

The diagnosis is soft tissue injuries to the supporting structures of his back, resulting in myofascial injury of a mild degree, the result of little haemorrhages, bruises and tears in muscles, tendons and ligaments. There should be complete recovery by the end of the year. His condition and symptomatology resulted from him being tossed about at the time of the rear end collision.

2. Does he suffer a substantial or complete inability to perform his pre-accident duties?

The answer is NO. He has minor residual pain, which is restricting him minimally from doing the laundry, pushing the vacuum and things like that but as the Occupational Therapist identified in her Work Test of October, he should be capable of doing these things successfully now.

3. Does the claimant require any further treatment as a result of the accident? If yes, please comment on the nature, frequency and duration.

I have explained this in the above outline. The answer is YES - until the end of the year. It should consist of the type of treatment he has been receiving at the chiropractor until the present, but it should not and must not include any manipulation of his neck or his back. He could attend on two occasions a week until the end of the year. In addition, if deep-water hydrotherapy can be located for him at some facility in Scarborough, he could attend there twice a week again until the end of the year. This is not absolutely essential, but it would facilitate the recovery process.

4. Is the treatment currently being given medically responsible?

The answer is YES, except for any back or neck manipulation procedures that are being done.

5. Is the medication, if any, currently being taken, or prescribed, medically necessary and required as a result of the MVA? Are there any adverse side effects that would affect his return to pre-accident activities or treatment?

The answer is Tylenol would be an appropriate therapeutic analgesic but the patient is not taking it.

6. Please comment on pre-existing conditions and what degree the accident had in exacerbating them.

The answer is NONE.

7. Does the pre-morbid history suggest or imply that he should have been physically restricted or limited to his functional ability to perform his pre-accident activities before the accident? Please identify the restrictions/limitations.