# MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

# **GENERAL INFORMATION**

**Requestor Name** 

Respondent Name

**Memorial Compounding Pharmacy** 

State Office of Risk Management

**MFDR Tracking Number** 

Carrier's Austin Representative

M4-18-4897-01

**Box Number 45** 

**MFDR Date Received** 

August 13, 2018

### REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

<u>Requestor's Position Summary:</u> "The carrier denied the original bill as well and the reconsideration based on lack of preauthorization."

Amount in Dispute: \$555.68

#### RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

<u>Respondent's Position Summary</u>: "Upon notification of this dispute the Office performed a review of the medical billing received from Memorial Compounding which determined that the charges were appropriately denied for 197-Precertification/authorization/notification absent."

Response Submitted by: State Office of Risk Management

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
January 30, 2018	Pharmacy Services - Compounds	\$555.68	\$555.68

### **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 §134.502 sets out the procedures for pharmaceutical benefits.
- 3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.503 sets out the fee guidelines for pharmaceutical services.
- 4. The insurance carrier reduced payment for the disputed services with the following claim adjustment codes:
  - 197 Precertification/authorization/notification absent
  - 15 Payment adjusted because the submitted authorization number is missing, invalid, or done not apply to the billed services or provider

• 293 – This procedure requires prior authorization and none was identified

# <u>Issues</u>

- 1. Is the insurance carrier's reason for denial of payment supported?
- 2. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement for the compound in question?

### **Findings**

The requestor is seeking reimbursement of \$555.68 for a compound dispensed January 30, 2018. The
insurance carrier denied the disputed compound with claim adjustment reason code 197 –
"Precertification/authorization/notification absent."

For the dates of service in dispute the applicable rule is 28 TAC §134.530(b)(2) which states that preauthorization is **only** required for:

- drugs identified with a status of "N" in the current edition of the ODG Treatment in Workers' Comp
   (ODG) / Appendix A, ODG Workers' Compensation Drug Formulary, and any updates;
- any compound that contains a drug identified with a status of "N" in the current edition of the ODG
   Treatment in Workers' Comp (ODG) / Appendix A, ODG Workers' Compensation Drug Formulary, and
   any updates; and
- any investigational or experimental drug for which there is early, developing scientific or clinical evidence demonstrating the potential efficacy of the treatment, but which is not yet broadly accepted as the prevailing standard of care as defined in Labor Code §413.014(a).

The insurance carrier states in their position statement, "...SOAH found that compounded topical creams are not recognized or approved by the Food and Drug Administration and the compounded drugs are an investigational or experimental drug due to not being broadly accepted as the prevailing standard of care." The determination of a service's investigational or experimental nature is determined on a case by case basis as a utilization review pursuant to Texas Insurance Code §4201.002. Further, Texas Insurance Code §4201.002(13) states that utilization review, in relevant part, "includes a system for prospective, concurrent, or retrospective review to determine the experimental or investigational nature of health care services."

DWC found no evidence that the insurance carrier engaged in a prospective or retrospective utilization review (UR) as required by Texas Insurance Code §4201.002 in order to establish that the following compound is investigational or experimental in nature.

Because SORM failed to perform UR on the services in dispute, the requirement for preauthorization under TAC §134.530(b)(1)(C) is not triggered in this case. The insurance carrier's preauthorization denial is therefore not supported.

Absent any evidence that the insurance carrier presented other defenses to requestor before medical fee dispute resolution that conform with the requirements of Title 28, Part 2, Chapter 133, Subchapter C, DWC finds that the compounds in question are eligible for reimbursement.

- 2. 28 TAC §134.503 applies to the compounds in dispute and states, in pertinent part:
  - (c) The insurance carrier shall reimburse the health care provider or pharmacy processing agent for prescription drugs the lesser of:
    - (1) the fee established by the following formulas based on the average wholesale price (AWP) as reported by a nationally recognized pharmaceutical price guide or other publication of pharmaceutical pricing data in effect on the day the prescription drug is dispensed:
      - (A) Generic drugs: ((AWP per unit) x (number of units) x 1.25) + \$4.00 dispensing fee per prescription = reimbursement amount;
      - (B) Brand name drugs: ((AWP per unit) x (number of units) x 1.09) + \$4.00 dispensing fee per prescription = reimbursement amount;
      - (C) When compounding, a single compounding fee of \$15 per prescription shall be added to the calculated total for either paragraph (1)(A) or (B) of this subsection; or

Ingredient	NDC	Price/	Total	AWP Formula	Billed Amt	Lesser of
		Unit	Units	§134.503(c)(1)	§134.503	(c)(1) and
					(c)(2)	(c)(2)
Baclofen	38779038809	\$35.63	5.4	\$240.50	\$190.78	\$190.78
Amantadine	38779041105	\$24.23	3	\$90.84	\$72.69	\$72.69
Gabapentin	38779246109	\$59.85	3.6	\$269.33	\$204.66	\$204.66
Bupivacaine	38779052405	\$45.60	1.2	\$68.40	\$54.72	\$54.72
Amitriptyline	38779018904	\$18.24	1.8	\$41.04	\$32.83	\$32.83
					Total	\$555.68

The total reimbursement is \$555.68. This amount is recommended.

# Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, DWC finds that the requestor has established that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$555.68.

#### **ORDER**

Based on the submitted information, pursuant to Texas Labor Code Section 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), DWC has determined the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the disputed services. DWC hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor \$555.68, plus applicable accrued interest per 28 TAC §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this order.

# **Authorized Signature**

		October 11, 2018
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 Rule §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 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. **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.