Dear [Name] of [Provider 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, MD MPH
Medical Director

cc: [Name] of [Employee Name]
DOCEMENTS 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
- National Correct Coding Initiatives
- OMFS Inpatient Services Fee Schedule

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: The reimbursement of CPT 96361, 96374, 96376 and 99219.**
- Additional reimbursement is not recommended based on the findings.
- Claims Administrator reimbursement the provider $641.77.
- Provider billed the disputed CPT codes on a UB04, bill type 137 for date of service 11/19/2014- 11/20/2014.
- The Provider billed CPT 99385 in addition to the disputed codes. The Claims Administrator issued reimbursement for CPT 99285.
- Based on the NCCI edits the following code pairs generally cannot be reported together: 96374 and 99219; 99219 and 99285.
- A qualifying modifier was not appended to the column 2 code: CPT 99219. No additional reimbursement is recommended for 99219.
- CPT 96361 and 96374 have a PC/TC status code indicator “5.”
- § 9789.12.9 Professional Component (PC)/Technical Component (TC) Indicator: “5” Incident To Codes--This indicator identifies codes that describe services covered incident to a physician's service when they are provided by auxiliary personnel employed by the physician and working under his or her direct personal supervision. These services are not payable when they are provided to hospital inpatients or patients in a hospital outpatient department. Modifiers 26 and TC cannot be used with these codes.
• CPT 99376 has a hospital status indicator of “N” and is packaged into APC rates. CPT 99376 is included in the reimbursement issued for CPT 99385.
• CPT codes 96361, 96374 and 96376 are not reimbursable when provided as an outpatient hospital service.
• These services are incident to the physician services, and no separate reimbursement is recommended.

The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Code</th>
<th>Provider Billed</th>
<th>Plan Allowed</th>
<th>Dispute Amount</th>
<th>Multiple Surgery</th>
<th>Workers’ Comp Allowed Amt.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96361</td>
<td>$383.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$34.25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DISPUTED SERVICE: See Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96374</td>
<td>$282.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$68.48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DISPUTED SERVICE: See Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96376</td>
<td>$564.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$26.95</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DISPUTED SERVICE: See Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99219</td>
<td>$4386.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$154.08</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DISPUTED SERVICE: See Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99285</td>
<td>$3083.00</td>
<td>$471.32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NOT A DISPUTED SERVICE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>