



3250 W. Pleasant Run, Suite 125 Lancaster, TX 75146-1069
Ph 972-825-7231 Fax 972-274-9022

Notice of Independent Review Decision

DATE OF REVIEW: 1/5/2015

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE

The item in dispute is the prospective medical necessity of Work Hardening Program x 80 hours.

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

The reviewer is a Medical Doctor who is board certified in Chiropractic.

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)

The reviewer agrees with the previous adverse determination regarding the medical necessity of 80 hours of a Work Hardening Program.

A copy of the ODG was not provided by the Carrier/URA for this review.

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

This case involves a female who was injured at work when she slipped and fell backwards. She complains of injuries to the neck, left shoulder, bilateral wrists, lower back and left foot according to the examination. The note on 7/14/14 indicates the injured worker has anger

towards her manager and doesn't want to return to work. It further states that her main complaint is in the left shoulder with a lesser amount of pain in the lumbar spine without neurological components. She apparently accepted a return to work offer on 7/25/14 per the records provided. indicates that a stress fracture was found in the fourth metacarpal (this report is not available for review). She has had a behavioral analysis. One of the 11/7/14 preauthorization requests indicates that a possible fracture was detected in the left clavicle in the distal third; however, no follow-up was contained within the records. The notes of contact with the employer indicate the IW must lift 33 lbs. in carrying, lifting, pushing, and overhead reaching for approximately 5 hours per day. The Functional Capacity Evaluation of 11/7/14 indicates that another Functional Capacity Evaluation was performed on 9/11/14; however, it was not provided in the documentation. In the November Functional Capacity Evaluation, the IW declined several tests including Bruce's treadmill, waist to shoulder lifting, chest to overhead lifting, repetitive pegboard test, and functional specific testing. Grip strength testing indicated she had bilateral weakness when compared to norms. The request Work Hardening program was denied by the carrier due to a lack of objective findings. The reconsideration denial indicates that it was not medically necessary due to the lack of psychological issues, no evidence of plateau, and no attempt at modified duty.

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

It is my opinion that this injured worker hasn't met the requirements for a work hardening program. She specifically doesn't meet criteria 3, 4, 5, and 8. Grip strength testing was noted to be reduced; however, rapid exchange grip testing wasn't performed to verify the findings. Secondly, the Functional Capacity Evaluation examiner indicated that the IW wouldn't attempt to perform many of the tests. However, reviewing the IW's heart rate and pain scale rating during the examination, there wasn't an objective increase in either measurement that would correlate with increased pain. There was an increase in pain scale to an 8/10 with stooping due to left shoulder pain, and 7/10 with squatting due to lumbar pain after 1 repetition. The subjective complaints do not match objective findings (increased HR/pain level) that are usually associated with patients in severe pain. The Range Of Motion testing of the left shoulder and lumbar spine are unusual as each repetition is exactly the same as the next repetition. This is statistically unlikely. Based upon these findings, the requested service is not medically necessary.

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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

(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). (This criterion is not met. The objective findings do not match the subjective symptoms.)

(4) *Functional capacity evaluations (FCEs)*: A valid Functional Capacity Evaluation 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 criterion is not met as some of the findings are not consistent with physiological responses of a patient in pain while providing maximal effort.)

(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. (This criterion is not met as there hasn't been evidence of plateau.)

(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). (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is not met as notes indicate she is openly hostile about her manager and returning to work.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

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

(17) *Vocational 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. (This criterion is met.)

(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 of 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). (This criterion is met.)

(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 a 4 week period, 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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

(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. (This criterion is met.)

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
- AHCP- 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)