

DECISION AND ORDER

This case is decided pursuant to Chapter 410 of the Texas Workers' Compensation Act and Rules of the Division of Workers' Compensation adopted thereunder.

ISSUES

A contested case hearing was held on July 30, 2009 to decide the following disputed issue:

Is the preponderance of the evidence contrary to the decision of the IRO that the Claimant is not entitled to chronic pain management five sessions a week for two weeks for the compensable injury of _____?

PARTIES PRESENT

Petitioner/Claimant appeared and was assisted by RR, ombudsman.
Respondent/Carrier appeared and was represented by DK, attorney.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Claimant sustained a compensable injury to her lumbar spine on _____ while working as a stocker at (Employer). Claimant underwent a laminectomy/discectomy at L3-4 and L4-5 on October 3, 2008. Claimant participated in post-operative physical therapy but continues to suffer from low back pain with radicular symptoms. Claimant's treating doctors have recommended epidural steroid blocks and five sessions a week of chronic pain management for two weeks. The request for chronic pain management was denied by the Carrier and referred to an IRO who determined that the recommended treatment was not medically necessary.

The IRO reviewer, a clinical psychologist, concluded that there was insufficient psychological and medical data to support the request for chronic pain management and that the Claimant did not meet the criteria for a multidisciplinary pain management program as recommended in the Official Disability Guidelines (*ODG*).

Texas Labor Code Section 408.021 provides that an employee who sustains a compensable injury is entitled to all health care reasonably required by the nature of the injury as and when needed. Section 401.011(22-a) defines health care reasonably required as "health care that is clinically appropriate and considered effective for the injured employee's injury and provided in accordance with best practices consistent with: (A) evidence based medicine; or (B) if that evidence is not available, generally accepted standards of medical practice recognized in the medical community." "Evidence based medicine" is further defined, by Section 401.011(18-a) as the use of the current best quality scientific and medical evidence formulated from credible scientific studies, including peer-reviewed medical literature and other current scientifically based texts, and treatment and practice guidelines in making decisions about the care of individual patients.

In accordance with the above statutory guidance, the Division of Workers' Compensation has adopted treatment guidelines by Division Rule 137.100. This rule directs health care providers to provide treatment in accordance with the current edition of the *ODG*, and such treatment is presumed to be health care reasonably required as defined in the Texas Labor Code. Thus, the focus of any health care dispute starts with the health care set out in the *ODG*.

The *ODG* criteria for the general use of multidisciplinary pain management programs are as follows:

Criteria for the general use of multidisciplinary pain management programs:

Outpatient pain rehabilitation programs may be considered medically necessary when all of the following criteria are met:

- (1) Patient with a chronic pain syndrome, with pain that persists beyond three months including three or more of the following: (a) Use of prescription drugs beyond the recommended duration and/or abuse of or dependence on prescription drugs or other substances; (b) Excessive dependence on health-care providers, spouse, or family; (c) Secondary physical deconditioning due to disuse and/or fear-avoidance of physical activity due to pain; (d) Withdrawal from social knowhow, including work, recreation, or other social contacts; (e) Failure to restore preinjury function after a period of disability such that the physical capacity is insufficient to pursue work, family, or recreational needs; (f) Development of psychosocial sequelae after the initial incident, including anxiety, fear-avoidance, depression or nonorganic illness behaviors; (g) The diagnosis is not primarily a personality disorder or psychological condition without a physical component;
- (2) The patient has a significant loss of ability to function independently resulting from the chronic pain;
- (3) Previous methods of treating the chronic pain have been unsuccessful and there is an absence of other options likely to result in significant clinical improvement;
- (4) The patient is not a candidate for further diagnostic, injection(s) or other invasive or surgical procedure, or other treatments that would be warranted. If a goal of treatment is to prevent or avoid controversial or optional surgery, a trial of 10 visits may be implemented to assess whether surgery may be avoided;
- (5) An adequate and thorough multidisciplinary evaluation has been made, including pertinent diagnostic testing to rule out treatable physical conditions, baseline functional and psychological testing so follow-up with the same test can note functional and psychological improvement;
- (6) The patient exhibits motivation to change, and is willing to decrease opiate dependence and forgo secondary gains, including disability payments to effect this change;
- (7) Negative predictors of success above have been addressed;
- (8) These programs may be used for both short-term and long-term disabled patients. See above for more information under *Timing of use*;
- (9) Treatment is not suggested for longer than 2 weeks without evidence of compliance and significant demonstrated efficacy as documented by subjective and objective gains. (Note: Patients may get worse before they get better. For example, objective gains may be moving joints that are stiff from lack of use, resulting in increased subjective pain.) However, it is also not suggested that a continuous course of treatment be interrupted at two weeks solely to document these gains, if there are preliminary indications that these gains are being made on a concurrent basis. Integrative summary reports that include

