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 $1,536.00 in additional reimbursement for a total of $1,786.00. A detailed explanation of the decision is provided later in this letter.

The Claim Administrator is required to reimburse the Provider a total of $1,786.00 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,

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

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
- PPO Contract: 60%

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 full remuneration for Functional Restoration Program services, billed as Unlisted Procedure Code 97799-86 x 15 units, for date of service 09/09/2014 – 09/12/2014.

- The Claims Administrator reimbursed the Provider $489 of $3,375.00 on with the following rational: “The Official Medical Fee Schedule does not list this code. An allowance has been made for a comparable code.” Code reassignment is 97750 Physical Performance Test.

- EOR Reflects Multiple Procedure Discount Applied by Claims Administrator for 97750.

- Modifier -86: OMFS “This Modifier is used when prior authorization was received for services that exceed OMFS ground rules.”

- OMFS allows for Unlisted Procedure Codes to be reimbursed by “By Report.”

- §9789.12.4 (c) “In determining the value of a By Report procedure, consideration may be given to the value assigned to a comparable procedure or analogous code. The comparable procedure or analogous code should reflect similar amount of resources, such as practice expense, time, complexity, expertise, etc. as required for the procedure performed.”

- There is no allowance listed under the OMFS for the billed procedure code 97799 or, more specifically, a Functional Restoration Program, and a CPT Code has yet to be formulated for this comprehensive program.
• CPT 97750, applied by the Claims Administrator, is not a “comparable” procedure to Functional Restoration as Functional Restoration Programs require a comprehensive approach in controlling pain and, most importantly, a CPT Code has yet to be formulated for Functional Restoration Programs.

• Request for Authorization, dated 06/30/2014 states the Provider’s usual and customary fee for the 160 hour Functional Restoration Program.

• Authorization for Functional Restoration Program presented for IBR, dated 07/08/2014, signed by Physician Reviewer, indicates treatment is “authorized” and “expires 11/30/2014.” Criteria for Modifier -86 met.

• Recommend reimbursement for 1 unit of 97799-86 representing dates of service 09/09/2014 – 09/12/2014.

• Partial one Contractual Agreement provided for IBR, entitled “Fee for Service Rates,” for “Unlisted Procedures,” reflect “60% of Providers Usual and Customary Fee. The 95% indicated on the contract refers to deductions taken from “unit value” and “conversion factors” for established CPT Codes. CPT 97799 is a By Report Code without a comparable procedure. As such, the contractual reimbursement defaults to the ‘Unlisted Procedure,’ reimbursement terms.

The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: Based on the aforementioned documentation and guidelines, additional reimbursement is warranted for 97799-86**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Service</th>
<th>09/09/2014 – 09/12/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physician Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Code</td>
<td>Provider Billed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97799 - 86</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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