June 6, 2005

DEE TORRES
TEXAS WORKERS COMP. COMISSION
AUSTIN, TX 78744-1609

CLAIMANT: ___
EMPLOYEE: ___
POLICY: M2-05-1669-01
CLIENT TRACKING NUMBER:

Records Received:

RECORDS RECEIVED FROM THE STATE:
Notification of IRO Assignment dated 5/17/05, 10 pages

RECORDS RECEIVED FROM RESPONDENT:
TWCC Work Status Report, 12/4/03, 2/4/04, 3/4/04, 4/14/04, 3/21/05, undated, 5 pages
William F. Farley DC report dated 7/30/04, 3pages; Addendum dated 8/26/04, 1 page
Report from Glen Lakes Clinic, Inc dated 12/3/04, 3 pages
TWCC Report of Medical Evaluation dated 12/4/03, 4/14/04, 6/22/04, 7/30/04, 10/21/04, illegible, undated, 6 pages
MMI Uma Gullapalli, MD 10/21/04, 6 pages
North Texas Neurosurgical Consultants Interval History dated 7/23/04, 1 page
Letter from Medical Equation, Inc dated 9/8/04, 2 pages
IME Michael Ciepritu MD 3/2/04, 5 pages
MRI of the cervical spine report dated 3/24/04, 2 pages
MRI of brain dated 3/24/04, 1 page
Jacob Rosenstein, MD H&P dated 4/14/04, 3 pages
Jacob Rosenstein, MD notes, 5/10/04, 6/7/04, 7/27/04, 1/13/05, 1/3/05, 8 pages
Go!Rehab report 11/29/03, 5 pages
Consultation, Marty Hall, DC dated 2/4/04, 5 pages
EMG/NCV/EP reports, Marty Hall, DC dated 2/4/05, 1 page
Phyllis Frostenson, MD radiology reports 3/24/04, 4 pages
FCE, Highpoint Rehabilitation Institute dated 6/21/04, 14 pages
William Farley, DC, Amended report dated 7/30/04
HighPoint Physical Therapy progress note dated 6/14/04, 2 pages
Psychodiagnostic Interview dated 12/18/03, 4 pages

(continued)

Diagnostic lab reports, ER notes, drug screen dated 10/10/03, 5 pages
CT Scan report dated 10/11/03, 1 page
Arlington Ophthalmology exam dated 10/12/03, 1 page
SOAP note dated 12/2/03, 12/3/03, 11/6/03, 11/10/03, 11/11/03, 11/12/03, 11/13/03, 11/17/03, 11/18/03, 11/19/03, 11/20/03, 11/24/03, 11/25/03, 11/26/03, 12/1/03, 12/10/03. 12/18/03, 12/23/03, 12/29/(03?), 12/30/03, 12/31/03, 1/5/04, 1/6/04, 1/21/04, 1/22/04, 2/22/04, 23 pages
Highpoint PT Discharge Summary, 6/16/04, 2 pages
Intracorp Nurse's Chronological List of Submitted Records date 8/5/04, 2 pages
Letter from Farrukh Hamid, MD, Intracorp dated 7/28/04, 2 pages
Highpoint PT Notes/Progress Reports, 5/26/04, 5/28/04, 6/1/04, 6/2/04, 6/4/04, 6/9/04, 6/11/04, 14 pages
Highpoint PT Cervical Evaluation dated 5/24/04, 2 pages
MRI, cervical spine dated 1/8/04, 1 page
Authorization to release information dated 1/8/04, 1 page
Radiology report, DNI dated 4/30/04, 1 page
Go!Rehab report dated 2/27/04, 5 pages
Neuropsychological Evaluation, Bob Gant PhD dated 2/2/04, 5 pages
Initial Evaluation, Injury Care Center dated 11/4/03, 2 pages
Neuropsychological Evaluation, Bob Gant PhD dated 12/18/03, 4 pages
Records from Arlington Memorial Hospital, 10/10/03, 17 pages
Letter from John Obermiller, MD dated 9/8/04, 2 pages
Referral for EDX testing dated 2/5/04, Mary Hall, DC, 1 page
TWCC-69 Report of Medical Evaluation, 10/28/04, 7/30/04
Functional Exam dated 2/20/04, 6 pages

