# MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

Requestor Name Respondent Name

Memorial Compounding Pharmacy TPCIGA for Reliance National Insurance Co

MFDR Tracking Number Carrier's Austin Representative

M4-18-5313-01 Box Number 50

**MFDR Date Received** 

August 30, 2018

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

<u>Requestor's Position Summary</u>: "The carrier denied the reconsideration based on medical necessity. These medications do not require preauthorization therefore do not need a retrospective review."

Amount in Dispute: \$555.68

#### RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

<u>Respondent's Position Summary</u>: "Payment has been dispute as the medications were not found to be medically necessary."

Response Submitted by: Broadspire

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

| Dates of Service | Disputed Services   | Amount In<br>Dispute | Amount Due |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------|
| January 11, 2018 | Compound medication | \$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 §133.240 sets out guidelines for medical claim processing.
- 3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.503 sets out the fee guidelines for pharmacy services.
- 4. The insurance carrier reduced payment for the disputed services with the following claim adjustment codes:
  - 50 These are non-covered services because this is not deemed a medical necessity by the payer

### <u>Issues</u>

- 1. Are the insurance carrier's reasons for denial of payment supported?
- 2. What rule is applicable to reimbursement?
- 3. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

### **Findings**

1. The requestor is seeking \$555.68 for compound medication dispensed on January 11, 2018. The insurance carrier denied disputed services with claim adjustment reason code 50 – "These are non-covered services because this is not deemed a medical necessity by the payer."

28 TAC §133.240 (q) states,

When denying payment due to an adverse determination under this section, the insurance carrier shall comply with the requirements of §19.2009 of this title (relating to Notice of Determinations Made in Utilization Review). Additionally, in any instance where the insurance carrier is questioning the medical necessity or appropriateness of the health care services, the insurance carrier shall comply with the requirements of §19.2010 of this title (relating to Requirements Prior to Issuing Adverse Determination), including the requirement that prior to issuance of an adverse determination the insurance carrier shall afford the health care provider a reasonable opportunity to discuss the billed health care with a doctor or, in cases of a dental plan or chiropractic services, with a dentist or chiropractor, respectively.

Review of the submitted documentation found insufficient evidence to support the insurance carrier met the provisions of the above stated rule. The denial of medical necessity will not be considered in this dispute.

2. 28 TAC 134.503 (c) states in pertinent part,

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)  $\times 1.25$ ) + \$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

| 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     | \$90.86        | \$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    |
|               |             |         |       |                |            | \$555.68   |

3. The allowed amount for the service in dispute is \$555.68. This amount is recommended.

### **Conclusion**

**Authorized Signature** 

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 \$555.68.

#### **ORDER**

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

|           |  | October 3, 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.