INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

November 6, 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 Assigned: 08/26/2014

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:
**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: none
- National Correct Coding Initiatives
- Other: CMS Claims Processing Transmittal 100-04-178; CMS 1997 Documentation Guidelines for Evaluation and Management Services; 2013 CPT published by AMA

**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**: Office visit CPT code 99214 down coded to a CPT code 99213.
- Based on review of the medical record documentation the office visit code 99213 is upheld.
- The patient presented with one condition that was not improving. History and Examination were detailed and medical decision making was low. Per CMS Claims Processing Manual the “medical necessity of a service is the overarching criterion for payment in addition to the individual requirements of a CPT code. It would not be medically necessary or appropriate to bill a higher level of evaluation and management service when a lower level of service is warranted. The volume of documentation should not be the primary influence upon which a specific level of service is billed.”
The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE:** Reimbursement of code: 99214

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Code</th>
<th>Provider Billed</th>
<th>Plan Allowed</th>
<th>Dispute Amount</th>
<th>Assist Surgeon</th>
<th>Multiple Surgery</th>
<th>Workers' Comp Allowed Amt.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99214</td>
<td>$124.78</td>
<td>$76.49</td>
<td>$48.29</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$76.49</td>
<td>DISPUTED SERVICE: Deny higher level E/M Service 99214. No additional reimbursement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copy to:

[Redacted]

Copy to:

[Redacted]