

Envoy Medical Systems, LP
(512) 705-4647
1726 Cricket Hollow Drive
(512) 491-5145
Austin, TX 78758
#

PH:

FAX:

IRO Certificate

Notice of Independent Review Decision

DATE OF REVIEW: X

IRO CASE NO. X

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)

Overtaken (Disagree) X

Partially Overtaken (Agree in part/Disagree in part)

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW

X

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY SUMMARY

This is a X patient who was injured at work on X when X was in a X. There is a diagnosis of traumatic brain injury and bilateral ankle pain with ongoing neurological functional impairments. At the time of the X, there was loss of consciousness and X was transported to the hospital where X underwent a X. X was hospitalized for X months. X was discharged home with family and received outpatient services at that time. X years ago, X moved to X and lived with X for a X months but the arrangement did not go as planned and X was placed in an X. Per assessment on X, X ambulated with a X. At the time of the assessment, X was broken and X was awaiting new X. X was showing improvement in function including being able to ambulate up to X. X was screened for X. X was noted to have X. There are notes in the chart from X that X was waiting for X. There is recommendation from the members of X interdisciplinary team that there is medical necessity to X. There is documentation that payment was processed for a X. Recommendation was made for X. Request for X was submitted. Initial request for X was denied due to X.

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

Opinion: I disagree with the benefit company's decision to deny the requested service.

ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION INCLUDE CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT THE DECISION (continuation)

Rationale:

This review pertains to the need for X. There is sufficient documentation that regardless of the status of the X, the interdisciplinary team is recommending X. There is documented improvement in X.

The requested service, **X**, is medically necessary.

**DESCRIPTION AND SOURCE OF THE SCREENING CRITERIA
OR OTHER CLINICAL BASIS USED TO MAKE THE DECISION**

ACOEM-AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OCCUPATIONAL &
ENVIRONMENTAL
MEDICINE UM KNOWLEDGE BASE

AHCPR-AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE RESEARCH &
QUALITY GUIDELINES

DWC-DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION
POLICIES OR GUIDELINES

EUROPEAN GUIDELINES FOR MANAGEMENT OF
CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN

INTERQUAL CRITERIA

**MEDICAL JUDGEMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE &
EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED
MEDICAL STANDARDS X**

MERCY CENTER CONSENSUS CONFERENCE
GUIDELINES

MILLIMAN CARE GUIDELINES

**ODG-OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT
GUIDELINES X**

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 DESCRIPTION)

OTHER EVIDENCE BASED, SCIENTIFICALLY VALID,
OUTCOME FOCUSED GUIDELINES (PROVIDE
DESCRIPTION)

Disclaimer:

The opinions rendered in this case are the opinions of this evaluator. This evaluation has been conducted on the basis of the medical documentation as provided with the assumption that the material is true, complete, and correct. If more information becomes available at a later date, then additional service, reports, or reconsideration may be requested. Such information may or may not change the opinions rendered in this evaluation. The opinion is based on a clinical assessment from the documentation provided.