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
DOCTORS HOSPITAL AT RENAISSANCE

Respondent Name
TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

MFDR Tracking Number
M4-19-4435-01

Carrier's Austin Representative
Box Number 54

MFDR Date Received
June 10, 2019

Response Submitted By
Texas Mutual Insurance Company

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

"denial reason was for the documentation does not support an Emergency service… We rendered services on good faith based on the information what was exchanged and therefore are also requesting that our claim be reprocessed for payment."

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

"documentation did not support an emergency room visit…. Additional review of the claim does not indicate the treating doctor advised or referred the patient to the ED… Documentation submitted from the provider does not support emergency care treatment per Rule 133.2"

SUMMARY OF DISPUTE

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Dispute Amount	Amount Due
March 22, 2019	Outpatient Hospital Services	$398.46	$398.46

AUTHORITY

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and 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 §134.403 sets out the hospital facility fee guideline for outpatient services.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.2 defines words and terms related to medical bill processing.
4. Texas Labor Code §408.021 establishes an injured employee's entitlement to medical benefits.
5. The insurance carrier reduced payment for the disputed services with the following claim adjustment codes:
   - P12 – WORKERS' COMPENSATION JURISDICTIONAL FEE SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT.
   - 899 – DOCUMENTATION AND FILE REVIEW DOES NOT SUPPORT AN EMERGENCY IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 133.2
   - B7 – THE PROVIDER WAS NOT CERTIFIED/ELIGIBLE TO BE PAID FOR THIS PROCEDURE/SERVICE ON THIS DATE OF SERVICE.
   - 16 – CLAIM/SERVICE LACKS INFORMATION OR HAS SUBMISSION/BILLING ERROR(S) WHICH IS NEEDED FOR ADJUDICATION.
   - 225 – THE SUBMITTED DOCUMENTATION DOES NOT SUPPORT THE SERVICE BEING BILLED. WE WILL RE-EVALUATE THIS UPON RECEIPT OF CLARIFYING INFORMATION.
   - 242 – NOT TREATING DOCTOR APPROVED TREATMENT.
   - 350 – BILL HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED AS A REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OR APPEAL.
   - DC4 – NO ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT ALLOWED AFTER RECONSIDERATION. FOR INFORMATION CALL (800) 859-5995 X3994.

- 193 – ORIGINAL PAYMENT DECISION IS BEING MAINTAINED. UPON REVIEW, IT WAS DETERMINED THAT THIS CLAIM WAS PROCESSED PROPERLY.
- W3 – IN ACCORDANCE WITH TDI-DWC RULE 134.804, THIS BILL HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED AS A REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OR APPEAL.

Issues

1. Are the insurance carrier's reasons for denial of payment supported?
2. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement?

Findings

1. The insurance carrier denied disputed services with claim adjustment reason codes
   - 899 – DOCUMENTATION AND FILE REVIEW DOES NOT SUPPORT AN EMERGENCY IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 133.2
   - B7 – THE PROVIDER WAS NOT CERTIFIED/ELIGIBLE TO BE PAID FOR THIS PROCEDURE/SERVICE ON THIS DATE OF SERVICE.
   - 16 – CLAIM/SERVICE LACKS INFORMATION OR HAS SUBMISSION/BILLING ERROR(S) WHICH IS NEEDED FOR ADJUDICATION.
   - 225 – THE SUBMITTED DOCUMENTATION DOES NOT SUPPORT THE SERVICE BEING BILLED. WE WILL RE-EVALUATE THIS UPON RECEIPT OF CLARIFYING INFORMATION.
   - 242 – NOT TREATING DOCTOR APPROVED TREATMENT.

   Texas Labor Code §408.021(c) requires that, "Except in an emergency, all health care must be approved or recommended by the employee's treating doctor." No information was presented to support that the disputed services were approved or recommended by the injured employee's treating doctor.

   Rule §133.2(5)(A), defines a medical emergency as:

   > the sudden onset of a medical condition manifested by acute symptoms of sufficient severity, including severe pain, that the absence of immediate medical attention could reasonably be expected to result in:
   > (i) placing the patient's health or bodily functions in serious jeopardy, or
   > (ii) serious dysfunction of any body organ or part.

