

**THIS DECISION HAS BEEN APPEALED. THE
FOLLOWING IS THE RELATED SOAH DECISION NUMBER:**

SOAH DOCKET NO. 453-04-5977.M2

IRO Certificate #4599

NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION

May 3, 2004

Re: IRO Case # M2-04-1123-01

Texas Worker's Compensation Commission:

___ has been certified as an independent review organization (IRO) and has been authorized to perform independent reviews of medical necessity for the Texas Worker's Compensation Commission (TWCC). Texas HB. 2600, Rule133.308 effective January 1, 2002, allows a claimant or provider who has received an adverse medical necessity determination from a carrier's internal process, to request an independent review by an IRO.

In accordance with the requirement that TWCC assign cases to certified IROs, TWCC assigned this case to ___ for an independent review. ___ has performed an independent review of the proposed care to determine if the adverse determination was appropriate. For that purpose, ___ received relevant medical records, any documents obtained from parties in making the adverse determination, and any other documents and/or written information submitted in support of the appeal.

The case was reviewed by a physician who is Board Certified in Anesthesiology and Pain Management, and who has met the requirements for the TWCC Approved Doctor List or who has been granted an exception from the ADL. He or she has signed a certification statement attesting that no known conflicts of interest exist between him or her and any of the treating physicians or providers, or any of the physicians or providers who reviewed the case for a determination prior to referral to ___ for independent review. In addition, the certification statement further attests that the review was performed without bias for or against the carrier, medical provider, or any other party to this case.

The determination of the ___ reviewer who reviewed this case, based on the medical records provided, is as follows:

Medical Information Reviewed

1. Requestor's position letter 3/19/04
2. Denial of pain management program 3/8/04, 2/23/04
3. Report of medical evaluation 10/30/03, 7/1/03, 2/13/03, 9/6/02
4. Functional abilities evaluation of the lumbar spine region 4/21/03
5. Operative report and hospital summary 3/10/03
6. Report of EMG/NCS 6/10/02
7. TWCC 69 2/3/04
8. CT lumbar spine 3/10/03
9. MRI lumbar spine 6/10/02
10. Rebuttal to denial of psychological services
11. Behavioral medicine evaluation 2/5/04
12. Notes clinical interview 1/21/04
13. Work hardening notes
14. Medical clinic general template 5/6/02

15. Medical clinic notes 5/16/02, 7/17/03,
16. Comprehensive evaluation 5/8/02
17. FCE 6/21/02, 4/21/03
18. Functional evaluation testing report 7/8/02
19. H & P 7/22/02, 2/13/03
20. Orthopedic notes 7/25/02, 7/30/02, 7/31/02 - 8/23/02
21. Procedure note 8/8/02
22. Office note 8/26/02, 9/30/02, 10/28/02
23. Psychologist clinical interview 1/21/04
24. Psychologist initial evaluation 8/19/02
25. Psychologist progress summary 10/9/02, 10/16/02, 11/6/02, 11/13/02, 12/16/02
26. Neurosurgical consultation 12/18/02
27. Treatment pain 1/3/03
28. Consult report 12/18/02
29. Consult report 1/14/03
30. Progress note 2/4/03, 3/12/03
31. Carrier review 2/14/03
32. Evaluation and management note 2/14/03
33. Work status reports
34. Physical therapy assessment 7/2/03

History

The patient is a 45-year-old male who has had lower back pain since an injury on _____. Physical therapy, work hardening and epidural steroid injections have been performed. The patient has also been treated with psychotherapy.

Requested Service(s)

Chronic pain management program X 30 sessions

Decision

I agree with the carrier's decision to deny the proposed program.

Rationale

The patient has received extensive therapy, including psychotherapy. It is not reasonable and necessary to continue with behavioral therapy when he has had similar treatment modalities in the past without marked improvement in his functional status.

This medical necessity decision by an Independent Review Organization is deemed to be a Commission decision and order.

YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING

Either party to medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the 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 **10** (ten) calendar days of your receipt of this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 142.5(c)).

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 **20** (twenty) calendar days of your receipt of this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 142.5(c)).

This decision is deemed received by you 5 (five) days after it was mailed or the date of fax (28 Tex. Admin. Code 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing and a **copy of this decision** must be sent to:

Chief Clerk of Proceedings / Appeals Clerk
P.O. Box 17787
Austin, Texas 78744
Fax: 512-804-4011

The party appealing this decision shall deliver a copy of its written request for a hearing to other party involved in this dispute.

Sincerely,

In accordance with Commission Rule 102.4 (b), I hereby certify that a copy of this Independent Review Organization (IRO) decision was sent to the carrier and the requestor or claimant via facsimile or US Postal Service from the office of the IRO on this 5th day of May 2004.