

## **CASEREVIEW**

**8017 Sitka Street  
Fort Worth, TX 76137  
Phone: 817-226-6328  
Fax: 817-612-6558**

### **INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW:**

X: Visit Note by X  
X: Office Visit by X, MD  
X: X MRI interpreted by X  
X: Office Visit by X, MD  
X: Office Visit by X, MD  
X: Operative Note by X, MD  
X: Peer Review by X, MD  
X: Office Visit by X, MD  
X: Office Visit by X, MD  
X: Office Visit by X, MD  
X: Confidential Diagnostic Interview by X, XX  
X: MRI X interpreted by X, MD  
X: Office Visit by X, MD  
X: UR performed by X, MD  
X: UR performed by X, MD

### **PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:**

The claimant is a X who was injured on X when X. Treatment included X.

On X, the claimant presented to X for followup of X. X had a X placed on X. X reported being in constant pain and X most of the time at work. X continued to experience X. X continued with X. Plan: X.

On X, the claimant presented to X, MD with X. X reported X pain as X. Plan: X.

On X, MRI X: X findings are seen at the X levels as described with no X level.

On X, the claimant presented to X, MD with continued X. X reported X pain as X. Medications included: X. On examination X was limited secondary to pain. There was X. X was positive X. X was X. X was grossly intact, X. Unable to check X. Positive for X. Unable to X. Plan: X, then X.

On X, Operative Report by X, MD. Postoperative Diagnosis: X. Procedure: X guided, X, X.

On X, the claimant presented to X, MD with X relief of the X symptoms following X. There was still pain in X. X rated X pain level a X. Physical exam is same. Continue with X. Start X.

On X, the claimant presented to X, MD with reports that the X was helpful and X wanted to continue with the other X planned X.

On X, the claimant presented to X, MD with a pain level of X. It was recorded that X had developed X. On examination X was limited secondary to pain. There was X. X was positive X. X was X. X was grossly intact, except X. Unable to check X. Positive for X. X was shiny and X. Plan: Consider X. Refer to Dr. X. Order X MRI. Start X.

On X, the claimant presented to X, XX for XX consultation. X was considered XX stable who was having a difficult time functioning due to X pain condition and physical limitations, but was highly motivated for recovery. Recommendations: X is psychologically stable, X judgment is sound, and X is capable of informed consent concerning the pending surgical procedure. X is psychologically able to tolerate this procedure and to actively participate in X recovery. A X will hopefully provide the patient with a X in pain, which will allow X to increase X activity level, prevent the need for X, and improve X quality of life.

On X, MRI X: 1. No X abnormality. 2. No X. No significant X. No X abnormalities. 3. Few incidental scattered X, most prominent at X. Partially visualized X can be

further evaluated with X.

On X, the claimant presented to X, MD with a pain level of X. Exam unchanged.  
Plan: X. Continue X.

On X, X, MD performed a UR. Rationale for Denial: The claimant reported X pain. The examination of the X revealed X was limited with X secondary to pain. There is X to X of X. There was positive X and positive X. The claimant has completed a X evaluation. Per ODG, X is recommended only for selected patients in cases when less invasive procedures have failed or are contraindicated." The claimant has been treated with X. However, there is no documentation of failure of other forms of less invasive procedures including X. There is also do diagnosis of X. As such, medical necessity has not been established.

On X, X, MD performed a UR. Rationale for Denial: On X, the claimant presented to Dr. X with complaints of X. X complied of X. X exam revealed limited X, X secondary to pain. There was X. X was positive. X was X. The X. X were unable to be checked. There was positive X. X was unable to X. This request was previously denied as there was no indication of failure of other forms of less invasive procedures, such as X, and there was no diagnosis of X (X)X. While the claimant did have X, there is no indication X has X. Furthermore, additional records regarding the appeal were not provided for review. Therefore, X is not medically necessary.

**ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION INCLUDE CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT THE DECISION:**

The request for a X is denied. This claimant took a X. Following this accident, X has had X pain with X. X has failed X. The X MRI demonstrated no X. No X were noted in the X MRI. A X was recommended.

The Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) recommends X for patients with X (X) X and in specific conditions when less invasive procedures have failed.

From my review of the records, the diagnosis for this patient's current complaints is not clearly defined. X MRI studies do not demonstrate X. I am not convinced

that X has X. There was no X provided to confirm diagnosis. Therefore, the X is not medically necessary at this time.

**A DESCRIPTION AND THE SOURCE OF THE SCREENING CRITERIA OR OTHER CLINICAL BASIS USED TO MAKE THE DECISION:**

- ACOEM- AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OCCUPATIONAL & ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE UM KNOWLEDGEBASE
- AHRQ- AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH & QUALITY GUIDELINES
- DWC- DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION POLICIES OR GUIDELINES
- EUROPEAN GUIDELINES FOR MANAGEMENT OF CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN
- INTERQUAL CRITERIA
- MEDICAL JUDGMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE, AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS
- MERCY CENTER CONSENSUS CONFERENCE GUIDELINES
- MILLIMAN CARE GUIDELINES
- ODG- OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT GUIDELINES
- PRESLEY REED, THE MEDICAL DISABILITY ADVISOR
- TEXAS GUIDELINES FOR CHIROPRACTIC QUALITY ASSURANCE & PRACTICE PARAMETERS
- TMF SCREENING CRITERIA MANUAL
- PEER REVIEWED NATIONALLY ACCEPTED MEDICAL LITERATURE (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)

OTHER EVIDENCE BASED, SCIENTIFICALLY VALID, OUTCOME FOCUSED GUIDELINES (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)