



## 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 | F: (512) 804-4811 | (800) 252-7031 | TDI.texas.gov | @TexasTDI

## MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

### GENERAL INFORMATION

**Requestor Name**

Austin Pain Associates

**Respondent Name**

Texas Mutual Insurance Co

**MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-16-0172-01

**Carrier's Austin Representative**

Box Number 54

**MFDR Date Received**

September 21, 2015

### REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "the codes billed are current accepted 2015 Laboratory CPT Codes, have their own allowed amounts for separate reimbursement, and do not bundle."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$2,240.82

### RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "This dispute for dates of service 02/20/2015 must be dismissed because the provider has not included any evidence that it sought reconsideration of the denial on the original bill and Texas Mutual has not evidence of a request for reconsideration as required by Rule 133.307(c)(2)(J)."

**Response Submitted by:** Texas Mutual

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
February 20, 2015	Urinary Drug Screens	\$2,240.82	\$539.85

### FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and applicable 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 §137.100 details concepts of disability management
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.210 sets out the documents required to be file with medical bills during the medical billing process.
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code Part 1, Chapter 19, Subchapter U sets out the requirements for utilization review of health care provided under Texas workers' compensation insurance coverage.
5. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203 sets out the reimbursement for clinical laboratory services.

6. The insurance carrier reduced payment for the disputed services with the following claim adjustment codes:
  - 16 – Claim/service lacks information or has submission/billing error(s).
  - 97 – The benefit for this service is included in the payment/allowance for another service/procedure that has already been adjudicated
  - 225 – The submitted documentation does not support the service being billed we will re-evaluate this upon receipt of clarifying information.
  - 758 – ODG documentation requirements for urine drug testing have not been met
  - 18 – Exact duplicate claim/service
  - 892 – Denied in accordance with DWC rules and/or medical fee guideline including current CPT code descriptions/instructions
  - 754 – Not a request for reconsideration, does not include same billing codes, DOS and/or dollar amount as original bill per Rule 133.250

### **Issues**

1. Is the respondent's position supported?
2. Are the insurance carrier's reasons for denial or reduction of payment supported?
3. Did the requestor appropriately raise reasonableness and medical necessity?
4. Were the Medicare policies met?
5. What is the applicable fee guideline rule?
6. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

### **Findings**

1. The respondent states, "...no valid request for reconsideration exists and Texas Mutual is entitled to a dismissal of this dispute. 28 Texas Administrative Code 133.307 states,
  - (3) Dismissal. A dismissal is not a final decision by the division. The medical fee dispute may be submitted for review as a new dispute that is subject to the requirements of this section. The division may dismiss a request for MFDR if:
    - (A) the division determines that the medical bills in the dispute have not been submitted to the insurance carrier for an appeal, when required;
    - (B) the request contains an unresolved adverse determination of medical necessity;
    - (C) the request contains an unresolved compensability, extent of injury, or liability dispute for the claim; or
    - (D) the division determines that good cause exists to dismiss the request, including a party's failure to comply with the provisions of this section.

Review of the submitted information finds;

- a. Explanation of benefits dated April 13, 2015 had denials for "Claim/service lacks information" and "Denied in accordance with DWC rules and/or medical fee guideline including current CPT code descriptions/instructions
- b. Requestor submitted a "corrected claim" on June 16, 2015
- c. Respondent processed "corrected claim" on July 21, 2015 denying as a duplicate and citing Rule 133.250(D) that this reconsideration request was not in compliance with Division guidelines.

The Division does not find good cause exists in dismissing this request. The denial messages for the corrected claim points towards the merits as a reconsideration request rather than as a new claim that received original adjudication. The remaining denial reasons are discussed below.

2. The insurance carrier denied disputed services with multiple claim adjustment reason codes. Denial reason 225, citing that the documentation does not support the service billed, and that the carrier would "...re-evaluate this upon receipt of clarifying information." In its response to this medical fee dispute, the carrier cites the lack of clarifying information and/or documentation as a reason for denial of payment. The process

for a carrier's request of documentation not otherwise required by 28 TAC 133.210 is detailed in section (d) of that section as follows:

Any request by the insurance carrier for additional documentation to process a medical bill shall:

- (1) be in writing;
- (2) be specific to the bill or the bill's related episode of care;
- (3) describe with specificity the clinical and other information to be included in the response;
- (4) be relevant and necessary for the resolution of the bill;
- (5) be for information that is contained in or in the process of being incorporated into the injured employee's medical or billing record maintained by the health care provider;
- (6) indicate the specific reason for which the insurance carrier is requesting the information; and
- (7) include a copy of the medical bill for which the insurance carrier is requesting the additional documentation.

No documentation was found to support that the carrier made an appropriate request for additional documentation during the billing process with the specificity required by rule. The division concludes that carrier failed to meet the requirements of 28 TAC 133.210(d).

The respondent's claim adjustment code 758 states that "ODG documentation requirements for urine drug testing have not been met." Documentation requirements for the services provided are not established by ODG, rather, documentation requirements are established by 28 TAC §133.210 which describes the documentation required to be submitted with a medical bill. 28 TAC §133.210 does not require documentation to be submitted with the medical bill for the services in dispute. The carrier's denial reason is not supported.

Per 28 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §137.100 (a) states, in pertinent part, that "Health care providers shall provide treatment in accordance with the current edition of the *Official Disability Guidelines - Treatment in Workers' Comp...*" Review of the February, 2015 ODG pain chapter under the "Drug testing" "Urine drug testing (UDT), Recommended as a tool to monitor compliance with prescribed substances, identify use of undisclosed substances, and uncover diversion of prescribed substances."

