

US Decisions Inc.  
An Independent Review Organization  
3616 Far West Blvd Ste 117-501 US  
Austin, TX 78731  
Phone: (512) 782-4560  
Fax: (512) 870-8452  
Email: [@us-decisions.com](mailto:@us-decisions.com)

***Notice of Independent Review Decision  
Amended Letter***

***Review Outcome***

***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 is a X who was injured on X. The mechanism of injury was not available in the records provided. The diagnosis was X. X had a history of X.

An office visit note dated X was documented by X, MD. X returned for a follow-up of X. X reported X and stated X. X had X and presented to review it. X continued to have X. X reported X was X. X was X and was X. Pain was to X and X. On examination, the X showed X, X showed X, X, and X. X in X. The X was reviewed. The assessment was X. The plan was to X as it was medically necessary. X was recommended. X was to continue X and follow-up in X. X, evaluated X on X. X had X. X reported X. X would X. X rated the pain X. X had been given X. X reported X. X had X. On examination, X was noted to be X. There was X. X showed X. X showed X. X and X were X and painful. It was documented that X had X. X overall X was X. X continued to X. X were X. However, the X was not X for X. The X highly recommended that X continued to X. X was highly indicated to X. Per X note dated X, Dr. X prescribed X to help X with X. This was noted to be medically necessary.

Per the office visit note dated X, X showed X. There was X and no evidence of X.

Treatment to date X.

Per a utilization review adverse determination letter dated X, X, MD denied the request for X. Rationale: X. In this case, claimant has X. There is no documentation of X. Therefore, X is not medically necessary.”

An appeal letter dated X from X documented that the X had been recommended for X as treatment for X. The X had been X and prescribed by X, MD per the attached X notes and X. X was X, for which Dr. X recommended X. Despite continued X, X continued to X per the attached clinical notes from Dr. X. The X was the best remaining option for X and to avoid the need for X. X can be categorized as X. X was the X and X of X. A recent study reported that X. The X is the only X treatment option that would benefit X. At the time, the request was medically necessary.

Per a utilization review adverse determination letter dated X, the appeal request for X was denied by X, MD. Rationale: X. Therefore, X is not medically necessary for X to X.

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

The ODG recommends the use of X as a X if X. In this situation, the ODG recommends the use of X for X. The provided documentation indicates the X is X. The date of X is not documented. X note indicates X since the injury date with X. There is no indication of how long the injured worker X and there is no documentation of X. As such, X is not medically necessary.

***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)