IRO Express Inc. An Independent Review Organization 2131 N. Collins, #433409

Arlington, TX 76011 Phone: (682) 238-4976

Fax: (888) 519-5107

Email: @iroexpress.com

Notice of Independent Review Decision

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:

X

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW:

Χ

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

X is a X who was injured on X. X was X. The diagnoses were X. According to an office visit conducted via telemedicine by X on X, X was seen for complaints of X with X to the X. X continued to report X. X had X. It X to the X and X. X reported X while X and X. The X was rated X. It was X and X. Aggravating factors included X. X had undergone X. The X affected the X. Examination of the X revealed X. X were X present. X and X were noted to be X on the X. X at the X at the X, X and X, and X was X. X was X on the X. X was X over the X. Per X, X continued to have progression of X with X to X and X. X had a X before X symptoms. X had tried X with X and X to no X. X reported X symptoms were X. X had subjective and objective X. There was X with X and X. X and X of the X showed no X. X opted to proceed with X as X had exhausted conservative management. X recommended X.

X of the X dated X demonstrated following findings: at the X, there was X causing X. At the X, there was a X causing X. An X of the X dated X revealed X. No X was noted. Treatment to date included X. Per a peer review and utilization review adverse determination letter dated X by X, the request for X was noncertified. Rationale: "This X request is not supported. Guidelines only recommend a X procedure if there are X symptoms that correlate with examination findings and imaging studies. Although this X has complaints of X symptoms and there are X findings on physical examination, no official X report is provided indicating the presence of any X." Per a peer review dated X and a reconsideration review adverse determination letter dated X by X, the prospective request for reconsideration review of X was noncertified. Rationale: "The Official Disability Guidelines only supports a X of the X if there are complaints of X and X as well as corresponding findings on X and physical examination. No official X report is provided indicating the presence of any X involvement at X to support a X at this X. This request is not medically necessary."

ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION INCLUDE CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT THE DECISION:

The request for X, was reviewed. Previously, the requested X was denied due to the lack of a X report. The available records did include a X report which noted a X which contributed to X. The MRI findings do correlate with the claimant's physical exam findings that noted X. The claimant had X.

Given the evidence of a X that had X and the imaging findings, it is this reviewer's opinion that medical necessity for the X, is established.

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
☐ 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)
\square PEER REVIEWED NATIONALLY ACCEPTED MEDICAL LITERATURE (PROVIDE ADESCRIPTION)
\square PRESLEY REED, THE MEDICAL DISABILITY ADVISOR
☐ TEXAS GUIDELINES FOR CHIROPRACTIC QUALITY ASSURANCE & PRACTICE PARAMETERS
☐ TMF SCREENING CRITERIA MANUAL