## CPC Solutions An Independent Review Organization P. O. Box 121144 Arlington, TX 76012

Ph: (855) 360-1445 Fx: (817) 385-9607

Email:@irosolutions.com

## **Notice of Independent Review Decision**

## Amended Date:

		-				•	-					
$\boldsymbol{\mu}$	e <sub>1</sub>	/1	QΙ	\ <i>A/</i>	•	"	It	$\sim$	റ	m	Δ	•
<i>1</i> \	$\mathbf{c}$	,,,	<b>C</b>	vv	•	/L	ıL	•	u	,,,	G	_

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

Χ

Description of the service or services in dispute:

Χ

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

X

Information Provided to the IRO for Review:

Χ

Patient Clinical History (Summary)

The patient is a X whose date of injury is X. X was X and had X and X. X

dated X indicates diagnoses are X, X, X and X and X. Pain level is X. Required X and X. Initial interview dated X indicates that treatment to date includes X, X and X. Current medication is X. X is X and X is X. X is X and X is X.

## 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 for the X and X is not recommended as medically necessary, and the previous denials are upheld. The initial request was non-certified noting that the claimant is X. There is no indication the claimant would require X. The denial was upheld on appeal noting that the request for X the guideline as X does not X. There seems to be some confusion of how many X to. There is insufficient information to support a change in determination, and the previous non-certifications are upheld. There is no X or the patient's response thereto submitted for review. There are X records submitted for review to establish that the patient has completed an X with X followed by X. There is no documentation of an attempt to X. There is no updated clinical information submitted for review. The patient's current medication X is not documented. 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:

<ul> <li>ACOEM-America College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine unknowledgebase</li> </ul>
□ 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
□ Internal 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 Médical Literature (Provide a description)
☐ Other evidence based, scientifically valid, outcome focused guidelines (Provide a description)