Becket Systems

An Independent Review Organization 815-A Brazos St #499 Austin, TX 78701 Phone: (512) 553-0360 Fax: (512) 366-9749

Email: manager@becketsystems.com

November 5, 2018

Description of the service or services in dispute: XX

Description of the qualifications for each physician or other health care provider who reviewed the decision:

Board Certified in Pain Management

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

\sqcup	Overturned (Disagree)
\checkmark	Upheld (Agree)
	Partially Overturned (Agree in part / Disagree in part)

Patient Clinical History (Summary)

XXXX who sustained a work-related injury on XXXX. The injury resulted from a XXXX. The activity involved XX that occurred at work. XXXX was diagnosed with XX, XX.

On XXXX for a follow-up of XX pain, medication management, and continuation of care. The symptoms were located in the entire XX and included XX pain, XX XX, XX spasm, XX XX of XX and XX pain. The pain radiated to the XX XX, XX XX, XX XX, and XX XX. It was described as XX and XX with gradual onset. The episodes occurred XX. XXXX described the symptoms as XX in severity and unchanged, rated at XX/10. The symptoms were exacerbated by turning the XX to the XX and to the XX. The relieving factors included heat. The associated symptoms included a XX and XX extremity XX (XX XX, with XX and XX in the XX XX). XXXX was not being treated for this problem at the time. By report, there was poor compliance with treatment. XXXX was unable to work or do XX at the time. On XX XX examination, there was moderate tenderness of the XX XX muscles. Trigger points were noted at the XX XX and XX XX. The range of motion was decreased in flexion and XX XX flexion, due to pain.

The treatment to date included medications (XXXX) with XX improvement, XX therapy (XX), and XX XX in XXXX.

Per a utilization review decision letter dated XXXX, the request for XX XX XX XX XX XX at XX-XX with XX and XX was denied by XXXX with the following rationale: "In my judgment, the available information does not support the medical necessity of this request. This request is

not supported by the Official Disability Guidelines XX and XX XX Chapter: XX XX XX (XX) as well as the Pain Chapter: XX XX XX (XX). The guideline would recommend an XX XX XX following failure of conservative therapy with neurologic deficient on examination and corroboration from imaging and / or XX testing. There were no specific neurologic deficit findings at the level requested nor corroboration from imaging. Therefore, an adverse determination of the request for XX at XX-XX with XX and XX is recommended."

Analysis and Explanation of the Decision include Clinical Basis, Findings and Conclusions used to support the decision.

The records were reviewed to determine whether the requirements for an XX under the ODG were met. XX All of these requisite criteria are lacking in the records reviewed.

Two prior utilization reviews were performed, which could not support the requested procedure. There are no exceptional factors that warrant going outside the ODG. Given the documentation available, the requested service(s) is considered not medically necessary.

A description and the source of the screening criteria or other clinical basis used to make the decision:

	☐ ACOEM-America College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine
	AHRQ-Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Guidelines DWC-Division of Workers Compensation Policies and Guidelines European Guidelines for Management of Chronic XX XX Pain Interqual Criteria Medical Judgment, Clinical Experience, and expertise in accordance with accepted medical standards
	Mercy Center Consensus Conference Guidelines
	Milliman Care Guidelines
П	ODG-Official Disability Guidelines and Treatment Guidelines

XX and XX XX; (updated XX)
XX XX XX (XX)
XX
Pressley Reed, the Medical Disability Advisor
Texas Guidelines for Chiropractic Quality Assurance and 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)

Appeal Information

You have the right to appeal this IRO decision by requesting a Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation (Division) Contested Case Hearing (CCH). A Division CCH can be requested by filing a written appeal with the Division's Chief Clerk no later than 20 days after the date the IRO decision is sent to the appealing party and must be filed in the form and manner required by the Division.

Request for or a Division CCH must be in writing and sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings Texas Department of Insurance Division of Workers' Compensation P. O. Box 17787 Austin, Texas, 78744

For questions regarding the appeals process, please contact the Chief Clerk of Proceedings at 512-804-4075 or 512-804-4010. You may also contact the Division Field Office nearest you at 1-800-252-7031.