

**MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.**

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



---

**INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION**

November 19, 2015

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

IBR Case Number:	CB15-0001969	Date of Injury:	10/23/2015
Claim Number:	[Redacted]	Application Received:	10/23/2015
Claims Administrator:	[Redacted]		
Date(s) of service:	08/11/2015		
Provider Name:	[Redacted]		
Employee Name:	[Redacted]		
Disputed Codes:	29897		

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: N/A
- 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 seeking remuneration for code 29897, **Arthroscopy, ankle (tibiotalar and fibulotalar joints), surgical; debridement, limited.**
- Claims Administrator denied code indicating on the Explanation of Review “Number of services exceed Utilization Agreement” and “Payment based on individual pre-negotiated agreement for this specific service.”
- RFA was not submitted for review.
- Authorization dated 07/22/2015 indicates “Left ankle arthroscopic limited debridement/synovectomy with peroneal tenosynovectomy longus and brevis with excision of peroneal tubercle to be done at Provider’s Center/Approved by Physician Advisor.” CPT codes to be billed were not identified on the Authorization
- Provider billed codes 29897, 28120, 27680 x 2 on a CMS 1500 with place of service 24.
- Provider was reimbursed for all codes except 29897.
- Operative Report submitted for date of service 8/11/2015 **DOCUMENTS** services performed as: 1.tenosynovectomy of the peroneus longus and peroneus brevis, 2. excision of peroneal tubercle on the calcaneus and 3. synovectomy of the anterior hyperplastic synovium.
- Not identified anywhere in the operative report is a service of debridement, removal of dead, damaged tissue, which Provider requested and billed.

- Based on lack of documentation to support billed code 29897, reimbursement of code is not warranted.

The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: Reimbursement of code 29897**

<b>Date of Service:</b> 08/11/2015							
<b>Physician Services</b>							
<b>Service Code</b>	<b>Provider Billed</b>	<b>Plan Allowed</b>	<b>Dispute Amount</b>	<b>Assist Surgeon</b>	<b>Multiple Surgery</b>	<b>Workers' Comp Allowed Amt.</b>	<b>Notes</b>
29897	\$805.78	\$0.00	\$805.78	N/A	N/A	\$0.00	<b>Refer to Analysis</b>

Copy to:

██████████  
 ██████████  
 ██████████

Copy to:

██  
 ██  
 ██