DECISION AND ORDER

This case is decided pursuant to Chapter 410 of the Texas Workers’ Compensation Act and Rules of the Division of Workers’ Compensation adopted thereunder.

ISSUES

A contested case hearing was held on December 10, 2009 to decide the following disputed issue:

Is the preponderance of the evidence contrary to the decision of the Independent Review Organization (IRO) that Claimant is not entitled to a RS-LSO brace for the compensable injury of __________?

PARTIES PRESENT

Petitioner/Claimant appeared and was assisted by JT, ombudsman. Respondent/Carrier was represented by RJ, attorney, who appeared by telephone.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Documentary evidence indicates that Claimant slipped and fell at work in 2007 and has had back pain that has failed to improve with treatment.

Carrier denied two requests for Claimant to have a RS-LSO brace, relying on the Official Disability Guidelines (ODG). In September of 2009, an IRO reviewer upheld the previous adverse determinations. The reviewer, a physician who is board certified in physical medicine and rehabilitation, as well as in pain management and electrodiagnostic medicine, relied on (1) the ODG and (2) the reviewer's medical judgment, clinical experience and expertise in accordance with accepted medical standards. The IRO reviewer wrote that the ODG did not support a request for a brace for an indefinite period in the treatment of back pain. The reviewer noted that Claimant's request for the brace was for an indefinite period and not for a trial period.

Claimant testified that he read the determination of the IRO to mean that he should have a RS-LSO brace for a one month trial period.

Texas Labor Code Section 408.021 provides that an employee who sustains a compensable injury is entitled to all health care reasonably required by the nature of the injury as and when needed. Health care reasonably required is further defined in Texas Labor Code Section 401.011 (22a) as health care that is clinically appropriate and considered effective for the injured employee's injury and provided in accordance with best practices consistent with evidence based medicine or, if evidence based medicine is not available, then generally accepted standards of medical practice recognized in the medical community. Health care under the Texas Workers' Compensation system must be consistent with evidence based medicine if that evidence is available. Evidence based medicine is further defined in Texas Labor Code Section 401.011 (18a) to be the use of the current best quality scientific and medical evidence formulated from
credible scientific studies, including peer-reviewed medical literature and other current scientifically based texts and treatment and practice guidelines. The Commissioner of the Division of Workers' compensation is required to adopt treatment guidelines that are evidence-based, scientifically valid, outcome-focused and designed to reduce excessive or inappropriate medical care while safeguarding necessary medical care. Texas Labor Code Section 413.011(e). Medical services consistent with the medical policies and fee guidelines adopted by the commissioner are presumed reasonable in accordance with Texas Labor Code Section 413.017(1).

In accordance with the above statutory guidance, the Division of Workers' Compensation has adopted treatment guidelines by Division Rule 137.100. This rule directs health care providers to provide treatment in accordance with the current edition of the ODG, and such treatment is presumed to be health care reasonably required as defined in the Texas Labor Code. Thus, the focus of any health care dispute starts with the health care set out in the ODG. Also, in accordance with Division Rule 133.308 (t), "A decision issued by an IRO is not considered an agency decision and neither the Department nor the Division are considered parties to an appeal. In a Contested Case Hearing (CCH), the party appealing the IRO decision has the burden of overcoming the decision issued by an IRO by a preponderance of evidence-based medical evidence."

For lumbar supports, the ODG provides the following:

- Not recommended for prevention. Under study for treatment of nonspecific LBP. Recommended as an option for compression fractures and specific treatment of spondylolisthesis, documented instability, or post-operative treatment. There is strong and consistent evidence that lumbar supports were not effective in preventing neck and back pain. (Jellema-Cochrane, 2001) (van Poppel, 1997) (Linton, 2001) (Assendelft-Cochrane, 2004) (van Poppel, 2004) (Resnick, 2005) Lumbar supports do not prevent LBP. (Kinkade, 2007) Among home care workers with previous low back pain, adding patient-directed use of lumbar supports to a short course on healthy working methods may reduce the number of days when low back pain occurs, but not overall work absenteeism. (Roelofs, 2007) Acute osteoporotic vertebral compression fracture management includes bracing, analgesics, and functional restoration, and patients with chronic pain beyond 2 months may be candidates for vertebral body augmentation, ie, vertebroplasty. (Kim, 2006) An RCT to evaluate the effects of an elastic lumbar belt on functional capacity and pain intensity in low back pain treatment, found an improvement in physical restoration compared to control and decreased pharmacologic consumption. (Calmels, 2009) A systematic review on preventing episodes of back problems found strong, consistent evidence that exercise interventions are effective, and other interventions not effective, including stress management, shoe inserts, back supports, ergonomic/back education, and reduced lifting programs. (Bigos, 2009) See also Back brace, post operative (fusion).

For back brace, the ODG provides the following:

- Under study, but given the lack of evidence supporting the use of these devices, a standard brace would be preferred over a custom post-op brace, if any, depending on the experience and expertise of the treating physician. There is conflicting
evidence, so case by case recommendations are necessary (few studies though lack of harm and standard of care). There is no scientific information on the benefit of bracing for improving fusion rates or clinical outcomes following instrumented lumbar fusion for degenerative disease. Although there is a lack of data on outcomes, there may be a tradition in spine surgery of using a brace post-fusion, but this tradition may be based on logic that antedated internal fixation, which now makes the use of a brace questionable. For long bone fractures prolonged immobilization may result in debilitation and stiffness; if the same principles apply to uncomplicated spinal fusion with instrumentation, it may be that the immobilization is actually harmful. Mobilization after instrumented fusion is logically better for health of adjacent segments, and routine use of back braces is harmful to this principle. There may be special circumstances (multilevel cervical fusion, thoracolumbar unstable fusion, non-instrumented fusion, mid-lumbar fractures, etc.) in which some external immobilization might be desirable. (Resnick, 2005)

Claimant did not present evidence based medical evidence contrary to the decision of the IRO. Even though all the evidence presented was not discussed, it was considered. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are based on all of the evidence presented.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The parties stipulated to the following facts:
   
   A. Venue is proper in the (City) Field Office of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers’ Compensation.
   
   B. On __________, Claimant, who was the employee of (Employer), sustained a compensable injury.

2. Carrier delivered to Claimant a single document stating the true corporate name of Carrier, and the name and street address of Carrier’s registered agent, which document was admitted into evidence as Hearing Officer’s Exhibit Number 2.

3. A RS-LSO brace is not health care reasonably required for the compensable injury of __________.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers’ Compensation, has jurisdiction to hear this case.

2. Venue is proper in the (City) Field Office.

3. The preponderance of the evidence is not contrary to the decision of the IRO that a RS-LSO brace is not health care reasonably required for the compensable injury of __________.
DECISION

Claimant is not entitled to a RS-LSO brace for the compensable injury of __________.

ORDER

Carrier is not liable for the benefits at issue in this hearing. Claimant remains entitled to medical benefits for the compensable injury in accordance with §408.021.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is ZURICH AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY
701 BRAZOS STREET, SUITE 1050
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-3232

Signed this 10th day of December, 2009.

CAROLYN F. MOORE
Hearing Officer