb. versus return to VERY HEAVY job demands over 100 lb. These multiple barriers to recovery deem work conditioning as an inappropriate level of rehabilitation. Therefore, the request for 30 additional hours of work conditioning is deemed non-certified.

Per ODG:

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 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](#)). Exceptions to the 2-year post-injury cap may be made for patients with injuries that have required long-term medical care; i.e., extensive burns, diagnoses requiring multiple surgical procedures, or recent (within 6 months) completion of the last surgery, for patients who do not have the psychological barriers to return to work that would qualify them for a CPM program. ([L&I, 2013](#))

(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.

ODG Work Conditioning (WC) Physical Therapy Guidelines

WC amounts to an additional series of intensive physical therapy (PT) visits required beyond a normal course of PT, primarily for exercise training/supervision (and would be contraindicated if there are already significant psychosocial, drug or attitudinal barriers to recovery not addressed by these programs). See also [Physical therapy](#) for general PT guidelines. WC visits will typically be more intensive than regular PT visits, lasting 2 or 3 times as long. And, as with all physical therapy programs, Work Conditioning participation does not preclude concurrently being at work.

Timelines: 10 visits over 4 weeks, equivalent to up to 30 hours.

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
- 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)