The division concludes that the services were provided in accordance with the division's treatment guidelines; that the services are presumed reasonable pursuant to 28 TAC §137.100(c), and Labor Code §413.017; and are also presumed to be health care reasonably required as defined by Labor Code §401.011(22-a).

3. Health care provided in accordance with the ODG is presumed reasonable as specified in (c) of Rule §137.100. Section (e) of that same rule allows for the insurance carrier to retrospectively review reasonableness and medical necessity:

An insurance carrier may retrospectively review, and if appropriate, deny payment for treatments and services not preauthorized under subsection

- (d) of this section when the insurance carrier asserts that health care provided within the Division treatment guidelines is not reasonably required. The assertion must be supported by documentation of evidence-based medicine that outweighs the presumption of reasonableness established by Labor Code §413.017.

28 Texas Administrative Code Part 1, Chapter 19, Subchapter U sets out the requirements for utilization review of health care provided under Texas workers' compensation insurance coverage. Applicable 28 TAC §19.2003 (b)(31) defines retrospective review as "A form of utilization review for health care services that have been provided to an injured employee." No documentation was found to support that the insurance carrier retrospectively reviewed the reasonableness and medical necessity of the service in dispute pursuant to the minimal requirements of Chapter 19, subchapter U as required. The insurance carrier failed to follow the appropriate administrative process and remedy in order to address its assertions regarding appropriateness of care and medical necessity.

4. 28 TAC §134.203(b) states that "For coding, billing, reporting, and reimbursement of professional medical services, Texas workers' compensation system participants shall apply the following: (1) Medicare payment

policies, including its coding; billing; correct coding initiative (CCI) edits; modifiers; bonus payments for health professional shortage areas (HPSAs) and physician scarcity areas (PSAs); and other payment policies in effect on the date a service is provided with any additions or exceptions in the rules.” 28 TAC §134.203(a) states that “Medicare payment policies” when used in this section, shall mean reimbursement methodologies, models, values and weights including its coding, billing, and reporting payment policies as set forth in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) payment policies specific to Medicare.” The services in dispute are clinical laboratory services; therefore, Medicare policies for the clinical laboratory services must be met. The services in dispute are addressed in the CMS Clinical Laboratory Fee Schedule. The requestor billed the following AMA CPT codes/descriptions as follows:

<u>HCPCS</u>	<u>SHORT DESCRIPTION</u>
G0431	Drug screen multiple class
G6052	Assay of meprobamate
G6045	Assay of dihydrocodeinone
G6046	Assay of dihydromorphinone
G6056	Assay of opiates
G6041	Assay of urine alkaloids
G6031	Assay of benzodiazepines
G6051	Assay of flurazepam
G6042	Assay of amphetamines
82542	Column chromatography/mass spectrometry (eg, GC/MS, or HPLC/MS),

Review of the medical bill finds that current AMA CPT codes were billed, and that there are no CCI conflicts or Medicare billing exclusions that apply to the clinical laboratory services in dispute. The requestor met 28 TAC §134.203(b).

5. The services in dispute are eligible for payment. 28 TAC §134.203(e) states:

“The MAR for pathology and laboratory services not addressed in subsection (c)(1) of this section or in other Division rules shall be determined as follows:

- (1) 125 percent of the fee listed for the code in the Medicare Clinical Fee Schedule for the technical component of the service; and
- (2) 45 percent of the Division established MAR for the code derived in paragraph (1) of this subsection for the professional component of the service.”

CMS payment policy files identify those clinical laboratory codes which contain a professional component, and those which are considered technical only. The codes in dispute are not identified by CMS as having a possible professional component, for that reason, the MAR is determined solely pursuant to 28 TAC §134.203(e)(1). The maximum allowable reimbursement(MAR) for the services in dispute is 125% of the fee listed for the codes in the 2015 Clinical Diagnostic Laboratory Fee Schedule found on the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services website at <http://www.cms.gov>. The total MAR is calculated as follows:

Date of Service	Submitted Code	Submitted Charge	Units	MAR
February 20, 2015	G0431	\$369.00	1	\$75.63 x 125% = \$94.54
February 20, 2015	G6052	\$150.00	1	\$23.98 x 125% = \$29.98
February 20, 2015	G6045	\$110.00	1	\$28.10 x 125% = \$35.13
February 20, 2015	G6046	\$110.00	1	\$34.98 x 125% = \$43.73

February 20, 2015	G6056	\$400.00	4	$\$26.48 \times 125\% = \$33.10 \times 4 = \$132.40$
February 20, 2015	G6041	\$123.00	1	$\$40.85 \times 125\% = \$51.06$
February 20, 2015	G6031	\$480.00	1	$\$25.17 \times 125\% = \$31.46$
February 20, 2015	G6051	\$80.82	1	$\$26.94 \times 125\% = \$33.68$
February 20, 2015	G6042	\$82.00	1	$\$21.15 \times 125\% = \$26.44$
February 20, 2015	82542	\$336.00	2	$\$24.58 \times 125\% = \$30.73 \times 2 = \$61.45$
	TOTAL			\$539.85

6. The total maximum allowable reimbursement for the services in dispute is \$539.85. The amount previously paid by the Carrier is \$539.85. The remaining balance due to the requestor is \$539.85.

#### **Conclusion**

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 \$539.85.

#### ***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 \$539.85 plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130 due within 30 days of receipt of this Order.

#### **Authorized Signature**

---

Signature

---

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

---

October , 2015  
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, 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 MFDR 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.**