



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 Pharmacy

Respondent Name

Hartford Insurance Company of Midwest

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-18-4555-01

Carrier's Austin Representative

Box Number 47

MFDR Date Received

July 30, 2018

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "The above claimant received medication and the carrier still has not acknowledged receipt of service. The original bill was submitted and received to carrier on 12/11/2017."

Amount in Dispute: \$555.68

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "Based upon the available documentation for review, and the included noted guidelines: We respectfully do not recommend approval for the requested services of "CMPD: Amitriptyline, Bupivacaine, Gabapentin, Amantadine, Baclofen, Base, #60/5, 0 refills, topical analgesic, NDC: N/A, DOS 1/03/2017 as reasonable or medical necessary."

Response Submitted by: The Hartford

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
December 11, 2017	Pharmacy Services	\$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. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.530 sets out the closed formulary requirements for claims not subject to certified networks.

5. The insurance carrier reduced payment for the disputed services with the following claim adjustment codes:
- 197 – Precertification/authorization/notification absent

Issues

1. Is Hartford Insurance Company of Midwest's reason for denial of payment supported?
2. Did Hartford Insurance Company of Midwest raise a new defense pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307?
3. Is Memorial Compounding Pharmacy (Memorial) entitled to reimbursement for the compound in question?

Findings

1. Memorial is seeking reimbursement of \$555.68 for a compound dispensed on December 11, 2017. Hartford Insurance Company of Midwest denied the disputed compound with claim adjustment reason code 197 – "Precertification/authorization/notification absent."

28 Texas Administrative Code §134.530(b)(2) 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 in question does not include a drug identified with a status of "N" in the current edition of the ODG, *Appendix A*. Hartford Insurance Company of Midwest failed to articulate any arguments to support its denial for preauthorization. Therefore, the division concludes that the compound in question did not require preauthorization and Hartford Insurance Company of Midwest's denial of payment for this reason is not supported. Therefore, the disputed compound will be reviewed for reimbursement.

2. In its position statement, The Hartford argued on behalf of Hartford Insurance Company of Midwest, "Based upon the available documentation for review, and the included noted guidelines: We respectfully do not recommend approval for the requested services of "CMPD: Amitriptyline, Bupivacaine, Gabapentin, Amantadine, Baclofen, Base; #60/5, 0 refills, topical analgesic, NDC, N/A, DOS 1/03/2017 as reasonable or medically necessary."

28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(d)(2)(F) states, in relevant 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 finds that Hartford Insurance Company of Midwest failed to present a medical necessity denial to Memorial Compounding Pharmacy in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.240 prior to the date the request for medical fee dispute resolution (MFDR) was filed. The division concludes that this defense presented in The Hartford's position statement shall not be considered for review because this assertion constitutes a new defense pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(d)(2)(F)

3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §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 \text{ per unit}) \times (\text{number of units}) \times 1.25) + \4.00 dispensing fee per prescription = reimbursement amount;
- (B) Brand name drugs: $((AWP \text{ per unit}) \times (\text{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
- (2) notwithstanding §133.20(e)(1) of this title (relating to Medical Bill Submission by Health Care Provider), the amount billed to the insurance carrier by the:
 - (A) health care provider; or
 - (B) pharmacy processing agent only if the health care provider has not previously billed the insurance carrier for the prescription drug and the pharmacy processing agent is billing on behalf of the health care provider.

The compound in dispute was billed by listing each drug included in the compound and calculating the charge for each drug separately as required by 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.502(d)(2). Each ingredient is listed below with its corresponding reimbursement amount as applicable.

Drug	NDC	Generic(G) /Brand(B)	Price /Unit	Units Billed	AWP Formula	Billed Amt	Lesser of AWP and Billed
Baclofen	38779038809	G	\$36.58	5.4	\$246.92	\$190.78	\$190.78
Amantadine HCL	38779041105	G	\$24.23	3	\$90.84	\$72.69	\$72.69
Gabapentin	38779246109	G	\$59.85	3.6	\$269.33	\$204.66	\$204.66
Bupivacaine HCL	38779052405	G	\$45.60	1.2	\$68.40	\$54.72	\$54.72
Amitriptyline	38779018904	G	\$18.24	1.8	\$41.04	\$32.83	\$32.83
						Total	\$555.68

The total reimbursement is therefore \$555.68. 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.

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 \$555.68, 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

Date

9/18/2018

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.