

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**

<u>Requestor Name</u> Memorial Compounding Pharmacy Respondent Name

Harford Accident & Indemnity Co

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-19-1824-01

<u>Carrier's Austin Representative</u> Box Number 47

MFDR Date Received

November 28, 2018

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

Requestor's Position Summary: "The carrier denied the reconsideration based on claim not processed."

Amount in Dispute: \$798.06

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

**<u>Respondent's Position Summary</u>:** "The Hartford's denial of medications was based on the following findings. There is no support for the compounded topical medication because the patient appears to be capable of taking the same or similar medications in oral form..."

Response Submitted by: The Hartford

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
November 28, 2017	Flurbiprofen, Meloxicam, Mefenamic Acid, Baclofen, Bupivacaine HCL, Ethoxy Diglycol, Versapro Cream, Compounding Fee	\$798.06	\$798.06

## 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 §134.503 sets out the fee guidelines for pharmaceutical services.
- 3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.530 sets out prior authorization requirement for pharmacy services.
- 4. The insurance carrier reduced payment for the disputed services with the following claim adjustment codes:
  - 27 Expenses incurred after coverage terminated
  - 197 Precertification/authorization/notification absent

#### Issues

- 1. Is the insurance carrier's position supported?
- 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 states in their position, "There is not ODG support for this patient."

28 TAC §133.240(q) states in pertinent part,

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.

28 TAC §133.307 (d)(F) states,

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. If the response includes unresolved issues of compensability, extent of injury, liability, or medical necessity, the request for MFDR will be dismissed in accordance with subsection (f)(3)(B) or (C) of this section.

Review of the submitted documentation found insufficient evidence to support the health care provider was notified of the adverse determination in anyway prior to MFDR and the only denial was for prior authorization not an adverse determination. The respondents' position is not supported.

2. The requestor is seeking reimbursement of \$798.06 for a compound dispensed May 16, 2018. The carrier denied the disputed compound based on lack of preauthorization. 28 TAC 134.530 (b) (1) states,

Preauthorization for claims subject to the Division's closed formulary.

(1) Preauthorization is only required for:

(A) 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;

(B) any prescription drug created through compounding prescribed before July 1, 2018 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;

(C) any prescription drug created through compounding prescribed and dispensed on or after July 1, 2018; and

(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).

Based on the above, the insurance carrier's denial is not supported.

- 3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.503 (c) applies to the compound 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

Drug	NDC	Generic(G) /Brand(B)	Price /Unit	Units Billed	AWP Formula	Billed Amt	Lesser of AWP and Billed
Flurbiprofen	38779036209	G	\$36.58	6	\$274.35	\$219.48	\$219.48
Meloxicam	38779274601	G	\$194.67	0.18	\$43.80	\$35.04	\$35.04
Mefenamic Acid	38779066906	G	\$126.60	1.8	\$284.85	\$222.48	\$222.48
Baclofen	38779038809	G	\$35.63	3	\$133.61	\$106.89	\$106.89
Bupivacaine	38779052405	G	\$45.60	1.2	\$68.40	\$54.72	\$54.72
Ethoxy Diglycol	38779052405	G	\$0.34	3	\$1.28	\$1.03	\$1.03
Versapro Cream	38779252903	В	\$3.20	44.82	\$156.33	\$143.42	\$143.42
Fee	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
						Total	\$798.06

The total reimbursement is \$798.06. This amount is recommended.

#### **Conclusion**

The outcome of each independent medical fee dispute relies upon the relevant evidence presented by the requestor and the respondent at the time of adjudication. Though all the evidence in this dispute may not have been discussed, it was considered.

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 \$798.06.

#### 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 \$798.06, plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code \$134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this order.

#### **Authorized Signature**

Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

<u>June 28, 2019</u>

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.