



IRO Certificate No: X

Notice of Workers' Compensation Independent Review Decision

Date of Notice: X

TX IRO Case #: X

X

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE: X.

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW: X

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]: The patient is a X. On X, the patient was seen for a follow up visit related to a work compensation injury. The date of injury was last X. Patient continues to complain of neck and lower back pain with pain scale of X. The patient's previous therapies are X last X.

The patient is tentatively scheduled for X on X, still with pending authorization.

On X, the request for X does not meet the criteria. The medical necessity of the request was not demonstrated. There are no findings on MRI at the level to be X.





On X, a letter of appeal was sent. The writer stated that the patient has met medical and necessary criteria for the approval of X.

On X, the determination for the request of X was upheld. The requested medical treatment does not meet established criteria for medical necessity.

1) Is the requested X medically necessary?

Answer: No, the request for X is not medically necessary.

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

The ODG criteria for X.

0.

In this case, the patient is a X who had injury on last X. Patient continues to complain of neck and lower back pain with pain scale of X. The patient's previous therapies are X last X. X was recommended. The ODG criteria for X.

For this matter, based on the review of the medical records, current literature, and ODG guidelines used. The requested procedure is not supported by the guidelines cited, as there is insufficient evidence to establish the safety and efficacy of X. The ODG criteria states that X is not recommended to be performed at X. Therefore, the request for X does not meet medical necessity and previous determination should be upheld.

SOURCE OF REVIEW CRITERIA:





Med	dicine UM Knowle	dgebase	
	AHRQ – Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality Guidelines		
	DWC - Division of Workers' Compensation Policies or		
Gui	delines		
	European Guidelines for Management of Chronic Low Back		
Pair	n		
	Interqual Criteria		
	Medical Judgment, Clinical Experience, and Expertise in		
Acc	ordance with Acce	epted Medical Standards	
	Mercy Center Consensus Conference Guidelines		
	Milliman Care Guidelines		
\boxtimes	ODG- Official Disability Guidelines & Treatment Guidelines		
	Presley Reed, the Medical Disability Advisor		
	Texas Guidelines for Chiropractic Quality Assurance & Practice		
Par	ameters		
	TMF Screening Criteria Manual		
	Peer Reviewed Nationally Accepted Medical Literature		
(Pr	ovide a Description	n)	
X	Other Evidence Based, Scientifically Valid, Outcome Focused		
Gui	delines (Provide a	Description)	
X.			
REV	VIEW OUTCOME:		
Upo	on independent re	view, the reviewer finds that the previous	
adv	erse determinatio	n/adverse determinations should be:	
\boxtimes	Upheld	(Agree)	
	Overturned	(Disagree)	
	Partially Overturned (Agree in part/Disagree in part		





ATTESTATIONS:

• X.

The clinical reviewer states the following: X

Credentials, Knowledge & Experience X.

Financial Incentives

X.

Independence

X.

Conflict of Interest

■ X