MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name Respondent Name

Memorial Compounding Pharmacy Ace American Insurance Co

MFDR Tracking Number Carrier's Austin Representative

M4-19-1715-01 Box Number 15

MFDR Date Received

November 26, 2018

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

<u>Requestor's Position Summary:</u> "The carrier denied the original bill as well and the reconsideration based on precertification/authorization/notification absent."

Amount in Dispute: \$555.68

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

<u>Respondent's Position Summary</u>: "Per First Script review, charges were denied correctly as: Pre-auth is required."

Response Submitted by: Gallagher Bassett

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
April 12, 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

<u>Issues</u>

- 1. Did the respondent present a new defense?
- 2. Is the insurance carrier's reason for denial of payment supported?
- 3. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement for the compound in question?

Findings

1. The respondent stated in the position that, "Pre-authorization is required based on State of TX rules: 28 TAC 134.530. (D). 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)."

28 TAC 133.307 (d)(2)(F) states in pertinent 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 found insufficient evidence to support the insurance carrier denied or raised defenses stated in their position statement prior to the request for MFDR. Based on the above, these new defenses will not be considered in this review.

2. The requestor is seeking reimbursement of \$555.68 for a compound dispensed April 12, 2018. The insurance carrier denied the disputed compound based on lack of preauthorization.

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 division finds that the compound rendered on the date of service in question does not include a drug identified with a status of "N" in the current edition of the ODG, *Appendix A*. The insurance carriers' assertion of investigational and experimental was not supported by "evidence based medicine" as required by 28 TAC 134.530 (g) (2) which states in pertinent part, "In order for an insurance carrier to deny payment subject to a retrospective review for pharmaceutical services that are recommended by the division's adopted treatment guidelines, §137.100 of this title, the denial must be supported by **documentation of evidence-based medicine** that outweighs the presumption of reasonableness established under Labor Code §413.017." The reference made by the insurance carrier were, "ODG Status: N/A, FDA Orange Book Status: ZB-Particular pharmaceutical entity was not evaluated." The service in dispute will be reviewed per applicable fee guideline.

- 3. 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;

The fee calculation based on the above is;

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

		July 10, 2019
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.