INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

March 11, 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: UPHOLD.** MAXIMUS Federal Services has determined that no additional reimbursement is warranted. The Claims Administrator’s determination is upheld and the Claim Administrator does not owe the Provider additional reimbursement. A detailed explanation of the decision is provided later in this letter.

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,

Paul Manchester, M.D., M.P.H.
Medical Director

cc: [Contact Information]
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
- Partial Contractual Agreement

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 seeking remuneration for 82486 x 38 units submitted for date of service 04/17/2014.
- Pursuant to Labor Code section 5307.1(g)(2), the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers’ Compensation orders that the pathology and clinical laboratory fee schedule portion of the Official Medical Fee Schedule (OMFS) contained in title 8, California Code of Regulations, section 9789.50, has been adjusted to conform to the changes to the Medicare payment system that were adopted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) for calendar year 2013. Effective for services rendered on or after January 1, 2013, the maximum reasonable fees for pathology and laboratory services shall not exceed 120% of the applicable California fees set forth in the calendar year 2012 Clinical Laboratory Fee Schedule. Based on the adoption of the CMS payment system, CMS coding guidelines and fee schedule were referenced during the review of this Independent Bill Review (IBR) case.
- Claims Administrator denied 36 units of 89842 citing “medically unlikely edits” as the reason for denial.
- Provider submitted laboratory results for CPT 82486 documenting qualitative test results for the following drug categories: Narcotics/Analgesics, Opiates, Oxycodone, Methadone, Benzodiazepines, Barbiturates, Amphetamines, Tricyclic Antidepressants, Antidepressants, Neuropathic and Sedatives/Hypnotics and Validity Testing including; Creatinine, Nitrite, Glutaraldehyde, pH, S.G. & Oxidant/PCC.
• Provider billed laboratory services on a CMS-1500 form with CPT 82486 x 40 units along with **ICD-9 V58.83; Encounter for therapeutic drug monitoring.**
• Authorization specific to CPT 82846 could not be identified in the documentation provided for IBR.
• The Provider conducted drug screening tests utilizing urine gas/chromatography method. Historically, urine drug screens electronically measured are reported with HCPCS code G0431; “any method.”
• HCPCS code G0431 is reported with only one unit of service regardless of the number of drugs screened. The testing described by G0431 includes all CLIA high complexity urine drug screen testing as well as any less complex urine drug screen testing performed at the same patient encounter.
• HCPCS G0431: Drug screen qualitative; multiple drug classes by high complexity test method (e.g. immunoassay, enzyme assay), per patient encounter.
• EOR 09/24/2014 indicates the Provider was reimbursed $232.56, over the allowable amount for G0431.
• Based on the aforementioned guidelines, additional reimbursement is not recommended for 82846 Urine Drug Screen x 38 units.

The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: 82846 x 38 units.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Service</th>
<th>04/17/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physician Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Code</th>
<th>Provider Billed</th>
<th>Plan Allowed</th>
<th>Dispute Amount</th>
<th>Assist Surgeon</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Workers’ Comp Allowed Amt.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82846</td>
<td>$1,227.20</td>
<td>$232.56</td>
<td>$994.94</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$232.56</td>
<td>Refer to Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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