C-IRO Inc.

Notice of Independent Review Decision

Case Number: 348563

Date of Notice: 11/10/2022

C-IRO Inc. An Independent Review Organization 3616 Far West Blvd Ste 117-501 CI Austin, TX 78731 Phone: (512) 772-4390 Fax: (512) 387-2647 Email: <u>@ciro-site.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:

⊠ Overturned Disagree

□ Partially Overtuned Agree in part/Disagree in part

⊠ 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: \boldsymbol{X}

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]: X who was injured on X. The mechanism of injury was X. The diagnosis was X On X, X, MD evaluated X in a follow-up visit. Overall, X stated X symptoms were X. X was X. Previous history of X. X was told by X that X had X. X had to X. symptoms remained X. Daily X was described as X. X used a X. X had a X. The examination noted X. X was X. X showed X. X was X. The assessment was X. As X had X, Dr. X discussed X. X would X. X had been X revealed X: 1.X. 2.X. 3.X. 4.X. 5.X. Treatment to date included X Per a utilization review adverse determination letter dated X, the request for X with X Dr. X & assistant X with X was X by X, MD. Rationale: "This X. Exam findings demonstrate X. The claimant has X. However, X. X were X. Therefore, this request is X. Recommend X. This Is based upon this reviewer's X. Because an adverse determination for X Per a reconsideration review adverse determination letter dated X, the request for X with X Dr. X & assistant X with X : X was X by X, MD. This review pertains to the request of X. Regarding the request for X Dr. X & assistant X with X, ODG conditionally X. Recommended as an X, as indicated. X recommended in X. Based on the medical documentation presently available for review, the above-noted reference X. The current X examination findings are X. The current documentation showed X. X to X. As such, the request for X Dr. X & assistant X with X. Because an adverse determination for X The requested X. The records X. In addition, the X report demonstrates at the X. At X, there is X. There is X. The X do X. However, the X report X. In addition, the patient has X. Thus, the X. X with X Dr. X & assistant X with X: X is X

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

The requested X. The records X. In addition, the X report demonstrates at the X. At X, there is X. There is X. The X do X. However, the X report X. In addition, the patient has X. Thus, the X. X with X Dr. X & assistant X with X: X is 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 X

□ 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)