January 20, 2015

Dear [Name],

MAXIMUS Federal Services has completed the Independent Bill Review (“IBR”) of the above workers’ compensation case. This letter provides you with the IBR Final Determination and explains how the determination was made.

**Final Determination: OVERTURN.** MAXIMUS Federal Services has determined that additional reimbursement is warranted. The Claims Administrator’s determination is reversed and the Claim Administrator owes the Provider additional reimbursement of $250.00 for the review cost and $1531.25 in additional reimbursement for a total of $1781.25. A detailed explanation of the decision is provided later in this letter.

The Claim Administrator is required to reimburse the Provider a total of $1781.25 within 45 days of the date on this letter per section 4603.2 (2a) of the California Labor Code. The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its expert reviewer is deemed to be the Final Determination of the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers’ Compensation. This determination is binding on all parties. In certain limited circumstances, you can appeal the Final Determination. Appeals must be filed with the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board within 20 days from the date of this letter. For more information on appealing the final determination, please see California Labor Code Section 4603.6(f).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: [CC Name]
DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Pertinent documents reviewed to reach the determination:

- The Independent Bill Review Application
- The original billing itemization
- Supporting documents submitted with the original billing
- Explanation of Review in response to the original bill
- Request for Second Bill Review and documentation
- Supporting documents submitted with the request for second review
- The final explanation of the second review
- Official Medical Fee Schedule
- Negotiated contracted rates:
- National Correct Coding Initiatives

HOW THE IBR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services Chief Coding Specialist reviewed the case file and researched pertinent coding and billing standards to reach a determination. In some cases a physician reviewer was employed to review the clinical aspects of the care to help make a determination. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/services.

ANALYSIS AND FINDING

Based on review of the case file the following is noted:

- **ISSUE IN DISPUTE**: Provider is dissatisfied with reimbursement of ML104-94.
- Claims administrator reimbursed $6125.00 indicating on the Explanation of Review “MOD Modifier billed not warranted and or documented.”
- -94 evaluation and medical-legal testimony performed by an Agreed Medical Evaluator. Where this modifier is applicable, the value of the procedure is modified by multiplying the normal value by 1.25.
- The report is obtained at the request of a party or parties, the administrative director, or the appeals board for the purpose of proving or disproving a contested claim and addresses the disputed medical fact or facts specified by the party, or parties or other person who requested the comprehensive medical-legal evaluation report. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit a physician from addressing additional related medical issues.
- Documentation reviewed included a request by the attorney dated July 3, 2014 which states “Thank you for agreeing to serve as the internal AME as between applicant and defendant.” No documentation from the claims administrator to provider requesting a QME was submitted for this review.
- Provider submitted his 30 page Comprehensive Agreed Panel Qualified Medical Evaluation as requested by attorney for which he was reimbursed.
- Based on information reviewed, reimbursement for the increased value of modifier -94 is warranted.
The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE:** Additional reimbursement of code ML 104-94 is recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Code</th>
<th>Provider Billed</th>
<th>Plan Allowed</th>
<th>Dispute Amount</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Multiple Surgery</th>
<th>Workers’ Comp Allowed Amt.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 104-94</td>
<td>$7,656.25</td>
<td>$6,125.00</td>
<td>$1,531.25</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$7,656.25</td>
<td>DISPUTED SERVICE: Allow reimbursement $1,531.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copy to:

[Redacted]

Copy to:

[Redacted]