

August 20, 2003

Re: Medical Dispute Resolution  
MDR # M2-03-1096-01

In accordance with the requirement for TWCC to randomly assign cases to IROs, TWCC assigned your case to \_\_\_ for an independent review. \_\_\_ has performed an independent review of the medical records to determine medical necessity. In performing this review, \_\_\_ reviewed relevant medical records, any documents provided by the parties referenced above, and any documentation and written information submitted in support of the dispute.

The independent review was performed by a matched peer with the treating health care provider. Your case was reviewed by a physician who is Board Certified in Spine Surgery.

**Clinical History:**

This female claimant presented to her physician with complaints of back and leg pain related to her work-related injury on \_\_\_\_\_. The physician prescribed medications, as well as the RS4i muscle stimulator.

**Disputed Services:**

Interferential muscle stimulator, bilateral at L-4, L-5 and S-1.

**Decision:**

The reviewer disagrees with the determination of the insurance carrier and is of the opinion that the muscle stimulator is medically necessary in this case.

**Rationale:**

Interferential muscle stimulation has been proven to reduce pain. Specifically, in spinal-type pain, it has been proven to reduce cervical myofascial pain. A physician's note on 02/12/03 stated that the use of the muscle stimulator has decreased the patient's pain and analgesic medication consumption. Based on this information, the interferential muscle stimulator has been effective and is, therefore, medically necessary for this patient.

I am the Secretary and General Counsel of \_\_\_ and I certify that the reviewing physician in this case has certified to our organization that there are no known conflicts of interest that exist between him and any of the treating physicians or other health care providers or any of the physicians or other health care providers who reviewed this care for determination prior to referral to the Independent Review Organization.

We are simultaneously forwarding copies of this report to the payor and the Texas Workers' Compensation Commission. This decision by \_\_\_\_ is deemed to be a Commission decision and order.

### **YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING**

Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of this decision and has a right to request a hearing.

**If disputing a spinal surgery prospective decision** a request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings **within ten (10) days** of your receipt of this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 142.5©).

**If disputing other prospective medical necessity** (preauthorization) decisions a request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings **within twenty (20) days** of your receipt of this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 148.3).

This Decision is deemed received by you **five (5) days** after it was mailed (28 Tex. Admin. Code 102.4(h) or 102.5 (d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to:

Chief Clerk of Proceedings  
Texas Workers' Compensation Commission  
P.O. Box 40669  
Austin, TX 78704-0012

A copy of this decision should be attached to the request. The party appealing the decision shall deliver a copy of its written request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute.

I hereby verify that a copy of this Independent Review Organization (IRO) Decision was sent to the carrier, the requestor and claimant via facsimile or U.S. Postal Service from the office of the IRO on August 20, 2003.

Sincerely,