



## MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

### PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Type of Requestor:</b> (x) Health Care Provider ( ) Injured Employee ( ) Insurance Carrier	
Requestor's Name and Address: RS Medical P.O. Box 872650 Vancouver, WA 98687-2650	MDR Tracking No.: M4- 05-A063-01
	Claim No.:
	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name and Address: Insurance Co. of the State of PA Rep Box: 19	Date of Injury:
	Employer's Name: Tenet Healthcare Corp.
	Insurance Carrier's No.: YDWC15754

### PART II: REQUESTOR'S PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION AND POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Payment has been made based on old fee guidelines for E0745; which had a D code in the pre 1996 fee schedule, which is not a comparable device as it provides only muscle stimulation. The Commission has not established a maximum allowable for the RS4I Sequential Stimulator. The RS4I provides 2 modalities...4 channel muscle stimulation plus interferential electrotherapy, providing equivalent therapy of 2 devices, therefore a higher fee allowance is reasonable and warranted."

Principle Documentation:

1. DWC-60/Table of Disputed Service
2. CMS-1500's
3. EOB's

### PART III: RESPONDENT'S PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION AND POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "While the S.O.A.H. decisions are not binding on the Commission, previous S.O.A.H. decisions indicate minimal weight should be given to EOB's for documenting fair and reasonable reimbursement. The willingness of some Carriers to reimburse at or near the billed amount does not necessarily document that the billed amount is fair and reasonable and does not show how effective medical cost control is achieved, a criteria identified in Section 413.011 (d) of the Texas Labor Code. The provider has failed to show that their fees are in accordance with fees that other providers are charging for the same device and not what other carriers are paying."

Principle Documentation:

1. Position Summary
2. Copy of DWC-60 Part I-IV

### PART IV: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code	CPT Code(s) or Description	Part V Reference	Additional Amount Due
07/08/2004 - 08/07/2004	F/F	E-1399-RR	A 1-9	\$141.59
07/08/2004	F/F	A4556	B 1-2	\$52.00
07/08/2004	F/F	A4557	B 1,3	\$26.00
<b>TOTAL DUE</b>				<b>\$219.59</b>

### PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

A. The disputed issue: Whether payment is due the Requestor for rental of DME known as the RS4i.

1. The Respondent EOB denial code(s) asserts: "F –Please submit the appropriate health care financing administration procedure coding system (HCPCS) code for the listed service." For Reconsideration, Respondent stated same denial.

2. The HCPCS Level II CPT Code E1399 is used for billing of miscellaneous DME, when a specific code for the DME is not available. Reimbursement for DME billed using this code will vary, as it does not have an established value set by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) or the Division.

3. For date(s) of service on or after August 1, 2003, Division Rule 134.202(b), 2002 Medical Fee Guideline, requires health care providers to apply the Medicare program reimbursement methodologies for coding, billing, reporting and reimbursement of professional services, including DME. CMS partnered with the Statistical Analysis Durable Medical Equipment Regional Carrier (SADMERC) to provide guidance to manufacturers and suppliers on the proper use of the Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS), the means by which durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) are identified for Medicare billing. Manufacturers and suppliers are instructed by CMS and through the Durable Medical Equipment Regional Carrier (DMERC) supplier manual and advisories to contact the SADMERC HCPCS Unit to obtain proper billing codes for DMEPOS items. (Reference to website: <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/DMEPOSFeeSched/LSDMEPOSFEE/list.asp>)

SADMERC representatives have determined that the RS4i is properly coded using CPT code E1399. According to SADMERC, no other more specific HCPCS billing code accurately describes this piece of equipment. With this decision, SADMERC established that the RS4i is not the same as a transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulator (TENS) unit. However, according to industry experts and product information, the RS4i is substantially similar to muscle stimulator such as E0745, with features such as programmable treatment plans, four channels with up to eight pads to cover larger areas.

4. According to Division Rule 134.202 (c)(6), for products and services which CMS or the Division does not have an established reimbursement value; the carrier shall assign a relative value. The relative value may be based on nationally recognized published relative value studies, published commission medical dispute decisions, and values assigned for services involving similar work or resource commitment.

