

**Envoy Medical Systems, LP**  
**1726 Cricket Hollow**  
**Austin, Texas 78758**

PH. 512/248-9020  
IRO Certificate #4599

Fax 512/491-5145

**NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION**

August 12, 2005

**Re: IRO Case # M2-05-2059-01**

Texas Worker's Compensation Commission:

Envoy Medical Systems, LP (Envoy) has been certified as an independent review organization (IRO) by the Texas Department of Insurance and has been authorized to perform independent reviews of medical necessity for the Texas Worker's Compensation cases 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 Worker's compensation assign cases to certified IROs, this case was assigned to Envoy for an independent review. Envoy has performed an independent review of the proposed care to determine if the adverse determination was appropriate. For that purpose, Envoy 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 Worker's Compensation 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 Envoy 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 Envoy reviewer who reviewed this case, based on the medical records provided, is as follows:

Medical Information Reviewed

1. Table of disputed services
2. Denial letters

3. Notes 2005, Dr. Mayer
4. Mental health evaluation 5/5/05, J. Dersh
5. Quantitative functional evaluation 5/4/05
6. X-ray lumbar spine report 10/24/03, 1/24/03
7. Lumbar myelogram report 8/28/04
8. MRI cervical spine report 8/28/04
9. CT lumbar spine report 8/27/04
10. Notes, Dr. Chow
11. Reports, Dr. Curtis

#### History

The patient is a 55-year-old male who has had neck and low back pain since a \_\_\_ injury. There is severe depression with suicidal ideation. Chronic medications include opiates and antidepressants.

#### Requested Service(s)

PRIDE, Functional restoration pain management program x 27 visits

#### Decision

I agree in part and disagree in part with the carrier's decision to deny the requested 27 sessions of a pain management program. I disagree with the decision to deny 10 sessions, and I agree with the decision to deny more than 10 sessions at this time.

#### Rationale

Based on the records provided for this review, the likelihood of this individual improving after 13 years of disabilities is slim. But the patient does have significant psychological issues, and deconditioning, that may be successfully treated by a pain management program. It therefore, would be reasonable and medically appropriate to approve 10 sessions, with close evaluation of progress towards specific goals, such as increased ability to perform activities of daily living, decreased medication usage, and improved mood. Since there is a high risk that the patient may not benefit from a PMP, approval of 27 visits is not reasonable and necessary at this time.

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,

---

Daniel Y. Chin, for GP

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 15<sup>th</sup> day of August 2005.

Signature of IRO Representative:

Printed Name of IRO Representative: Alice McCutcheon

Requestor:

Respondent: Service Lloyds Insurance Co., Attn Wisteria Hutchenson, Fx 346-2539

Texas Workers Compensation Commission Fx 804-4871 Attn: