US Decisions Inc. An Independent Review Organization 3616 Far West Blvd Ste 117-501 US Austin, TX 78731 Phone: (512) 782-4560 Fax: (512) 870-8452 Email: <u>@us-decisions.com</u>

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:

Х

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW: \boldsymbol{X}

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

X who was injured on X. Per records, the injury was X. X was asked X. X was diagnosed with X.

Per utilization review dated X, it was documented that according to the X initial evaluation by X, PT, on X, there was documentation of X. There was X, X. X demonstrated X. The X factors included X. X was on X. The prior level of function was X. The ongoing level of function X. X examination revealed X.

Per records, X of the X dated X revealed a X. An X of the X dated X revealed a X. An X of the X dated X also revealed a X.

Treatment to date included medications X.

Per a utilization review adverse determination letter dated X by X, MD, the request for X. Rationale: "In this case, the patient is X. There is also a request for X. At present, claimant is undergoing X. Therefore, the request for X."

Per a utilization review reconsideration letter dated X, X, MD non-certified the request for X. Rationale: "This request is X. Previous progress notes dated X indicate that the X was X. Progress notes on X note X. It is unclear why X is needed in addition X. Without additional justification, this request for X."

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

The current request for X. The records reflect that the patient is enrolled in X. The records do not reflect that the patent is X. Furthermore, there is noted X. The requested X

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

☑ ODG- OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT GUIDELINES

□ 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

MEDICAL JUDGMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE, AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS

□ MERCY CENTER CONSENSUS CONFERENCE GUIDELINES

□ MILLIMAN CARE GUIDELINES

□ PRESLEY REED, THE MEDICAL DISABILITY ADVISOR

□ TEXAS GUIDELINES FOR CHIROPRACTIC QUALITY ASSURANCE & PRACTICE PARAMETERS

 \Box TEXAS TACADA GUIDELINES

□ TMF SCREENING CRITERIA MANUAL

□ PEER REVIEWED NATIONALLY ACCEPTED MEDICAL LITERATURE (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)

□ OTHER EVIDENCE BASED, SCIENTIFICALLY VALID, OUTCOME FOCUSED GUIDELINES (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)