

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

Provide a description of the review outcome that clearly states
whether **medical necessity exists** for **each** of the health care
services in dispute.

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW:
TDI: X

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

The patient is a X who was injured on X, while X for X. A X.

On X, a X and interpreted by X, M.D. The study showed: 1) X. 2) X. 3) X. 4) X. 5) X. 6) X.

On X, X were performed at X and interpreted by Dr. X. The study showed X.

On X, the patient was seen by X, D.O., for X. X had X. Peer doctor's opinion was X. The doctor had X. The X. This was an X. This was a X. This procedure should have X. There was X. The most X. X had marked X. As result of the X, X was requiring X.

On X, Lab Report from X indicated X.

On X, an X was performed at X, MD PA and interpreted by Dr. X. The X study was X. The X study was X.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X for X. X symptoms were X. The X study in summary while X. X had X. X had X. X was to X with Dr. X.

On X, the patient was seen by X, M.D., for X. The patient complained of X. X reported X. X felt X. X job was likely X. X related that X. X had to X. X had X. X frequently X. On exam, the X. X was X. X of X. X and X. There was X. X were X. X had X. The diagnoses were X. Plan was to X.

On X, the patient was seen by X, M.D., for X. The patient X. X also presented with X. X described further situation where X. Dr. X evaluated X and recommended X. X presented on X, with a X. X reported X. Dr. X also reported X. Dr. X went on to state that as a result of the X. While the X study X, Dr. X did quality findings with

the statement "X." X was X. X was seen in X, when X reported that X. X had X. Specifically, X described X. X had been X, by Dr. X. X reported that X was X. Dr. X evaluated X on X, and X. On exam, there was X. There was X. X significant X. The diagnoses were X. A X back to Dr. X was provided.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X for X. X were X. X continued to have X. X was X. A X utilizing an X. It was the X in the X. X was already X. X had X. X did have X. X did X. X approach, X.

On X, a lab report from X showed X.

On X, a Peer Review by X, M.D., indicated the request for X. In this case, X did X. Furthermore, X noted to X. On peer-to-peer, Dr. X could X. Also, Dr. X reported that X. X care should X. Therefore, the request for X.

Per Utilization Review dated X, the request for X: *"UR Determination: The prospective request for X. Explanation of findings: X. In this case, X. On peer-to-peer, Dr. X could X. Also, Dr, X reposted that X. X should X. Therefore, the request for X. References used in support of decision – X. Last review/update date: X. X. X must be corroborated by X."*

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X. The patient had X. X had X. X was looking for X, Dr. X reported that X. X had X. X was X. Objectively, X. X had X. X had X. X was X.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X. X was X. X reported that X. X particularly noted X. X continued to work in a X. X had noted X. X described further a situation X. On exam, there was X. The diagnoses were X.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X. Dr. X had X. The patient has had X. X had at X. X was on a X. X was X. X cannot X. X had X. X had X. X had X. X did X. Further X. X was on X. X was X. X did not X. X was X. X affect was X.

On X, a X Review Request from X indicated the procedure of X.

On X, a Peer Review by Dr. X indicated the request for X. In this case, there was X. There was X. Finally, a plan for X was noted, so there would be X. The request was X. Therefore, the requested X.

Per Utilization Review dated X, the prospective request for X: *"The prospective request for X. EXPLANATION OF FINDINGS - X. In this case, there is X. There is X. The request is X. Therefore, the requested X. REFERENCES USED IN SUPPORT OF DECISION - ODG by X- Last review/update date: X. X."*

On X, a correspondence from X indicated X had received a request for reconsideration (appeal) of an adverse utilization review determination related to the patient. Reconsideration request receipt date was X.

On X, a Peer Review by X, M.D., indicated the request for X. The patient sustained an injury on X. X was diagnosed with a X. There were X. As such, there was X. Therefore, the requested X.

Per Reconsideration dated X, the prospective request for X: "UR Determination - The appeal request for X. EXPLANATION OF FINDINGS - X. The injured worker is a X who sustained an injury on X. The injured worker was diagnosed with a X. There are X. As such, there is X. Therefore, the requested X. Clinical summary requested. N/A. REFERENCES USED IN SUPPORT OF DECISION: ODG by X. Last review/update date: X. Body system: X.

Treatment type: X Related Topics: See the X. See also X. Conditionally Recommended X. Recommended on a X as a X. X at a level X; X are not X. This treatment should be X. X are X. ODG Criteria - While only X: Patient criteria for X: (1) X.

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

The consideration for X. The X is outlined X. The X are outlined below. In this reviewer's opinion, the patient X. However, the X. Moreover, the ODG criteria clearly states X. X is outlined for a X. X is X, but X. Therefore, the request for X.

X, a X of the X was performed at X and interpreted by X, M.D. The study showed: 1) X. 2) X: 3) X. 4) X. 5) X.

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

**XODG- OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT
GUIDELINES**