MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name Respondent Name

Memorial Compounding Pharmacy XL Specialty Insurance Co

MFDR Tracking Number Carrier's Austin Representative

M4-19-1980-01 Box Number 19

MFDR Date Received

December 6, 2018

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "The carrier denied the original bill as well and the reconsideration based on precertification/authorization/notification/pretreatment abset [sic]."

Amount in Dispute: \$798.06

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "Per GB state disputes, charges were denied correctly. Preauthorization not obtained by provider."

Response Submitted by: Gallagher Bassett

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
June 28, 2018	Flurbiprofen, Meloxicam, Mefenamic Acid, Baclofen, Bupivacaine, 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:
 - 197 Precertification/authorization/notification absent
 - 16 Claim/service lacks information or has submission/billing error(s) which is needed for adjudication

<u>Issues</u>

- 1. Is the insurance carrier's reason for denial of payment supported?
- 2. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement for the compound in question?

Findings

1. The requestor is seeking reimbursement of \$798.06 for a compound dispensed June 28, 2018. The carrier denied based on lack of preauthorization. The denial for lack of information was not maintained upon reconsideration.

28 TAC §134.530(b)(1)(A) states in pertinent part,

- 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).

DWC 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 date of service is prior to July 1, 2018 and insufficient evidence was found to support a utilization review that found lack of medical efficacy of the treatment.

DWC concludes that the compound in question did not require preauthorization. The disputed compound will be reviewed for reimbursement.

- 2. 28 TAC §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) $\times 1.09$) + \$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, DWC finds that 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), DWC has determined the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the disputed services. DWC hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor \$798.06, plus applicable accrued interest per 28 TAC §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this order.

Authorized Signature		
		September 11, 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 DWC within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. The request may be faxed, mailed or personally delivered to 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 TAC §141.1(d).

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.