## INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW

| Type of Document Received | Date(s) of Record |
| :--- | :--- |
| Office Visit by X, PR, DPT | X |
| Re-Evaluation Visit by X, PR, DPT | X |
| Appeal from XX X for Rehabilitation | X |
| Denial Letter from X Services | X |
| Daily Note Visit by X, PR, DPT | X |
| XX X Medicine Report from X | X |
| Peer Clinical Review Report from X | X |
| IRO Request Fax from X | X |
| IRO Request form from X | X |
| IRO Request Details from Texas Department <br> of Insurance | X |
| Fax Records from X | X |
| Notice of Assignment Fax from Texas <br> Department of Insurance | X |
| XX Case Assignment from Texas Department <br> of Insurance | X |
| Claimant Records Email from X Services |  |

## EMPLOYEE CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

The claimant is a $X$ injured $X$ when " $X$ " sustaining an injury to the $X$. Office Visit by X, PR, DPT dated $X$ documented the claimant was diagnosed with unspecified $X$, not specified as traumatic; Pain in X; and X, not elsewhere classified. The claimant reported to X, PR, DPT $X$ experienced a strain in $X$ the previous day while $X$.
The Re-Evaluation Visit by X, PR, DPT dated X documented after X injury the claimant underwent $X$ for approximately $X$ weeks and saw improvements in $X(X)$, but continued to have significant pain. The claimant underwent an MRI that showed a X and subsequently underwent a X. X, PR, DPT documented the claimant presented with pain rated a $X$ and a $X$ while at work. Objective findings on
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examination by $X$, PR, DPT included range of motion of the $X$ was $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{X} ; \mathrm{X}, \mathrm{X} ; \mathrm{X}$; and X . X testing of the X revealed $-\mathrm{X} ;-\mathrm{X} ;+\mathrm{X} ;+\mathrm{X}$. The claimant reported to $X$, PR, DPT $X$ could carry no more than $X$ pound, could hold the base of a X , able to lift X pound, could touch the top of the X , and rolling onto the $\mathrm{X} . \mathrm{X}, \mathrm{PR}$, DPT recommended the claimant attend $X$ for $X$ visits a week with an expected duration of $X$ weeks.

Daily Note Visit by X, PT dated X documented the claimant presented for $X X$ visit. The claimant complained of pain and tightness in $X X$ that was worse about an hour after completing $X$ exercise. X , PT documented the claimant's pain was $X$ and $X$ when $X$ was elevated. $X$, PT reported the claimant was "still $X$ and $X$ today. $X$ responds well to $[\mathrm{X}]$ and $[\mathrm{X}]$ to decrease tightness and increase tolerance for $[\mathrm{X}]$ strengthening activities." X, PT recommended the claimant continue with current program.

Denial Letter from $X$ dated $X$ denied the request for $X X$ times per week for $X$ weeks stating, "The available documentation indicates that the claimant sustained a work-related injury to the X on X and completed X weeks of X with reported benefit. The claimant subsequently underwent X . The claimant has completed an unknown number of $X$ sessions thus far. The notes indicate that $X$ has had preop $X$ and currently undergoing $X$ weeks of $X$. There are no notes indicating when the first visit was completed and how far along X is with the current sessions. The most recent examination provided from $X$ is dated on $X$ that indicated $X$. Within those notes indicate an initial assessment was completed on X and a re-evaluation on X . There have been no documented improvements noted thus far. More specifically, according to the notes, X has decreased in all ranges from the initial to the most current note. $X$ has minimally improved in some areas such as $X$, whereas $X$ have remained unchanged. There were no notes indicating the progression of treatment and response to the unknown number of visits of $X$. It is not clear the benefits of $X$ and how
additional therapy will provide further benefit. The provider has not provided any objective evidence to support the X has been beneficial and or complicating factors with current X that would allow for deviation from guideline recommendations. ODG Guidelines recommend X and allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to $X$ visits per week to $X$ or less), plus active self-directed $X$. $X$ visits over $X$ weeks or $X$ visits over $X$ weeks for $X$ or up to $X$ visits for $X$. The claimant has had an unknown number of visits since the procedure on XX. Furthermore, the request is for $2 x$ a week and this does not indicate that there is fading treatment frequency with promotion of independence from passive care. This request is not medically necessary."

## ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION INCLUDE CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT THE DECISION.

This is a $X$ diagnosed with unspecified $X$, not specified as traumatic; Pain in $X$; and Stiffness of $X$, not elsewhere classified. The request is for $X X$ times per week for $X$ weeks.

According to Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), X visits of $X$ over X weeks are recommended for post arthroscopic $X$. In this case, the claimant underwent surgical intervention on X and had attended XX visits as of $X$. At this point in $X$ treatment the claimant is not fully recovered and would be expected to have some residual decreased X , as outlined by the therapist in the exam portion of the notes. The claimant was not yet at $X$ weeks from date of service at the time of the last $X$ visit and additional $X$ was warranted based on the ODG guidelines, time from $X$, and residual $X$ noted in $X$ and $X$. The request, however, was for $X$ visits. This exceeds the recommended $X$ visits.

Therefore, based on ODG guidelines and criteria, as well as the clinical documentation stated above, it is my professional medical
opinion that the request for $\mathrm{X} X$ times per week for X is not medically necessary and appropriate. I recommend the claimant instead be approved for X visits to allow for X .

## A DESCRIPTION AND THE SOURCE OF THE SCREENING CRITERIA OR OTHER CLINICAL BASIS USED TO MAKE THE DECISION: ODG-TWC

e section of TDI's website at www.tdi.texas.gov.

