

C-IRO Inc.
An Independent Review Organization
3616 Far West Blvd Ste 117-501 CI
Austin, TX 78731
Phone: (512) 772-4390
Fax: (512) 387-2647
Email: @ciro-site.com

Description of the service or services in dispute:

X

Description of the qualifications for each physician or other health care provider who reviewed the decision:

Board Certified X

Upon Independent review, the reviewer finds that the previous adverse determination / adverse determinations should be:

X

Patient Clinical History (Summary)

X who was injured on X. The biomechanics of the injury was not available in the medical records. X was diagnosed with X.

X underwent a X by X. The purpose of the examination was to determine X. X the X. X demonstrated the X demand category based on the definitions developed by X. X could X. It should be noted that X job was X. X had X. X about X. The X were evaluated, and X. X demonstrated the X. Above X.

On X was evaluated by X, MD for X. X had X. X had X. Examination of the X. The X showed X. There were X. Dr. X commented that X examination continued to X. Dr. X recommended that the claimant X.

Per a Utilization Review Decision Letter dated X, the request for X was denied by X, DO. Rationale: " At this time, due to lack of documentation to support the request, the request for X is recommended for non-certification as being not medically reasonable or necessary."

Per an appeal letter dated X by X was under X. X had made some X. Since X was X, believed that X. An X showed X. X documented, "My notes showing several attempts to reach physician for a peer-to-peer phone call for your review. Lastly, I added the statute from Texas Administrative Code which it states 'the URA must afford the provider of record reasonable opportunity to discuss the plan of treatment' prior to denial of the requested service. I was not afforded this opportunity due to lack of returned calls from messages I left for the peer-to-peer phone call."

Per an Adverse Determination Letter dated X, the request for X was denied by X, MD. Rationale: "As noted in ODG's X, the best way to get an X. Here, the claimant was placed X. It is unclear why attempts to X. ODG further notes that X should be an X. Here, again, the attending provider X. ODG further notes that such a program should be reserved as an option where quality programs are available. Here, however, outcomes of the program in question were not clearly discussed, detailed, or characterized. ODG notes that X amounts to an additional series of X. Here, recent X. The claimant, it is further noted, declined to X. It does not appear, X. Therefore, the request for reconsideration for X is not medically necessary. "

Analysis and Explanation of the Decision include Clinical Basis, Findings and Conclusions used to support the decision.

Based on the clinical information provided, the request for X is not recommended as medically necessary, and the previous denials are upheld. There is insufficient information to support a change in determination, and the previous non-certification is upheld. The submitted X. There is no documentation of attempts to return to X. The submitted clinical records indicate that, "X said that X." There are no X records submitted for review. Therefore, medical necessity is not established in accordance with current evidence-based guidelines.

A description and the source of the screening criteria or other clinical basis used to make the decision:

- ACOEM-America College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine
- AHRQ-Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Guidelines
- DWC-Division of Workers Compensation Policies and 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 and Treatment Guidelines
- Pressley Reed, the Medical Disability Advisor
- Texas Guidelines for Chiropractic Quality Assurance and 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)