5. The Requestor did not provide evidence to indicate how a relative value was selected.

6. The Respondent did not provide evidence indicating how the relative value was selected.

7. RS Medical has submitted product features and states that due to the unique features of the product as compared to other muscle stimulators, higher reimbursement is warranted. RS Medical also provided EOB(s) from other carriers who have reimbursed the full amount billed at \$250.00 for monthly rental. The EOB(s) provided by RS Medical illustrate the highest amount paid by carriers, but do not show the full range of reimbursements made by all carriers. RS Medical seeks 100% of its billed charges.

8. MDR does not concur that reimbursement of 100% of the provider charges for the RS4i is fair and reasonable. Allowing reimbursement of 100% of charges gives the manufacturer sole control over the amount billed and reimbursed and therefore, does not achieve effective medical cost control as required by Texas Labor Code §413.011. Cost information is used in a variety of reimbursement systems to determine fair and reasonable reimbursement (e.g. CMS's Durable Medical Equipment Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies (DMEPOS) fee schedule, and other Division fee guidelines) However, no cost information was submitted.

9. Because the RS4i is substantially similar to a muscular stimulator unit (E0745, Neuromuscular Stimulator) the Division considered various established values for the E0745 from a variety of sources to determine a fair and reasonable reimbursement for monthly rental of the RS4i. Using commercially available data on average commercial reimbursement rates for the E0745 code, the Divisions workers' compensation carrier reimbursement paid for code E0745 for dates of service in 2004, and 125% of the 2004 CMS assigned relative value for code E0745, the Division determined a reimbursement range of \$101.02 to \$182.16 for this code. The midpoint of that range, \$141.59 per month was determined to be a fair and reasonable reimbursement for rental of the RS4i. Reimbursement higher than the DMEPOS E0745 Neuromuscular Stimulator rate x 125% is used to recognize the unique features of the RS4i, as described above in #3.

The Respondent made a total payment in the amount of \$0.00, therefore, \$141.59 is due to the Requestor.

B. The disputed issue: Whether payment is due the Requestor for purchase of DME supplies known as HCPCS Code A4556 and A4557.

1. The Respondent EOB denial code(s) asserts: "F –Reimbursement is being withheld as this procedure is considered integral to the primary procedure billed." The "Reconsideration" was deemed the same.

2. The Requestor billed \$80.00 for 8 units of electrodes under HCPCS Code A4556. Per 2004 DMEPOS the MAR for HCPCS Code A4556 is \$15.18 per unit ( $\$12.14 \times 125\% = \$15.18$  per unit). The Respondent made no payment, therefore the Division finds that reimbursement is due in the amount of \$52.00 per Rule 134.202(d)(2).

3. The Requestor billed \$40.00 for 1 cable set unit under HCPCS Code A4557. Per 2004 DMEPOS the MAR for HCPCS Code A4557 is \$26.38 per unit (\$21.10 x 125% = \$26.38). The Respondent made no payment, therefore the Division finds that reimbursement is due in the amount of \$26.00 per Rule 134.202(d)(2).

**PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES IMPACTING DECISION**

28 Texas Administrative Code Sec. §413.011(a-d)  
28 Texas Administrative Code Sec. §134.1  
28 Texas Administrative Code Sec. §134.202 (b) & (c)(6)  
28 Texas Administrative Code Sec. §134.202 (d)(2)

**PART VII: DIVISION DECISION AND ORDER**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code, Sec. 413.031, the Division has determined that the Requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement in the amount of \$219.59 plus all accrued interest due at the time of payment to the Requestor within 30 days receipt of this Order.

Ordered by:

Michael Buggs

08/07/06

Authorized Signature

Typed Name

Date of Order

**PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST JUDICIAL REVIEW**

Appeals of medical dispute resolution decisions and orders are procedurally made directly to a district court in Travis County [see Texas Labor Code, Sec. 413.031(k), as amended and effective Sept. 1, 2005]. An appeal to District Court must be filed not later than 30 days after the date on which the decision that is the subject of the appeal is final and appealable. The Division is not considered a party to the appeal.

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