



## **Texas Department of Insurance**

### **Division of Workers' Compensation**

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • [www.tdi.texas.gov](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

## **MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION**

### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

**Requestor Name**

Selina Brittain, DC

**Respondent Name**

Texas Mutual Insurance Company

**MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-15-0251-01

**Carrier's Austin Representative**

Box Number 54

**MFDR Date Received**

September 17, 2014

### **REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "The following bill was audited incorrectly...Rule 134.204, Subsection (J), Subsection (4), Subparagraph (C), (ii), (II). This rule states if a full physical evaluation, with range of motion is performed, reimbursement for the first musculoskeletal body area is \$300.00...."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$150.00

### **RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "The following is the carrier's statement with respect to this dispute of 2/14/2014 to 2/14/2014. The requestor, as Designated Doctor, performed MMI and IR exams of the claimant on the date above and then billed Texas Mutual one unit of code 99456-W5-WP. The requestor placed the claimant in DRE category I. For this reason, according to Rule 134.204(j)(4)(C)(ii)(I), Texas Mutual paid the requestor \$150.00 for the DRE model found in the AMA Guides 4<sup>th</sup> edition. However, the requestor seeks reimbursement for the method used at (j)(4)(C)(ii)(II) because (II)(-a-) states 'If full physical evaluation, with range of motion, is performed...\$300 for the first musculoskeletal body area...' In Appeal No. 022509-s, decided November 21, 2002, the Panel stated: 'If the physician cannot decide into which DRE category the patient belongs, the physician may refer to and use the ROM Model, which is described in Section 3.3j (p. 112). (p. 99). Using the procedures of that model, the physician combines an impairment percent based on the patient's diagnosis with a percent based on the patient's spine motion impairment and a percent based on neurologic impairment, if it is present. (p. 99). The physician uses the estimate determined with the ROM Model to decide placement within one of the DRE categories. (p. 99). The proper DRE category is the one having the impairment percent that is closest to the impairment percent determined with the ROM Model. (p. 99).' The requestor's documentation shows that he used range of motion as a differentiator to place the claimant in a DRE category. While the Guides do allow for use of the Range of Motion Model as a differentiator to place the claimant in a DRE category, the requestor's documentation does not reflect use of the Range of Motion model but only use of range of motion. If the requestor had used the Range of Motion model then his documentation would show the DRE category as the one having the impairment percentage closest to the impairment percentage of the Range of Motion model. (j)(4)(C)(ii)(II) must be referring to the Range of Motion model. Otherwise the regulatory agency's interpretation of the 4<sup>th</sup> Edition regarding the use and relationship of the two models is incorrect. Nowhere in the pertinent sections of the Guides does it indicate simple range of motion per se is sufficient as a differentiator to clarify the DRE category. No additional payment is due for the range of motion."

**Response Submitted by:** Texas Mutual Insurance Company, 6210 E. Hwy 290, Austin, Texas 78723

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
February 14, 2014	Impairment Rating of a Musculoskeletal Body Area	\$150.00	\$150.00

## **FINDINGS AND DECISION**

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

### **Background**

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.204 sets out fee guidelines for Workers' Compensation specific services.
3. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
  - CAC-W1 – Workers Compensation State Fee Schedule Adjustment
  - 790 – This charge was reimbursed in accordance to the Texas Medical Fee Guideline.
  - CAC-193 – Original payment decision is being maintained. Upon review, it was determined that this claim was processed properly.
  - 891 – No additional payment after reconsideration.

### **Issues**

1. What is the applicable rule for determining reimbursement for the disputed services?
2. What is the total allowable amount for the impairment rating of the spine?
3. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

### **Findings**

1. This dispute involves a Designated Doctor Impairment Rating (IR) evaluation of the spine, with reimbursement subject to the provisions of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.204(j)(4)(C)(ii), which states that "The MAR for musculoskeletal body areas shall be as follows. (I) \$150 for each body area if the Diagnosis Related Estimates (DRE) method found in the AMA Guides 4th edition is used. (II) If full physical evaluation, with range of motion, is performed: (-a-) \$300 for the first musculoskeletal body area."

The Division notes that the document titled Medical Dispute Resolution Newsletter, No: 4, March 2005, submitted by the requestor in support of its request is not applicable to the services in dispute. This article titled Billing and Reimbursement for an Impairment Rating: ROM vs. DRE discusses former §134.202, which is not applicable to the disputed service. The applicable rule is, as stated above, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.204 adopted to be effective March 1, 2008, 33 TexReg 36.

2. According to the explanation of benefits and the respondent's position statement, the total of \$150.00 was reimbursed by the carrier for the IR of the spine. The carrier alleges that this amount was appropriately calculated based upon §134.204(j)(4)(C)(ii)(I).

The requestor disagrees. In its position, the requestor argues that the carrier should have allowed a total of \$300.00 for the impairment rating of the spine because it asked for reimbursement based upon §134.204(j)(4)(C)(ii)(II)(-a-)[emphasis added]. In order for the requestor to be reimbursed pursuant to rule §134.204(j)(4)(C)(ii)(II)(-a-), the health care provider, in this case, was required to perform a full physical evaluation with range of motion of the spine.

Review of the submitted documentation finds that a full physical evaluation and range of motion were performed on the spine. The provider documents: "**A full physical examination with range of motion was performed of the lumbar spine.** [emphasis added] ... After considering the above differentiators, the examinee's subjective symptoms and the medical records, it is determined the examinee's injury is best rated under DRE (Diagnosis Related Estimate) Category I, for 0% whole person impairment of the lumbar spine..." The Division concludes that the impairment rating of the spine is allowed at \$300.00 in accordance with the requirements of §134.204(j)(4)(C)(ii)(II)(-a-).

3. The division concludes that the total allowable for the impairment rating of the spine is \$300.00. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$150.00 for the IR of the spine. Based upon the documentation submitted, additional reimbursement in the amount of \$150.00 is recommended.

**Conclusion**

This decision is based upon a review of all the evidence presented by the parties in this dispute. Even though all the evidence was not discussed, it was considered. For the reasons stated above, the Division finds that the requestor has established that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$150.00.

**ORDER**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code Sections 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute. The Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor the amount of \$150.00 plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this Order.

**Authorized Signature**

	Laurie Garnes	November 25, 2014
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

**YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to seek review of this decision in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, effective May 31, 2012, *37 Texas Register 3833*, **applicable to disputes filed on or after June 1, 2012.**

A party seeking review must submit a **Request to Schedule a Benefit Review Conference to Appeal a Medical Fee Dispute Decision** (form **DWC045M**) in accordance with the instructions on the form. The request must be received by the Division within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. The request may be faxed, mailed or personally delivered to the Division using the contact information listed on the form or to the field office handling the claim.

The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §141.1(d).

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**