RECORDS RECEIVED FROM PROVIDER:
Follow-up examination, Jacob Rosenstein, MD dated 5/2/05, 2 pages
Follow-up notes, Jacob Rosenstein, MD dated 3/17/05 and 3/21/05, 2 pages

Summary of Treatment/Case History:
This 66 year old male had head and neck injury ___. He was treated with medication and physical therapy and improved. He returned to work July 2004. The pain recurred November 2004. He was treated with pain medication and trigger point injections and released to work 5/2/05 with restrictions. A request for a CT cervical spine was denied 3/29/05 for lack of information needed as opposed to other imaging studies such as MRI for evaluation of soft tissue abnormalities and nerve root compromise. The appeal was denied 4/19/05 as the results of CT were already known. The diagnosis is calcified central disc protrusion C5-6, left sided neck pain, right occipital neurites and post traumatic positional vertigo.

Questions for Review:
1. Pre authorization denied for cervical CT scan C1-T1. Is this medically necessary?

(continued)

Conclusion/Decision to Not Certify:

1. Pre authorization denied for cervical CT scan C1-T1. Is this medically necessary?

This reviewer can only agree with two of the previous denials. The prior CT showed a calcified disc at C5-6 and there is little doubt that will change. If Dr. Rosenstein thinks there has been further damage to nerve roots or even dislocation then he has not stated so. If he submits indications that there may be such a case then of course CT MRI and other tests might be needed. In view of information showing Dr. Rosenstein has released patient back to work then I doubt that this is the case. Also as one denial stated an MRI might be a better test than CT for soft tissue as well as nerve damage, and I would agree to this statement.

As the patient has improved since last flare up of pain and has returned to work taking only non narcotic medication then there is no need for further testing at this time.

References Used in Support of Decision:

Chapman's Orthopedics 3rd Edition 2001 Section VIII The Spine, Disc Injury and Degeneration Chapter 143 on Cervical Disc disease and Subsection on Diagnostic Testing Pages 3751-3752.

The specialist providing this review is board certified in Neurosurgery. The reviewer has served as the chief Neurosurgeon at several VA Hospitals throughout the country. The reviewer is a member of the American Medical Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American Paraplegia Society, Congress of Neurological Surgeons and the American Association of Neurosurgeons. The Reviewer has served as an association professor, assistant professor and clinical instructor at the university level. The reviewer also has publishing, presentation and research experience within their specialty. The reviewer has been in active practice for over 20 years.

MRIoA is forwarding this decision by mail, and in the case of time sensitive matters by facsimile, a copy of this finding to the treating provider, payor and/or URA, patient and the TWCC.

It is the policy of Medical Review Institute of America to keep the names of its reviewing physicians confidential. Accordingly, the identity of the reviewing physician will only be released as required by state or federal regulations. If release of the review to a third party, including an insured and/or provider, is necessary, all applicable state and federal regulations must be followed.

Medical Review Institute of America retains qualified independent physician reviewers and clinical advisors who perform peer case reviews as requested by MRIoA clients. These physician reviewers and clinical advisors are independent contractors who are credentialed in accordance with their particular specialties, the standards of the American Accreditation Health Care Commission (URAC), and/or other state and federal regulatory requirements.

(continued)

The written opinions provided by MRIoA represent the opinions of the physician reviewers and clinical advisors who reviewed the case. These case review opinions are provided in good faith, based on the medical records and information submitted to MRIoA for review, the published scientific medical literature, and other relevant information such as that available through federal agencies, institutes and professional associations. Medical Review Institute of America assumes no liability for the opinions of its contracted physicians and/or clinician advisors. The health plan, organization or other party authorizing this case review agrees to hold MRIoA harmless for any and all claims which may arise as a result of this case review. The health plan, organization or other third party requesting or authorizing this review is responsible for policy interpretation and for the final determination made regarding coverage and/or eligibility for this case.

1160275.1
ss

cc: requestor and respondent