

**THIS DECISION HAS BEEN APPEALED. THE FOLLOWING
IS THE RELATED SOAH DECISION NUMBER:
SOAH DOCKET NO. 453-05-0515.M2**

NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DETERMINATION

MDR Tracking Number: M2-04-1731-01
IRO Certificate Number: 5259

August 24, 2004

An independent review of the above-referenced case has been completed by a chiropractic doctor. The appropriateness of setting and medical necessity of proposed or rendered services is determined by the application of medical screening criteria published by Texas Medical Foundation, or by the application of medical screening criteria and protocols formally established by practicing physicians. All available clinical information, the medical necessity guidelines and the special circumstances of said case was considered in making the determination.

The independent review determination and reasons for the determination, including the clinical basis for the determination, is as follows:

See Attached Physician Determination

___ hereby certifies that the reviewing physician is on Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Approved Doctor List (ADL). Additionally, said physician has certified that no known conflicts of interest exist between him and any of the treating physicians or providers or any of the physicians or providers who reviewed the case for determination prior to referral to ___.

Sincerely,

CLINICAL HISTORY

Correspondence from ___, carrier reviews, FCEs, lower arterial examination report, MRI reports, EMG and NCV reports, designated doctor reports, PT progress notes and ___ reports.

Patient underwent MRI, lower arterial examination, EMG, NCV, biofeedback, TENS, aquatic therapy, manipulation, heat therapy, bed

rest, massage, psychotherapy, ultrasound, exercise therapy, epidural steroid injections and surgery after injuring his low back while attempting to catch a bin on ___.

REQUESTED SERVICE(S)

Chronic Pain Management Program x30 Sessions.

DECISION

Denied.

RATIONALE/BASIS FOR DECISION

Current medical literature states, "...there is no strong evidence for the effectiveness of supervised training as compared to home exercises. There is also no strong evidence for the effectiveness of multidisciplinary rehabilitation as compared to usual care." ¹ The literature further states "...that there appears to be little scientific evidence for the effectiveness of multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation compared with other rehabilitation facilities..." ² And a systematic review of the literature for a multidisciplinary approach to chronic pain found only 2 controlled trials of approximately 100 patients with no difference found at 12-month and 24-month follow-up when multidisciplinary team approach was compared with traditional care.³ Based on those studies and absent any documentation that the proposed treatment would be beneficial, it is medically unnecessary.

More importantly, the previously attempted active treatments and psychological sessions had within them the self-help strategies, coping mechanisms, exercises and modalities that are inherent in and central to the proposed chronic pain management program. In other words and for all practical purposes, much of the proposed program has already been attempted and failed. Therefore, since the patient is not likely to benefit in any meaningful way from repeating unsuccessful treatments, the chronic pain management program is medically unnecessary.

¹ Ostelo RW, de Vet HC, Waddell G, Kerchhoffs MR, Leffers P, van Tulder M, Rehabilitation following first-time lumbar disc surgery: a systematic review within the framework of the cochrane collaboration. Spine. 2003 Feb 1;28(3):209-18.

² Karjalainen K, Malmivaara A, van Tulder M, Roine R, Jauhiainen M, Hurri H, Koes B. Multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation for neck and shoulder pain among working age adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2003;(2):CD002194.

³ Karjalainen K, et al. Multidisciplinary rehabilitation for fibromyalgia and musculoskeletal pain in working age adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2000;2.

YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING

Either party to this 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 (20 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 **20** (twenty) calendar days of your receipt of this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 148.3).

This decision is deemed received by you 5 (five) days after it was mailed or the date of fax (28 Tex. Admin. Code 102.4(h) or 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing and a **copy of this decision** must be sent to:

Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk
Texas Workers' Compensation Commission
P.O. Box 17787
Austin, Texas 78744

Or fax the request to (512) 804-4011. A copy of this decision must be attached to the request.

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

In accordance with Commission Rule 102.4(h), 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 this 27th day of August 2004.