

MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.

Independent Bill Review
P.O. Box 138006
Sacramento, CA 95813-8006
Fax: (916) 605-4280



INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

July 2, 2015

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

IBR Case Number:	CB15-0000630	Date of Injury:	1/28/2014
Claim Number:	[REDACTED]	Application Received:	4/22/2015
Claims Administrator:	[REDACTED]		
Date Assigned:	5/21/2015		
Provider Name:	[REDACTED]		
Employee Name:	[REDACTED]		
Disputed Codes:	29823-RT-59		

Dear [REDACTED]

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: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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:
- National Correct Coding Initiatives
- Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Outpatient Prospective Payment System (OPPS)

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 denial of code 29823-RT-59
- Claims Administrator denied code indicating on the Explanation of Review “This procedure is included in another procedure performed on this date” and “Recommendation of payment has been based on a procedure code which best describes services rendered”
- 29823 - Arthroscopy, shoulder, surgical; debridement, extensive
- Provider billed code 29823 along with code 29807 which was reimbursed by Claims Administrator.
- As a pair code exists between codes 29823 and 29807, generally these two codes are not billed together. However, modifier indicator shows ‘1’ which states if an approved modifier is appended to the column two code and documentation is submitted to support billed code, then the edit may be overridden.
- Modifiers may be appended to HCPCS/CPT codes only if the clinical circumstances justify the use of the modifier. A modifier should not be appended to a HCPCS/CPT code solely to bypass an NCCI edit if the clinical circumstances do not justify its use.
- Provider did bill code with an approved modifier.
- Provider’s Operative Report documents “A motorized shaver was used to debride the chondral surface to complete the chondroplasty...”

- Documentation does not indicate procedure performed was ‘extensive’ and therefore, reimbursement of 29823 is not warranted.

The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: Reimbursement of code 29823-RT-59

Date of Service: 11/19/2014						
Service Code	Provider Billed	Plan Allowed	Dispute Amount	Multiple Surgery	Workers' Comp Allowed Amt.	Notes
29823	\$7582.57	\$0.00	\$2656.97	N/A	\$0.00	DISPUTED SERVICE: Reimbursement is not recommended

National Correct Coding Initiative information:

File	Column 1	Column 2	Modifier
Hospital APC Version 20.2	29807	29823	Allowed

Copy to:

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

Copy to:

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]