C-IRO Inc. An Independent Review Organization 3616 Far West Blvd Ste 117-501 CI Austin, TX 78731 Phone: (512) 772-4390 Fax: (512) 387-2647 Email: @ciro-site.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: \boldsymbol{X}

Information Provided to the IRO for Review

Patient Clinical History (Summary)

X is a X who was injured on X when X was X. X was diagnosed with X.

X was seen by X, DO from X through X. On X, X presented for evaluation and treatment of X. Incidentally, X had X and X in X. X reported X. At the time, the X was rated at X affecting X. X was X that indicated X. Examination revealed X. X had X. X to the X also X. X was X with X. X extending into the X or X were also noted with X. The assessment included X. On X, X presented for further care regarding X. Based on X findings, there was X. The X was described as X and X in nature. It was X at the X, rated at X. Treatment plan was to proceed with X. On X, X more on the X than the X. Dr. X commented that "X are going to recommending X. Unfortunately, the peer doctor apparently did not review our notes or dictations and apparently X is not familiar with X. X initiates care after X, X, X, X, which this gentleman all had does not succeed with X. X are not talking about X or X. Furthermore, it is standard of care in the local, national and world communities as X have practiced this specialty for X to provide X in the X. This is not X. This is X to provide a still X field in which the X can appropriately address the X in the X."

An X of the X was performed on X for X with X and X to the X. The study revealed X. There was X. X and X of the X were noted.

Treatment to date included X.

Per a Utilization Review Decision letter dated X, the request for X was denied by X, MD. Rationale: "In this case, the X presented with X. The X does complain of X that X into the X and X to the X. There is a request for X. There is also a request for X. There is no documentation of exceptional factors to support X outside of current evidence-based guideline recommendations that specifically indicate a lack of support for this procedure. Therefore, the requested X is non-certified."

Per an Adverse Determination letter dated X, the request for X was denied by X, MD. Rationale: "There are no documented extenuating circumstances to support an exception to the guidelines. Furthermore, this is not a procedure that would routinely warrant monitored X care. Therefore, the request for X is not shown to be medically necessary."

Analysis and Explanation of the Decision include Clinical Basis, Findings and Conclusions used to support the decision. The treating provider is requesting X. The records note X which X into the X and X to the X. The patient has X and therefor the request for X, is supported as 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)