INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

November 7, 2014

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.

IBR Case Assigned: 12/26/203

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]
Chief Coding Reviewer

cc: [Name]
DOCSUENTS 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
- Med. Legal Official Medical 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:** Provider disputing reimbursement for Med Legal services dated 12/26/2013. Provider billed for ML104 services, Claims Administrator down-coded the service based on the following reason: “ML104 changed to ML103 better defining services performed.”
- ML104 OMFS “4 or more complexity factors.”
  - Records review performed by unrecognized examiner.
  - Medical Record Review performed by “L.V.N.,” this reviewer is not recognized under Section 139.2 of the Labor Code
- Abstracted elements from provided documentation did not identify four complexity factors; Three Complexity Factors identified to support a ML103 service.
The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE:** Based on the aforementioned guidelines and documentation, reimbursement for ML104 services is not warranted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Service: 12/26/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Table" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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