# MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

Requestor Name Respondent Name

AHMED KHALIFA, MD ZURICH AMERICAN INSURANCE CO

MFDR Tracking Number Carrier's Austin Representative

M4-19-0213-01 Box Number 19

**MFDR Date Received** 

**SEPTEMBER 17, 2018** 

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

Requestor's Position Summary: "The carrier paid \$681.36; there is still a balance of \$132.88."

Amount in Dispute: \$132.88

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

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "the carrier is reprocessing the medical bill and will be paying it pursuant to

the Medical Fee Guidelines."

Response Submitted By: Flahive, Ogden & Latson

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
January 29, 2018	CPT Code 99202-59 New Patient Office Visit	\$118.13	\$0.00
	CPT Code 95886 Needle EMG	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CPT Code 95911 Nerve Conduction Studies	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HCPCS Code A4556 Electrodes	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HCPCS Code A4215 Needles	\$14.75	\$0.00
TOTAL		\$132.88	\$0.00

# **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 §134.203, effective March 1, 2008, sets the reimbursement guidelines for the disputed service.
- 3. The services in dispute were reduced / denied by the respondent with the following reason code:
  - 197-Precertification/authorization/notification absent.
  - B16-New patient qualifications were not met.
  - P12-Workers' compensation jurisdictional fee schedule adjustment.
  - W3-In accordance with TDI-DWC rule 134.804, this bill has been identified as a request for reconsideration or appeal.
  - 18-Exact duplicate claim/service.

#### Issues

- 1. What is the applicable fee guideline for professional services?
- 2. Was the office visit billed in accordance with fee guideline? Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement?
- 3. Is the requestor due additional reimbursement for HCPCS code A4215?

### **Findings**

- 1. The fee guidelines for disputed services are found in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203.
- 2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(5) states "Medicare payment policies" when used in this section, shall mean reimbursement methodologies, models, and values or 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."

CPT code 99202 is described as "Office or other outpatient visit for the evaluation and management of a new patient, which requires these 3 key components: An expanded problem focused history; An expanded problem focused examination; Straightforward medical decision making. Counseling and/or coordination of care with other physicians, other qualified health care professionals, or agencies are provided consistent with the nature of the problem(s) and the patient's and/or family's needs. Usually, the presenting problem(s) are of low to moderate severity. Typically, 20 minutes are spent face-to-face with the patient and/or family." The requestor appended modifier "59-Distinct Procedural Service" to code 99202.

Modifier "59" is defined as "Under certain circumstances, it may be necessary to indicate that a procedure or service was distinct or independent from other non-E/M services performed on the same day. Modifier 59 is used to identify procedures/services, other than E/M services, that are not normally reported together, but are appropriate under the circumstances. Documentation must support a different session, different procedure or surgery, different site or organ system, separate incision/excision, separate lesion, or separate injury (or area of injury in extensive injuries) not ordinarily encountered or performed on the same day by the same individual. However, when another already established modifier is appropriate it should be used rather than modifier 59. Only if no more descriptive modifier is available, and the use of modifier 59 best explains the circumstances, should modifier 59 be used."

A review of the submitted reports does not support a "different session, different procedure or surgery, different site or organ system, separate incision/excision, separate lesion, or separate injury (or area of injury in extensive injuries) not ordinarily encountered or performed on the same day by the same individual." The Division finds that the requestor has not supported the use of modifier "59."

On the disputed date of service, the requestor billed for CPT code 99202-59, 95911, and 95886. Per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(5), the Division referred to Medicare's coding and billing policies. Per Medicare fee schedule, CPT code 95886 has a global surgery period of "ZZZ" and code 95911 has "XXX.

The <u>National Correct Coding Initiative Policy Manual</u>, effective January 1, 2017, Chapter I, <u>General Correct Coding Policies</u>, section D, states:

All procedures on the Medicare Physician Fee Schedule are assigned a Global period of 000, 010, 090, XXX, YYY, ZZZ, or MMM. The global concept does not apply to XXX procedures. The global period for YYY procedures is defined by the Carrier (A/B MAC processing practitioner service claims). All procedures with a global period of ZZZ are related to another procedure, and the applicable global period for the ZZZ code is determined by the related procedure... Procedures with a global surgery indicator of "XXX" are not covered by these rules. Many of these "XXX" procedures are performed by physicians and have inherent pre-procedure, intra-procedure, and post-procedure work usually performed each time the procedure is completed. This work should never be reported as a separate E&M code. Other "XXX" procedures are not usually performed by a physician and have no physician work relative value units associated with them. A physician should never report a separate E&M code with these procedures for the supervision of others performing the procedure or for the interpretation of the procedure. With most "XXX" procedures, the physician may, however, perform a significant and separately identifiable E&M service on the same date of service which may be reported by appending modifier 25 to the E&M code. This E&M service may be related to the same diagnosis necessitating performance of the "XXX" procedure but cannot include any work inherent in the "XXX" procedure, supervision of others performing the "XXX" procedure, or time for interpreting the result of the "XXX" procedure. Appending modifier 25 to a significant, separately identifiable E&M service when performed on the same date of service as an "XXX' procedure is correct coding.

Per Medicare policy, "This E&M service may be related to the same diagnosis necessitating performance of the "XXX" procedure but cannot include any work inherent in the "XXX" procedure, supervision of others performing the "XXX" procedure, or time for interpreting the result of the "XXX" procedure." The Division finds that the requestor's E&M report did not meet all three required key components for billing CPT code 99202. In addition, the requestor did not code for the service in accordance with Medicare policies. As a result, reimbursement is not recommended.

3. The requestor is seeking medical dispute resolution for \$14.75 for HCPCS code A4215.

HCPCS code A4215 is defined as "Needle, sterile, any size, each." The respondent paid \$0.25 based upon the fee guideline.

Per Medicare guidelines, <u>Transmittal B-03-020</u>, effective February 28, 2003 if Durable Medical Equipment Prosthetics Orthotics and Supplies (DMEPOS) HCPCS codes are incidental to the physician service, it is not separately payable. A review of the submitted documentation does not support a separate service to support billing HCPCS code A4215 in conjunction with CPT codes 95886 and 95911. As a result, additional reimbursement is not recommended.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons stated above, the Division finds that the requestor has not established that reimbursement is due.

#### **ORDER**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

# **Authorized Signature**

		10/31/2018	
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 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.