MDR Tracking Number: M5-03-1251-01

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 or January 1, 2003 and Commission Rule 133.305 and 133.308 titled <u>Medical Dispute Resolution by Independent</u> <u>Review Organizations</u>, the Medical Review Division assigned an IRO to conduct a review of the disputed medical necessity issues between the requestor and the respondent.

The Medical Review Division has reviewed the IRO decision and determined that **the requestor prevailed** on the issues of medical necessity. Therefore, upon receipt of this Order and in accordance with §133.308(r)(9), the Commission hereby orders the respondent and non-prevailing party to **refund the requestor \$460.00** for the paid IRO fee. For the purposes of determining compliance with the order, the Commission will add 20 days to the date the order was deemed received as outlined on page one of this order.

In accordance with §413.031(e), it is a defense for the carrier if the carrier timely complies with the IRO decision.

Based on review of the disputed issues within the request, the Medical Review Division has determined that **medical necessity was the only issue** to be resolved. The FCE and work hardening program rendered 12-26-01 to 2-25-02 were found to be medically necessary. The respondent raised no other reasons for denying reimbursement for these charges.

The above Findings and Decision are hereby issued this 23rd day of May 2003.

Dee Z. Torres Medical Dispute Resolution Officer Medical Review Division

On this basis, and pursuant to §§402.042, 413.016, 413.031, and 413.019 of the Act, the Medical Review Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to pay the unpaid medical fees in accordance with the fair and reasonable rate as set forth in Commission Rule 133.1(a)(8) plus all accrued interest due at the time of payment to the requestor within 20 days of receipt of this order. This Order is applicable to dates of service 12-26-01 through 2-25-02 in this dispute.

The respondent is prohibited from asserting additional denial reasons relative to this Decision upon issuing payment to the requestor in accordance with this Order (Rule 133.307(j)(2)).

This Order is hereby issued this 23rd day of May 2003.

Roy Lewis, Supervisor Medical Dispute Resolution Medical Review Division

RL/dzt

May 20, 2003

NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION

RE: MDR Tracking #: M5-03-1251-01

has been certified by the Texas Department of Insurance (TDI) as an independent review organization (IRO). IRO Certificate Number is 5348. Texas Worker's Compensation Commission (TWCC) Rule §133.308 allows for a claimant or provider to request an independent review of a Carrier's adverse medical necessity determination. TWCC assigned the above-reference case to _____ for independent review in accordance with this Rule.

has performed an independent review of the proposed care to determine whether or not the adverse determination was appropriate. Relevant medical records, documentation provided by the parties referenced above and other documentation and written information submitted regarding this appeal was reviewed during the performance of this independent review.

This case was reviewed by a practicing chiropractor on the _____ external review panel. The _____ chiropractor reviewer signed a statement certifying that no known conflicts of interest exist between this chiropractor and any of the treating physicians or providers or any of the physicians or providers who reviewed this case for a determination prior to the referral to _____ for independent review. In addition, the _____ chiropractor reviewer certified that the review was performed without bias for or against any party in this case.

Clinical History

This case concerns a 35 year-old male who sustained a work related injury on _____. The patient reported that while at work he was carrying an exterior 10ft. door when he slipped on a wet board. The patient reported immediately feeling pain. The patient has undergone an MRI. The patient has been treated with chiropractic care that included electric stimulation and active therapy and has also completed a work hardening program. The diagnoses for this patient included thoracic sprain/strain and cervical sprain/strain.

Requested Services

Work hardening program and FCE on 12/26/01 through 2/25/02.

Decision

The Carrier's determination that these services were not medically necessary for the treatment of this patient's condition is overturned.

Rationale/Basis for Decision

The _____ chiropractor reviewer noted that this case concerns a 35 year-old male who sustained a work related injury to his back on _____. The _____ chiropractor reviewer also noted the diagnoses for this patient included thoracic sprain/strain and cervical sprain/strain. The _____ chiropractor reviewer further noted this patient was treated with chiropractic care that included electric stimulation and active therapy and also completed a work hardening program. The _____

chiropractor reviewer explained that the office visits from 12/26/01 through 2/25/02 were reasonable and medically necessary. The ____ chiropractor reviewer also explained that patient did respond to the exam/treatment. Therefore, the ____ chiropractor consultant concluded that the work hardening program and FCE from 12/26/01 through 2/25/02 were medically necessary to treat this patient's condition.

Sincerely,