# THIS DECISION HAS BEEN APPEALED. THE FOLLOWING IS THE RELATED SOAH DECISION NUMBER:

## SOAH DOCKET NO. 453-03-2988.M5

## MDR Tracking Number: M5-03-0057-01

Under the provisions of Section 413.031 of the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, Title 5, Subtitle A of the Texas Labor Code, effective January 1, 2002 and Commission Rule 133.305 and 133.308 titled <u>Medical Dispute Resolution by Independent Review Organizations</u>, the Medical Review Division (Division) assigned an IRO to conduct a review of the disputed medical necessity issues between the requestor and the respondent.

The Division has reviewed the enclosed IRO decision and determined that **the requestor did not prevail** on the issues of medical necessity. The IRO agrees with the previous determination that physical therapy was not medically necessary. Therefore, the requestor is not entitled to reimbursement of the IRO fee.

Based on review of the disputed issues within the request, the Division has determined that physical therapy fees were the only fees involved in the medical dispute to be resolved. As the treatment was not found to be medically necessary, reimbursement for dates of service from 1/25/02 to 1/28/02 is denied and the Division declines to issue an Order in this dispute.

This Decision is hereby issued this 21st day of March 2003.

Noel L. Beavers Medical Dispute Resolution Officer Medical Review Division

NLB/nlb

## IRO Certificate #4599

## NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION

March 14, 2003

## Re: IRO Case # M5-03-0057-01

Texas Worker's Compensation Commission:

has been certified as an independent review organization (IRO) and has been authorized to perform independent reviews of medical necessity for the Texas Worker's Compensation Commission (TWCC). Texas HB. 2600, Rule133.308 effective January 1, 2002, allows a

claimant or provider who has received an adverse medical necessity determination from a carrier's internal process, to request an independent review by an IRO.

In accordance with the requirement that TWCC assign cases to certified IROs, TWCC assigned this case to \_\_\_\_\_ for an independent review. \_\_\_\_\_ has performed an independent review of the proposed care to determine if the adverse determination was appropriate. For that purpose, \_\_\_\_\_ received relevant medical records, any documents obtained from parties in making the adverse determination, and any other documents and/or written information submitted in support of the appeal.

The case was reviewed by a Doctor of Chiropractic who is licensed by the State of Texas. He or she has signed a certification statement attesting that no known conflicts of interest exist between him or her and any of the treating physicians or providers, or any of the physicians or providers who reviewed the case for a determination prior to referral to \_\_\_\_\_ for independent review. In addition, the certification statement further attests that the review was performed without bias for or against the carrier, medical provider, or any other party to this case.

The determination of the \_\_\_\_\_ reviewer who reviewed this case, based on the medical records provided, is as follows:

### <u>History</u>

The patient was injured on \_\_\_\_\_. She reported repetitive-use injury to her hands on this date. Treatment began on 7/8/98 and continued through December, 2002.

<u>Requested Service</u> Chiropractic care 8/24/01, 1/25/02 and 1/28/02

## Decision

I agree with the carrier's decision to deny the requested treatment.

## Rationale

The patient has received extensive chiropractic care, injections, medication, pain management, occupational therapy and surgery. Treatment has been ongoing for approximately three years with very little documented relief of her symptoms. The patient was reported to have reached MMI on 1/5/99. After 1/5/99 all further treatments should have been reasonable and effective in relieving symptoms or improving function. The documentation from the treating chiropractor fails to show substantive, continued measures of improvement. The doctor failed to show how the disputed services were necessary.

This medical necessity decision by an Independent Review Organization is deemed to be a Commission decision and order.

Sincerely,