

**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:

Upheld      (Agree)

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:**

X

**PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:**

The patient is a X who was injured on X, when the patient was working out of X.

On X, the patient was seen at X, for X. The patient's X. On exam, X was X. The X revealed the X. X appeared to be the X. X for instance had a X. X measured X. The X showed a X. A X dated X, showed X. The X of the X, however, was X.

On X, the patient was seen by X, M.D., for X. The patient had received X. X rated at X. X reported X. There was X. On exam, X. X had X. X had X. X test was X. There was X. The diagnoses were X. Plan was to X.

On X, an X performed at X showed: 1) X. X. 2) X. 3) X.

On X, an X performed at X showed: 1) X. 2)X.

On X, an X performed at X showed: 1) X. 2)X. These changes combined X. The X. X involvement. The X. Findings included appearance to X. This included an X. X of X. The X. The X. X at X. The X otherwise demonstrated X. X areas of X. X. The X. The disc X. The visualized X. X of X. X signal X. X posterior X the X. X involvement. X changes. X. X. X involvement. X changes. X to X. X: The X of the X. X involvement. X. X. X involvement. X changes. The X changes combined to produce moderate X. Both X were contacted X. X: X of X. X. The anterior-to-X X involvement. X changes. The X. Both exiting X. There were X.

On X, a X performed at X showed: 1) X. 2)X.

On X, an X performed at an X showed: 1) X. 2) X. X. 3) X.

On X, the patient was seen by X, M.D. The patient reported X. Treatment included X. X exam showed X. X was X. The diagnoses

were X.

On X, an Order Note for X was placed by Dr.X.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X. The patient was X. X reported X. Plan was to X.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X. The patient was X. Plan was to X.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X. The patient was X. X level in the X rated at X. X reported X. On exam, X had X. X to the X. X to the X. There was X. Plan was a X.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X for X. X had had X. Dr. X had referred X here as X condition had X. On exam, X was X. X was X. X were X. X was X. X on the X. X exam revealed X. X exam was X. X were X. X was X. The diagnoses were X. X and X was ordered as X.

On X, X of the X performed at X demonstrated: 1)X. 2)X. X. X.

On X, an X performed at X demonstrated: 1) X. 2)X. X. X.

On X, an X performed at X demonstrated: 1)X. 2)X.

On X, the patient was seen by Dr. X. The patient complained of X. The X was X. X complained of . X had some X. X got X. X rated X. X presented for follow-up on X. Exam showed X was X. X were X. X was X. X on the X. X was X. X was X. X were X. X was X. X and X dated X, were reviewed. The diagnoses were X. X had continued X. In light of the X on X with X, Dr. X recommended a X with X, a X.

On X, a peer review report by X, M.D., indicated the request for X. Rationale: *“Updated X on X demonstrated X. Updated X of the X on X. Given that updated X had X. Therefore, my recommendation is to X. Guidelines: Guidelines/references: X. ODG by X. X was X. X was X. See X). Indications for X -X: 1)X. 2)X . 3)X. 4) X. 5 X. 6)X. 7)X. 8) X. 9)X. 10)X. 11)X. ODG by X. Recommended for X. X patients to X. See X);X ; and X for X, where X is X. GUIDELINES/REFERENCES: X- ODG by X. Recommended for X. X has X. See X.”*

Per Utilization Review dated X, the request for X: *“A peer reviewer has reviewed the X. This is to notify X.*

On X, correspondence by Dr. X indicated the patient was being followed for X. Ms. X reported that the X. X had ordered X and post X. X was seen on X, and reported X was better but X. Therefore, as the patient had X. The X was X performed on X that showed the X. It was of due process of X on “X” by Dr. X. The X was X. It would be seen how the patient was X.

On X, a Peer Review Report by X, M.D., indicated the X. Rationale: *“ X. Peer review performed on X, non-certified the request for X. It was noted that the patient X. Updated X. In response, the provider submitted a letter dated X, noting that the patient was X. X has been ordered as the patient X. The additional information was appreciated. However, the provider X. This patient is X. The patient recently X, While the patient had X. X have documented that the X. The X noted that the X. The X noted X. In addition, the provider noted that, as of X, the patient noted X. This is X. In light of X, additional X. Therefore, my recommendation is X.”*

Per Reconsideration dated X, the request for X: *“This letter is to X. The medical records and the request X.*

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

**DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE:**  
X.

The analysis of the records by the X. The requesting provider has 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**