

I-Resolutions Inc.
An Independent Review Organization
3616 Far West Blvd Ste 117-501 IR
Austin, TX 78731
Phone: (512) 782-4415
Fax: (512) 790-2280
Email: @i-resolutions.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:

X

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

X who was injured on X. X was X. The diagnosis was X.

On X, X was seen by X, DO for X. X gave a X. X had X. However, X had X. An X of the X was indeed X. Additionally, X had a X. X was X. X were X. Despite that, X was X. X risk for X. X intake X. X had tried X. On examination, there was X. X had X. There was X. X were noted in the X. The assessment included X. X prognosis was X. Dr. X opined X. Getting X. X was prescribed. Per a follow-up note dated X by Dr. X, X continued to have X. X had a X. X had X. X had tried X. X was even on X. Both reasons for X. If the peer doctor X. It was X. X and X do X. X on the other hand had X. X had X. Dr. X spent X.

An X of the X dated X revealed X. At X, a X. At X, there was a X. At X, X. At X, there was a X.

Treatment to date included X.

Per a peer review dated X and a utilization review adverse determination letter dated X, the request for X: “The Official Disability Guidelines discusses X. X are generally X. Such X are recommended X. The medical records X. With that said, it is not clear that the injured worker has X. A rationale at this time for a X is X. The request should be X. The request for X.”

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

The claimant has X. The submitted clinical records indicate that the claimant has X. X has X. X also continues on X. There are X documented on X. Based on the available records, the request for 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**
- 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)**