MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name Respondent Name

MEMORIAL COMPOUNDING PHARMACY ELECTRIC INSURANCE CO

MFDR Tracking Number Carrier's Austin Representative

M4-19-0874-01 Box Number 17

MFDR Date Received

October 16, 2018

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "The above claimant received medication and the carrier still has not acknowledged receipt of service. Reimbursement should be made to the provider if the claim has been submitted within the 95th day after the date on which the health care service was rendered."

Amount in Dispute: \$1,059.66

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "The compound medication in dispute in this matter was denied based on retrospective medical necessity."

Response Submitted by: Downs Stanford PC

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
May 25, 2018	Pharmacy Services	\$1,059.66	\$999.17

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. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.530 sets out the closed formulary requirements for claims not subject to certified networks.
- 5. The insurance carrier reduced payment for the disputed services with the following claim adjustment codes:
 - 197 Payment denied/reduced for absence of precertification/authorization

5264 – Payment is denied service not authorized

<u>Issues</u>

- 1. Did Electric Insurance Co raise a new defense pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307?
- 2. Is Electric Insurance Co's reason for denial of payment supported?
- 3. Is Memorial Compounding Pharmacy (Memorial) entitled to reimbursement for the compound in question?

Findings

1. In its position statement, Downs Stanford PC argued on behalf of Electric Insurance Co, "The compound medication in dispute in this matter was denied based on retrospective medical necessity."

28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(d)(2)(F) states, in relevant part, "The response shall address only those denial reasons presented to the requestor prior to the date the request for MFDR was filed with the division and the other party. Any new denial reasons or defenses raised shall not be considered in the review."

Review of the submitted documentation finds that Electric Insurance Co failed to present medical necessity denial to Memorial in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.240 prior to the date the request for medical fee dispute resolution (MFDR) was filed. The division concludes that this defense presented in Downs Stanford PC's position statement shall not be considered for review because this assertion constitutes a new defense pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(d)(2)(F).

2. Memorial is seeking reimbursement of \$1,059.66 for a compound dispensed on May 25, 2018. Electric Insurance Co denied the disputed compound with claim adjustment reason code 197 – "Payment denied/reduced for absence of precertification/authorization" and 5264 – "Payment is denied service not authorized."

28 Texas Administrative Code §134.530(b)(2) 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 division finds that the compound in question does not include a drug identified with a status of "N" in the current edition of the ODG, *Appendix A*. ACE American failed to articulate any arguments to support its denial for preauthorization. Therefore, the division concludes that the compound in question did not require preauthorization and Electric Insurance Co's denial of payment for this reason is not supported. Therefore, the disputed compound will be reviewed for reimbursement.

- 3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §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

- (2) notwithstanding §133.20(e)(1) of this title (relating to Medical Bill Submission by Health Care Provider), the amount billed to the insurance carrier by the:
 - (A) health care provider; or
 - (B) pharmacy processing agent only if the health care provider has not previously billed the insurance carrier for the prescription drug and the pharmacy processing agent is billing on behalf of the health care provider.

The compound in dispute was billed by listing each drug included in the compound and calculating the charge for each drug separately as required by 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.502(d)(2). Each ingredient is listed below with its corresponding reimbursement amount as applicable.

Drug	NDC	Generic(G) /Brand(B)	Price /Unit	Units Billed	AWP Formula	Billed Amt	Lesser of AWP and Billed
Meloxicam	38779274601	G	\$194.67	0.18	\$43.80	\$35.04	\$35.04
Flurbiprofen	38779036209	G	\$36.58	4.8	\$219.48	\$175.58	\$175.58
Tramadol HCL	38779237409	G	\$36.30	6	\$272.25	\$217.80	\$217.80
Cyclobenzaprine HCL	38779039509	G	\$46.33	1.8	\$104.25	\$83.39	\$83.39
Bupivacaine HCL	38779052405	G	\$45.60	1.2	\$68.40	\$54.72	\$54.72
Ethoxy Diglycol	38779190301	G	\$0.34	3	\$1.28	\$1.03	\$1.03
Versapro Cream	38779252903	В	\$3.20	45.02	\$157.03	\$144.06	\$144.06
Cyclobenzaprine Tablet	65162054150	G	\$1.09	90	\$122.85	\$155.75	\$122.85
Gabapentin Capsule	67877022305	G	\$1.33	90	\$149.70	\$177.26	\$149.70
Compounding Fee	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
				•		Total	\$999.17

The total reimbursement is therefore \$999.17. This amount is recommended.

Conclusion

Authorized Signature

For the reasons stated above, the Division finds that the requestor has established that reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$999.17.

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 \$999.17, plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code \$134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this order.

		12/20/2018
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.