treatment goals, compliance, progress assessment with objective measures and stage of treatment, must be made available upon request and at least on a bi-weekly basis during the course of the treatment program;

(10) Total treatment duration should generally not exceed 20 full-day sessions (or the equivalent in part-day sessions if required by part-time work, transportation, childcare, or comorbidities). (Sanders, 2005) Treatment duration in excess of 20 sessions requires a clear rationale for the specified extension and reasonable goals to be achieved. Longer durations require individualized care plans and proven outcomes, and should be based on chronicity of disability and other known risk factors for loss of function;

(11) At the conclusion and subsequently, neither re-enrollment in nor repetition of the same or similar rehabilitation program (e.g. work hardening, work conditioning, outpatient medical rehabilitation) is medically warranted for the same condition or injury.

Inpatient pain rehabilitation programs: These programs typically consist of more intensive functional rehabilitation and medical care than their outpatient counterparts. They may be appropriate for patients who: (1) don't have the minimal functional capacity to participate effectively in an outpatient program; (2) have medical conditions that require more intensive oversight; (3) are receiving large amounts of medications necessitating medication weaning or detoxification; or (4) have complex medical or psychological diagnosis that benefit from more intensive observation and/or additional consultation during the rehabilitation process. (Keel, 1998) (Kool, 2005) (Buchner, 2006) (Kool, 2007) As with outpatient pain rehabilitation programs, the most effective programs combine intensive, daily biopsychosocial rehabilitation with a functional restoration approach.

The IRO reviewer concluded that the Claimant did not meet the criteria as outlined in the *ODG* for the pain management program recommended. The Claimant testified that she believed she would benefit from a chronic pain management program in that she would gain confidence to take on additional activities and increase her functionality. Claimant's treating doctors have not addressed the criteria recommended in the *ODG* or the other concerns raised by the IRO. Based on the evidence presented, the Claimant failed to present an evidence-based medical opinion to overcome the IRO's decision and the preponderance of the evidence is not contrary to the IRO decision that the Claimant is not entitled to chronic pain management five sessions a week for two weeks for the compensable injury of _____.

Even though all the evidence presented was not discussed, it was considered. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are based on all of the evidence presented.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The parties stipulated to the following facts:
 - A. Venue is proper in the (City) Field Office of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.
 - B. On _____, Claimant was the employee of (Employer).
 - C. Claimant sustained a compensable injury on _____.

2. Carrier delivered to Claimant a single document stating the true corporate name of Carrier, and the name and street address of Carrier's registered agent, which document was admitted into evidence as Hearing Officer's Exhibit Number 2.
3. The Claimant does not meet the criteria outlined in the *ODG* for participation in an interdisciplinary chronic pain management program.
4. The requested five sessions per week for two weeks of chronic pain management program is not health care reasonably required for the compensable injury of _____.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation, has jurisdiction to hear this case.
2. Venue is proper in the (City) Field Office.
3. The preponderance of the evidence is not contrary to the decision of the IRO that the Claimant is not entitled to chronic pain management five sessions per week for two weeks for the compensable injury of _____.

DECISION

Claimant is not entitled to chronic pain management five sessions per week for two weeks for the compensable injury of _____.

ORDER

Carrier is not liable for the benefits at issue in this hearing. Claimant remains entitled to medical benefits for the compensable injury in accordance with §408.021.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is:

**CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY
701 BRAZOS STREET, SUITE 1050
AUSTIN, TX 78701**

Signed this 30th day of July, 2009.

Carol A. Fougerat
Hearing Officer