   The division notes the rule does not require the patient to actually *be* in jeopardy or *suffer* serious dysfunction. It only requires that the patient manifest acute *symptoms* of sufficient severity (including severe pain) that turning the patient away, without evaluation or treatment, could *be expected* (prior to rendering care and *without benefit of hindsight*) to result in serious jeopardy or dysfunction if treatment were not provided.

   The disputed service is an Emergency Room evaluation, review of the submitted documentation finds that at the time of triage (11:44), the injured employee reported "severe pain," rated a 9 on the pain scale. Even though the pain later subsided to "moderate," rating a 4 (at 12:33), the symptoms as presented at triage were sufficient to support a medical emergency in accordance with the definition in Rule §133.2(5)(A).

   While the respondent asserts "onset was 8 weeks prior," that refers to the original date of injury but not to the onset of severe pain, which the doctor documented in the History of Present Illness as "fluctuating in intensity." The documentation supports the onset of severe pain was sudden and acute and concerning enough at the time of triage that the hospital could not in good conscience turn the patient away without further evaluation. The division therefore finds the requirements of Rule §133.2(5)(A) were sufficiently met to support a medical emergency.

   Because a medical emergency was supported, no approval or recommendation was required from the treating doctor to evaluate and treat the injured employee. The insurance carrier's denial reasons are not supported. The disputed services will therefore be reviewed for payment in accordance with division rules and fee guidelines.

2. This dispute regards Emergency Department services subject to DWC *Hospital Facility Fee Guideline—Outpatient*, Rule §134.403, which requires the maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR) be the Medicare facility specific amount applying Medicare Outpatient Prospective Payment System formulas and factors modified by DWC rules.

   Rule §134.403(f)(1) requires the Medicare facility specific amount be multiplied by 200% for the disputed services.

   Medicare assigns an Ambulatory Payment Classification (APC) to OPPS services based on billed procedure codes and supporting documentation. The APC determines the payment rate. Reimbursement for ancillary items and services is packaged with the APC payment. CMS publishes quarterly APC rate updates, available at www.cms.gov.

Reimbursement for the disputed services is calculated as follows:

- Procedure code 99283 represents emergency department evaluation and management services, assigned APC 5023. The OPPS Addendum A rate is $222.99. This is multiplied by 60% for an unadjusted labor amount of $133.79, and in turn multiplied by the facility wage index of 0.8224 for an adjusted labor amount of $110.03. The non-labor portion is 40% of the APC rate, or $89.20. The sum of the labor and non-labor portions is the Medicare facility specific amount of $199.23. This is multiplied by 200% for a MAR of $398.46.
- Procedure code A9270 (Ibuprofen) has status indicator E1, for excluded or non-covered codes not payable on an outpatient bill. Payment for ancillary supplies and medications is included in the reimbursement for the primary service. Additional payment is not recommended.

The total recommended reimbursement for the disputed services is $398.46. The insurance carrier paid $0.00. The amount due is $398.46. This amount is recommended.

Conclusion

In resolving disputes regarding the amount of payment due for health care determined to be medically necessary and appropriate for treatment of a compensable injury, the role of the division is to adjudicate the payment, given the relevant statutory provisions and division rules. The findings in this decision are based on the evidence available at the time of review. Even though not all the evidence was discussed, it was considered.

For the reasons above, the division finds that additional payment is due. As a result, the amount ordered is $398.46.

ORDER

In accordance with Texas Labor Code Section 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), based on the submitted information, the division finds the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement. The division hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor $398.46, plus accrued interest per Rule §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this order.

Authorized Signature

	Grayson Richardson	July 12, 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.

The appealing party must submit a *Request to Schedule a Benefit Review Conference to Appeal a Medical Fee Dispute Decision* (form DWC045M). The division must receive the request within twenty days of your receipt of this decision.

The request may be faxed, mailed or personally delivered either to the field office handling the claim or to the division at the contact information listed on the form. You must deliver a copy of the request to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time you file the request. Include a **copy** of this **Medical Fee Dispute Decision** together with any other information required by 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.