

MDR: Tracking Number M5-03-1999-01

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 Medical Dispute Resolution by Independent Review Organizations, 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(q)(9), the Commission hereby orders the respondent and non-prevailing party to **refund the requestor \$450.00** 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 office visits, psychological services, FCE and analysis of information were found to be medically necessary. The physical therapy was not found to be medically necessary. The respondent raised no other reasons for denying reimbursement for these office visits, psychological services, FCE and analysis of information charges.

This Finding and Decision is hereby issued this 30th day of July 2003.

Carol R. Lawrence
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 from 4/12/02 to 9/6/02 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 30th day of July 2003.

Roy Lewis, Supervisor
Medical Dispute Resolution
Medical Review Division

RL/crl

July 28, 2003

Re: Medical Dispute Resolution
MDR #: M5-03-1999-01
IRO Certificate No.: IRO 5055

___ has performed an independent review of the medical records of the above-named case to determine medical necessity. In performing this review, ___ reviewed relevant medical records, any documents provided by the parties referenced above, and any documentation and written information submitted in support of the dispute.

The independent review was performed by a matched peer with the treating health care provider. This case was reviewed by a physician who is Certified in Chiropractic Medicine.

Clinical History:

This male claimant was injured in an occupational accident on ___. He sought chiropractic care, and was off work from 12/12/00 through 01/30/01. He was treated with passive modalities and released from care at the end of January 2001.

In July 2001, his symptoms gradually began to return, and he sought care on 10/26/01. Additional imaging and electrodiagnostic testing were performed at that time. MRI's of the thoracic spine, right shoulder, and cervical spine were essentially normal, except for some mild degenerative changes. Nerve testing revealed a mild carpal tunnel syndrome, and no motor radiculopathy from C-5 to T-1.

Disputed Services:

Office visits, physical therapy, psychological services, FCE, and analysis of information during the period of 04/12/02 through 09/06/02.

Decision:

The reviewer partially agrees with the determination of the insurance carrier and is of the opinion that physical therapy was not medically necessary. The office visits, psychological services, FCE, and analysis of information were medically necessary in this case.

Rationale:

The office visits were reasonably performed to assess the patient's condition and allow the treating doctor to manage the case. It appears the majority of the patient's symptoms were due to psychogenic origin. The patient did meet the criteria as set forth in the *Mental Health Guidelines* for psychological services. The FCE's were administered to record the progress of the patient's condition. Analysis of information was needed to manage the patient's case.

The physical therapy records provided show no significant evidence of progress/gain made with the physical therapy dispensed prior to the disputed therapy. Therefore, the physical therapy during the period in question was not medically necessary.

I am the Secretary and General Counsel of ___ and I certify that the reviewing healthcare professional in this case has certified to our organization that there are no known conflicts of interest that exist between him and any of the treating physicians or other health care providers or any of the physicians or other health care providers who reviewed this case for determination prior to referral to the Independent Review Organization.

Sincerely,