

**MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.**

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



---

**INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION**

January 15, 2015

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

IBR Case Number:	CB14-0001511	Date of Injury:	06/08/2009
Claim Number:	[REDACTED]	Application Received:	10/09/2014
Claims Administrator:	[REDACTED]		
Assigned Date:	11/12/2014		
Provider Name:	[REDACTED]		
Employee Name:	[REDACTED]		
Disputed Codes:	22830-22 x 2, 22852-22 x 4 and 64550-22 x 4		

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,

[REDACTED]  
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: 5% PPO Discount
- National Correct Coding Initiatives
- Medically Unlikely Edits

## 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 codes 22830 x 2, 22852 x 4 and 64550 x 4.
- The CMS developed Medically Unlikely Edits (MUEs) to reduce the paid claims error rate for Part B claims. An MUE for a HCPCS/CPT code is the maximum units of service that a provider would report under most circumstances for a single beneficiary on a single date of service. Codes 22830, 22852 and 64550 all show Medically Unlikely Edits with values of one (1). Therefore, additional reimbursement is not warranted.
- Provider billed each code with modifier -22 and asking for the increased value. The operative report was reviewed by the Maximus medical director who concluded: "In this case removal of previously placed posterior instrumentation means one dissects down thru the scar. The explanatory statement does not elucidate how this was more unusual than ordinary to justify use of the modifier 22. The fractured pedicle screw was not totally removed. Documentation does not justify use of modifier 22." Therefore, additional reimbursement for modifier -22 applied to codes is not warranted.

The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: Reimbursement of codes 22830-22 x 2, 22852-22 x 4 and 64550-22 x 4 is not recommended.**

<b>Date of Service: 01/14/2014</b>							
<b>Physician Services</b>							
<b>Service Code</b>	<b>Provider Billed</b>	<b>Plan Allowed</b>	<b>Dispute Amount</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Multiple Surgery</b>	<b>Workers' Comp Allowed Amt.</b>	<b>Notes</b>
22830	\$3349.40	\$1909.16	\$1440.24	2		\$0.00	<b>DISPUTED SERVICE:</b> No reimbursement recommended.
22852	\$2859.06	\$1086.44	\$1772.62	4		\$0.00	<b>DISPUTED SERVICE:</b> No reimbursement recommended.
64550	\$28.52	\$14.45	\$ 14.07	4		\$0.00	<b>DISPUTED SERVICE:</b> No reimbursement recommended.

Copy to:

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

Copy to:

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]