

MedHealth Review, Inc. 422 Panther Peak Drive Midlothian, TX 76065 Ph 972-921-9094 Fax (972) 827-3707

#### **Notice of Independent Review Decision**

### DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE

A DESCRIPTION OF THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH PHYSICIAN OR OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER WHO REVIEWED THE DECISION

#### **REVIEW OUTCOME**

Upon independent review the reviewer finds that the previous adverse determination/adverse determinations should be:

### INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

This case is regarding a X who sustained an X on X and is seeking authorization for a X. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is X. Per the progress note dated X, the injured worker was

X. Previous treatment has included X. Previous X included X.

X testing of the X dated X had X.

Progress report dated X has the injured worker with X. The X with X. The exam reveals X. There is a X. The treatment plan included an X. X was X.

The Utilization Review dated X. The rationale stated the records noted that the claimant received prior X. The total number of X.

X testing dated X has X. There is X. Overall X and these X.

Utilization review dated X. The rationale stated it is X. X to X. There is X.

Progress report dated X has the injured worker with X. There is X. The exam of the X. There is a X. X is X. The treatment plan included X.

Progress report dated X has the injured worker X. X has been X. X does X. The exam reveals X. There are X. There is X. X is X. X is X. The X studies were noted to X. The treatment plan included X.

Designated Doctor's Examination dated X has the injured worker with X. The symptoms are X. The pain is X. The pain radiated X. Associated symptoms

include X. X wakes in the X. X factors include use of X. X chief complaints are X. Either the X. X is able to X. Typically, the X. X has X. X is about X. X also has X. The symptoms are the X. The exam revealed a X. X were all X. X was X. X was performed at X. There was X. X is X. X was X. X was X. The X was X. X was noted to X.

Progress report dated X has the injured worker X. X reports X. X. The exam of the X. The treatment plan included X.

Appeal Request Denial dated X. The rationale stated current X. It is X. Additionally, X.

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

This is X who is undergoing treatment for X. X presented on X with X. There is X. The exam of the X. There is a X. X is X. However, detailed documentation is X. The documentation does X. Additionally, the exam findings X. Moreover, the X testing dated X was noted to be an X. There is X. Therefore, 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
AHRQ- AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH & QUALITY GUIDELINES
DWC- DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION POLICIES OR GUIDELINES
EUROPEAN GUIDELINES FOR MANAGEMENT OF X PAIN
INTERQUAL CRITERIA
MEDICAL JUDGEMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS
MERCY CENTER CONSENSUS CONFERENCE GUIDELINES
MILLIMAN CARE GUIDELINES

ODG- OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELIN & TREATMENT GUIDELINES	1ES
PRESSLEY REED, THE MEDICAL DISABILITY ADVISOR	
TEXAS GUIDELINES FOR CHIROPRACTIC QUALITY ASSURANCE & PRACTICE PARAMETERS	
TMF SCREENING CRITERIA MANUAL	
PEER REVIEWED NATIONALLY ACCEPTED MEDICAL LITERATURE (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)	
OTHER EVIDENCE BASED, SCIENTIFICALLY VALID, OUTCOME FOCUSED GUIDELINES (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)	