

Core 400 LLC
An Independent Review Organization
3616 Far West Blvd Ste 117-501 C4
Austin, TX 78731
Phone: (512) 772-2865
Fax: (512) 551-0630
Email: @core400.com

Notice of Independent Review Decision

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

Information Provided to the IRO for Review

X

Patient Clinical History (Summary)

X who was injured on X. On this date, X reported X, and when X, X and had a X.

X was evaluated by X, DO on X for a follow-up. X continued to X, X, and X. Dr. X thought that X through X that X and X. In most cases of X, there was X. It was a X, which continued to be evident in this case. As on previous documentation, X had a X that was X. An X was noted. X also had X. X had X and X. There was X and X with a X. Additionally, the claimant had X and X.

An X dated X. There were X.

Treatment to date included X, X, and X.

Per an Adverse Determination letter dated X, the request for X was denied by X, MD. Rationale: "In this case, the claimant is a X who reports a X on X. Documentation shows the claimant has X, X, and X. The claimant currently reports X, X, and X. The examination notes a X. The claimant X and X. There was X. An X from X reveals X or X. There are X. There is X of X and X. There is some X on the X. The provider notes X and recommends X under X. However, there is no documentation of X in the X provided X with the noted X. There is no evidence of X or X. Thus, the medical necessity of this request is not established. Recommended non-certification."

Per a Utilization Review Decision letter dated X, the prior denial was upheld by X, MD. Rationale: "ODG provides patient criteria for X including X or X and X. A request for the procedure in a X requires additional documentation of X. The claimant should be X. X should be administered using X and X of contrast for guidance. No more than X should be X per X. X not generally recommended. When required for X, a patient should remain X. In this case, the claimant is a X who reported X while X and had a X while X on X. The claimant has tried X and X. The claimant currently reports X, X, and X. Exam notes a X. The claimant X. There was X. This is X. An X from X reveals X or X. There is a X with X and X on the X. There is X of the X. The provider recommends X using a X and X, X, and an X. However, there is no documentation of X in this clinical presentation of X. The X provided does not show X. In addition, there is no evidence of X or X in a X. Thus, the requested X does not meet guidelines. Recommended non-certification."

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-certifications are upheld. There is no significant X documented on the submitted X. There is no documentation of recent or X. 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)