INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

December 23, 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.

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]

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
- Official Medical Fee Schedule
- Negotiated contracted rates: PPO Contract Agreement
- 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 reimbursement of DRG 493
- Claims Administrator reimbursed $11145.00 indicating on the Explanation of Review “This charge was adjusted to comply with the rate and rules of the contract indicated.”
- Maximus requested a copy of the PPO contract between Provider and Claims Administrator.
- Claims Administrator submitted documentation showing pricing per the PPO contract agreement between the Provider and Claims Administrator for DRG 493. Provider did not submit a copy of the contract or any documentation regarding a negotiated rate for DRG 493.
- Based on information reviewed, Claims Administrator indeed reimbursed DRG 493 according to the contract agreement. Therefore, no further reimbursement is warranted for DRG 493.
The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: Reimbursement of code 493 is not recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Service: 3/18/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient Services</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>DRG 493</td>
<td>$75279.35</td>
<td>$11145.00</td>
<td>$11256.81</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DISPUTED SERVICE: No reimbursement Recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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