

**CALIGRA MANAGEMENT, LLC
344 CANYON LAKE
GORDON, TX 76453
817-726-3015 (phone)
888-501-0299 (fax)**

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:

X

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

X who was injured on X, when X.

On X, the patient was seen by X, M.D., for X. Pain described as X. The X

factors included X. X factor was X. X was referred by X. Notes available from X indicated current treatment had included X. On exam, X. The foot was in X. The X was X. X appeared X. The diagnoses were X. A X. X was instructed to X. X was also instructed to X. A X of the X. A X was ordered due to X. X was prescribed. Plan for X. X was continued on X.

On X, an X performed at X showed: 1) X. X was seen. 2) There was X. 3) Otherwise, X.

On X, a Prospective Review by X, M.D., indicated the X.

Per Utilization Review dated X, the request for X: *“Based on the review of the provided documentation, the patient had complaints of X. According to the most recent note, the patient had X. X. An X-X revealed X. However, there is X. As such, the requested X. ODG by X, “X.”*

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X for a work-related injury to the X. X had been in a X. X symptoms have X. X of the X was reviewed. On exam, the X. There continued to be some X.

The diagnosis was X. Plan was to proceed with X. X.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X for X. The patient was status X. On exam, X. X showed X. Preoperative diagnosis was X. Planned procedure was X. X prescription was for X.

On X, Dr. X performed X. The X diagnosis was X.

Per Reconsideration dated X, the request for X: *“The ODG supports X. The ODG supports a X. The ODG does X. Medical literature supports X. In this circumstance, the worker reports X. A X exam documented X. X documented X. Treatment has included X. The provider recommended an X. There is a request for X. When noting that there is X. As such X. ODG X.”*

On X, a Retrospective Review by Dr. X indicated when noting that there was X. As such, X.

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

Per review of Dr. X records:

- Dr. X did X. Although the X.
- Dr X did X.
- Dr. X operative report (X) identified a “X” consistent with the X.

Per review of the X:

- X.

Per the UR of Dr. X:

- Denied the request for X.” However, the X had been performed X. There is X. The X report should have X. Thus, Dr. X opinion for X.

Per the UR of Dr.X:

- Denied the request for X.” This opinion based on X: Dr. X did X. This opinion is X. Moreover, the X report confirmed the X.

The X opinion (Dr. X) appears to have been (X), which was the X. The X report X (by Dr. X and/or the Carrier). Although X, current X would likely have produced a X (X) undermines X. Thus, X.

The X (Dr. X) is X.

The X report was X.

The X was documented by Dr. X on X. This document is X.

In this case, all parties appear to have X. Prospectively, this would X. However, it is evident that the X.

Respecting the X, it appears that this X. Although a X test is X, Dr. X documented this finding, which is a X. Thus, it is reasonable to consider, X.

X

However, there is no evidence in the X. Thus, there is X. Thus, it is reasonable to consider, in X.

X

A DESCRIPTION AND THE SOURCE OF THE SCREENING CRITERIA OR OTHER CLINICAL BASIS USED TO MAKE THE DECISION:

X ODG- OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT GUIDELINES