

May 11, 2005

VIA FACSIMILE
RS Medical
Attn: Joe Basham

VIA FACSIMILE
American Casualty Co.
C/o Burns Anderson Jury Brenner
Attn: Debra Derrickson

NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION

RE: MDR Tracking #: M2-05-1279-01
TWCC #:
Injured Employee:
Requestor: RS Medical
Respondent: American Casualty Co. c/o Burns Anderson Jury Brenner
MAXIMUS Case #: TW05-0080

MAXIMUS has been certified by the Texas Department of Insurance (TDI) as an independent review organization (IRO). The MAXIMUS IRO Certificate Number is 5348. Texas Worker's Compensation Commission (TWCC) Rule §133.308 allows for a claimant or provider to request an independent review of a Carrier's adverse medical necessity determination. TWCC assigned the above-reference case to MAXIMUS for independent review in accordance with this Rule.

MAXIMUS has performed an independent review of the proposed care to determine whether or not the adverse determination was appropriate. Relevant medical records, documentation provided by the parties referenced above and other documentation and written information submitted regarding this appeal was reviewed during the performance of this independent review.

This case was reviewed by a practicing physician on the MAXIMUS external review panel. The reviewer has met the requirements for the ADL of TWCC or has been approved as an exception to the ADL requirement. This physician is board certified in neurology and is familiar with the condition and treatment options at issue in this appeal. The MAXIMUS physician reviewer signed a statement certifying that no known conflicts of interest exist between this physician and any of the treating physicians or providers or any of the physicians or providers who reviewed this case for a determination prior to the referral to MAXIMUS for independent review. In addition, the MAXIMUS physician reviewer certified that the review was performed without bias for or against any party in this case.

Clinical History

This case concerns a male who sustained a work related injury on _____. The patient reported that while at work he injured his back when he lifted a punch hole bin. The patient had been treated with conservative treatment consisting of work cessation/restriction, medication, and physical therapy. The patient underwent an MRI of the lumbar spine on 2/15/05 that revealed horizontal orientation to the sacrum, slight disc desiccation at L3-4 and L4-5, and interval

resolution of edema in the right L5 pedicle. The current diagnoses for this patient include lumbosacral strain/sprain, degenerative disc disease of the lumbar spine, facet joint hypertrophy, possible facet syndrome, and chronic low back pain. The purchase of an RS4i sequential stimulator has been recommended for continued treatment of his condition.

Requested Services

Purchase of an RS4i sequential 4 channel combination interferential & muscle stimulator.

Documents and/or information used by the reviewer to reach a decision:

Documents Submitted by Requestor:

1. No documents submitted

Documents Submitted by Respondent:

1. Progress Reports 7/27/04 – 4/8/05
2. MRI report 2/15/05
3. Designated Doctor's Evaluation 2/23/05
4. EMG/NCV report 2/8/05

Decision

The Carrier's denial of authorization for the requested services is upheld.

Rationale/Basis for Decision

The MAXIMUS physician reviewer noted that this case concerns a male who sustained a work related injury to his back on _____. The MAXIMUS physician reviewer also noted that the current diagnoses for this patient include lumbosacral strain/sprain, degenerative disc disease of the lumbar spine, facet joint hypertrophy, possible facet syndrome, and chronic low back pain. The MAXIMUS physician reviewer further noted that the purchase of an RS4i sequential stimulator has been recommended for continued treatment of this patient's condition. The MAXIMUS physician reviewer explained that there is no evidence that long term use of the RS4i sequential stimulator for treatment of this patient's condition results in lasting improvement such as long term pain relief, decreased use of pain medications, and increased function. Therefore, the MAXIMUS physician consultant concluded that the requested purchase of an RS4i sequential 4 channel combination interferential & muscle stimulator is not medically necessary to treat this patient at this time.

This decision is deemed to be a TWCC Decision and Order.

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)** days of your receipt of this decision. (20 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)** 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. (28 Tex. Admin. Code 102.4(h) or 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to:

Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk
P.O. Box 17787
Austin, TX 78744

Fax: 512-804-4011

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. (Commission Rule 133.308(t)(2)).

Sincerely,

MAXIMUS

Elizabeth McDonald
State Appeals Department

cc: Texas Workers Compensation Commission
Mr. ____

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 11th day of May 2005.

Signature of IRO Employee: _____
External Appeals Department