Applied Resolutions LLC An Independent Review Organization 900 N. Walnut Creek Suite 100 PMB 290 Mansfield, TX 76063 Phone: (817) 405-3524 Fax: (888) 567-5355 Email: @appliedresolutionstx.com

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE: X

A DESCRIPTION OF THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH PHYSICIAN OR OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER WHO REVIEWED THE DECISION: X

REVIEW OUTCOME:

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

Х

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

X who was X. X was X. X was diagnosed with X. X was seen by X, DO on X. After the X. X also X for X. X reported X and X. X stated X. X also X. X had X. X had X. The pain was X. X also X. A X. On examination, X had X. There was X. The X. X were noted in X. X had X. The X was X and X. On X presented for X. X had a X and X. X had X. X had X. X into X. X also had X and X. X reported X. On X continued with X. X had X. On examination, X had X. A nd X. X reported X. On X continued with X. X had X. On examination, X had X, and X. X had a X. An X on X. Per peer review report by X, MD on X, the request for X utilizing a X was non-certified. Rationale: "Official Disability Guidelines X. The guideline recommends X. In this case, it is X. X, it is X. Overall, this request, therefore, is not medically necessary and should be non-authorized." Per peer review by X, MD on X, the request for X was non-certified. Rationale: "The X presented with X. There is a request for a X. There is X. As such, this request is not medically necessary. Thus, the requested 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 non-certifications are upheld. There is insufficient information to X, and the previous non-certifications are upheld. There is X. The X. It is X is being recommended.

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- 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

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

□ PEER REVIEWED NATIONALLY ACCEPTED MEDICAL LITERATURE (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)

□ PRESLEY REED, THE MEDICAL DISABILITY ADVISOR

□ TEXAS GUIDELINES FOR CHIROPRACTIC QUALITY ASSURANCE & PRACTICE PARAMETERS

□ TMF SCREENING CRITERIA MANUAL