



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

MEMORIAL COMPOUNDING RX

Respondent Name

Zurich American Insurance Company

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-19-0950-01

Carrier's Austin Representative

Box Number 19

MFDR Date Received

October 18, 2018

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "These medications do not require preauthorization therefore do not need a retrospective review."

Amount in Dispute: \$726.62

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "The requestor did not request and receive preauthorization for this investigational or experimental compound formulation or for this compound that is not included in Division's Closed Formulary."

Response Submitted by: Flahive, Ogden & Latson

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Table with 4 columns: Dates of Service, Disputed Services, Amount In Dispute, Amount Due. Row 1: May 9, 2018, Compound Medication, \$726.62, \$726.62

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 (DWC).

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 Codes §§134.530 and 134.540 sets out the closed formulary requirements, effective January 17, 2011, 35 TexReg 11344.
5. The insurance carrier denied payment based on the absence of preauthorization.

## Issues

1. Did the insurance carrier raise a new defense in its response?
2. Is the insurance carrier's reason for denial of payment supported?
3. Is Memorial Compounding Pharmacy (Memorial) entitled to reimbursement for the compound in question?

## Findings

1. In a subsequent response, Flahive, Ogden & Latson, on behalf of the insurance carrier, argued that "The issue of medical necessity has been joined, and the disputed services have not yet been determined to be medically necessary and appropriate."

The response from the insurance carrier is required to address only the denial reasons presented to the requestor the request for medical fee dispute resolution (MFDR) was filed with the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation (DWC). Any new denial reasons or defenses raised shall not be considered in this review.<sup>1</sup>

The submitted documentation does not support that a reason for denial of payment of the compound in question, based on medical necessity, was presented to Memorial before this request for MFDR was filed. Therefore, the DWC will not consider this argument in the current dispute review.

2. Memorial is seeking reimbursement for a compound dispensed on May 9, 2018. The insurance carrier denied the disputed compound based on preauthorization. Preauthorization is only required for:
  - drugs identified with a status of "N" in the current edition of the ODG Appendix A<sup>2</sup>;
  - any compound that contains a drug identified with a status of "N" in the current edition of the ODG Appendix A; and
  - any investigational or experimental drug.<sup>3</sup>

Flahive, Ogden & Latson, on behalf of the insurance carrier, argued that "The requestor did not request and receive preauthorization for this investigational or experimental compound formulation."

The determination of a service's investigational or experimental nature is determined on a case by case basis through utilization review.<sup>4</sup> Utilization review, includes a prospective, concurrent, or **retrospective review to determine the experimental or investigational nature** of health care services.<sup>5</sup>

The preamble relating to the adoption of relevant pharmacy rules clearly states that the DWC intended for the **ingredients** of the compound to drive preauthorization requirements, not compounds as a class.<sup>6</sup> The compound in question does not contain an ingredient identified with a status of "N" in the current edition of the ODG, Appendix A.

Flahive, Ogden & Latson provided **no evidence** that the insurance carrier engaged in a prospective or retrospective utilization review to establish that the specific compound considered in this review is investigational or experimental.

---

<sup>1</sup> 28 TAC §133.307 (d)(2)(F)

<sup>2</sup> *ODG Treatment in Workers' Comp (ODG) / Appendix A, ODG Workers' Compensation Drug Formulary*

<sup>3</sup> 28 Texas Administrative Codes §§134.530 (b)(1) 134.540 (b)

<sup>4</sup> Texas Insurance Code §19.2005 (b)

<sup>5</sup> Texas Insurance Code §4201.002 (13)

<sup>6</sup> The Division initially considered requiring preauthorization for all compound drugs. However, with stakeholder feedback and, in the interest of curbing the expense of numerous preauthorization requests, the Division reconsidered and adopts a more measured approach as specified in the proposal, which is requiring preauthorization only for those compounds that contain an "N" drug. The Division notes that an insurance carrier has the ability to conduct retrospective utilization review for all compounds not containing an "N" drug so that insurance carriers have the ability to only pay for medically necessary care.

[http://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/regviewer\\$ext.RegPage?sl=T&app=2&p\\_dir=F&p\\_rloc=231643&p\\_tloc=98652&p\\_ploc=78924&pg=6&p\\_reg=201006879&ti=&pt=&ch=&rl=&z\\_chk=53523](http://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/regviewer$ext.RegPage?sl=T&app=2&p_dir=F&p_rloc=231643&p_tloc=98652&p_ploc=78924&pg=6&p_reg=201006879&ti=&pt=&ch=&rl=&z_chk=53523)

Because the insurance carrier failed to perform utilization review on the disputed compound, the requirement for preauthorization based on a premise that the compound is investigational or experimental **is not triggered** in this case. The insurance carrier’s preauthorization denial is therefore not supported.

3. Because the insurance carrier failed to sufficiently support its denial of reimbursement, Memorial is entitled to reimbursement.

The compound in dispute was billed by listing each **drug** included in the compound and calculating the charge for each drug separately.<sup>7</sup> Each ingredient is listed below with its reimbursement amount.<sup>8</sup> The calculation of the total allowable amount is as follows:

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	38779237409	G	\$36.30	6	\$272.25	\$217.80	\$217.80
Cyclobenzaprine	38779039509	G	\$46.33	1.8	\$104.24	\$83.39	\$83.39
Bupivacaine	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	B	\$3.20	45.02	\$157.03	\$144.06	\$144.06
Fee	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
						Total	\$726.62

The total reimbursement is therefore \$726.62. This amount is recommended.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons stated above, the DWC finds that the requestor has established that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$726.62.

***ORDER***

Based on the submitted information, pursuant to Texas Labor Code Section 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the DWC has determined the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the disputed services. The DWC hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor \$726.62, plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this order.

**Authorized Signature**

	Laurie Garnes	January 29, 2020
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

<sup>7</sup> 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.502(d)(2)

<sup>8</sup> 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.503(c)

### ***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 DWC within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. The request may be faxed, mailed or personally delivered to the DWC 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.**