INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

January 26, 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,

[Name]
Medical Director

cc: [Names]
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 denial of code 76942 - Ultrasonic guidance for needle placement (e.g., biopsy, aspiration, injection, localization device), imaging supervision and interpretation.
- Claims Administrator denied code indicating on the Explanation of Review “Payment for this charge is not recommended without a statement documenting medical necessity.”
- Based on review of the Secondary Treating Physician’s Progress Report, Provider performed a pump analysis, refill and reprogramming.
- Provider’s report was reviewed by Maximus’ Medical Director whose conclusion determined that “vast majority of pumps are refilled in the office/home without ultrasound” and therefore, not medically necessary for CPT 76942.
- Based on information reviewed, reimbursement of CPT 76942 is not warranted.
The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE:** Reimbursement of code 76942 is not recommended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Service: 04/18/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physician Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Code</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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