

MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.

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



INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

May 25, 2016

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

IBR Case Number:	CB16-0000655	Date of Injury:	02/29/1996
Claim Number:	[REDACTED]	Application Received:	04/20/2016
Assignment Date:	05/19/2016		
Claims Administrator:	[REDACTED]s		
Date(s) of service:	11/13/2015 – 11/13/2015		
Provider Name:	[REDACTED]		
Employee Name:	[REDACTED]		
Disputed Codes:	76942		

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,
MAXIMUS

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

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 seeking remuneration for 76942 Ultrasonic guidance services utilized for Pain Pump Refill needle placement (eg, biopsy, aspiration, injection, localization device), with imaging supervision and interpretation services, performed on 11/13/2015.**
- The Claims Administrator denied reimbursement with the following rationale: “Medical necessity has not been established for this procedure.”
 - EORs do not reflect denial due to mutually exclusive procedure.
 - EORs do not indicate procedure not reflected in documentation.
 - EORs do not indicate procedure rarely performed.
 - EORs indicate “Medical Necessity” was not established.
- **Administrative Rules § 9792.6.** Utilization Review Standards – Definition (a) “Authorization” means assurance that appropriate reimbursement will be made for an approved specific course of proposed medical treatment to cure or relieve the effects of the industrial injury pursuant to section 4600 of the Labor Code, subject to the provisions of section 5402 of the Labor Code, based on either a completed “Request for Authorization,” DWC Form RFA, as contained in California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 9785.5, or a request for authorization of medical treatment accepted as complete by the claims administrator under section 9792.9.1(c)(2), that has been transmitted by the treating physician to the claims administrator. Authorization shall be given pursuant to the timeframe, procedure, and notice requirements of California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 9792.9.1, and may be provided by utilizing the indicated response section of the “Request for

Authorization,” DWC Form RFA if that form was initially submitted by the treating physician.

- **Authorization** for 76942 **not submitted** for IBR.
- **Administrative Rules Article 5.5.0. § 9792.5.7.** Requesting Independent Bill Review (b) Unless as permitted by section 9792.5.12, **independent bill review shall only be conducted if the only dispute between the provider and the claims administrator is the amount of payment owed to the provider.** Any other issue, including issues of contested liability or the applicability of a contract for reimbursement rates under Labor Code section 5307.11 shall be resolved before seeking independent bill review.
- **Based on the aforementioned documentation and guidelines, determination Upheld for 79642 as IBR is unable to determine issues of medical necessity.**

The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: CPT 76942

Date of Service: 11/13/2015							
Physician Services							
Service Code	Provider Billed	Plan Allowed	Dispute Amount	Assist Surgeon	Units	Workers' Comp Allowed Amt.	Notes
76942	\$495.39	\$0.00	\$89.35	N/A	1	\$0.00	Refer to Analysis

Copy to:

[Redacted]

Copy to:

[Redacted]