I-Resolutions Inc. An Independent Review Organization 3616 Far West Blvd Ste 117-501 IR Austin, TX 78731

Phone: (512) 782-4415 Fax: (512) 790-2280

Email: @i-resolutions.com

Notice of Independent Review Decision

Review Outcome

Description of the service or services in dispute:

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

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 with a date of injury of X. X sustained X.

X was seen by X on X for a follow-up of X. X complained of X. X had undergone X. A X was performed by X on X. X determined that X had not reached X. Furthermore, X agreed that X needed further X. On examination of the X, X was noted. There was X. X revealed X of X, X, and X and X. X dated X revealed X or X.

X underwent X by X on X for X. X stated that X had X with X, but the X. X revealed X. The X was X at X. Examination of the X reveals a X. X was not assessed due to X and X. X to X were noted over the X and X.

Treatment to date included X.

Per a Utilization Review decision letter dated X, the request for X was denied by X. Rationale: "The ODG recommends X. The provided documentation indicates the X sustained X. While not all previously authorized X were completed, it is likely the prior authorization has expired; however, there is no indication the X is unable to proceed with X given the completion of X. Based on available information, X is not necessary."

In a letter dated X, X explained the medical necessity for X. X continued to exhibit X. Although, X had completed X at another facility, X continued to exhibit X that X, but X. X was unable to X, and utilized X when X. X was X on the X due to X.

Per an Adverse Determination letter dated X, the prior denial was upheld by X. Rationale: "Per the Official Disability Guidelines, "Allow for X of treatment frequency (from X to X), X. X: Medical treatment: X: X" In this case, the claimant has X. X has had X with only X. Additional sessions would exceed guidelines. There is no contraindication to X. Therefore, 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-certifications are upheld. The request for X would exceed the Official Disability Guidelines. When treatment X exceeds the guidelines, exceptional factors should be noted. There are no exceptional factors of delayed recovery documented. The patient has completed X and

should be capable of continuing to X and X with X. Given the documentation available, the requested service(s) is considered 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
V	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)