

Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation 7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFO	DRMATION					
Type of Requestor: (x) He	alth Care Provide	er () Injured Employee	() Insurance Carrier			
Requestor's Name and Address: RS Medical		MDR Tracking No.:	M4-05-A573-01	M4-05-A573-01		
P.O. Box 872650		Claim No.:				
Vancouver, WA 98687-2650		Injured Employee's Name:				
Respondent's Name and Address: El Paso ISD			Date of Injury:			
REP BOX: 42		Employer's Name:	El Paso ISD			
			Insurance Carrier's No.:	ES 103483	ES 103483	
PART II: REQUESTOR'S	PRINCIPLE D	OCUMENTATION AND	POSITION SUMMARY	Y		
Requestor's Position Summary: "There is no established fee schedule for this device. Fair and Reasonable were not established by documentation"						
Principle Documentation:						
1. DWC-60/Table of Disputed Services/Position Summary						
2. CMS-1500's						
	3. EOBs					
PART III: RESPONDENT Respondent's Position Sur					mondation for this unit "	
Respondent s Position Sui	minary. we le	er the previous anowand	e of \$150.00 was a fair	and reasonable recon	intendation for this unit.	
Principle Documentation: 1. Position Summary						
	2. EOBs					
PART IV: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS						
Date(s) of Service	Denial Code	CPT Code(s)	or Description	Part V Reference	Additional Amount Due (if any)	
12/09/04 - 01/09/05	M1, 01, W4, W10	E-13	399-RR	1	\$0.00	
TOTAL DUE					\$0.00	
PART V: MEDICAL DISH	PUTE RESOLU	TION REVIEW SUMMA	RY, METHODOLOGY	, AND/OR EXPLANA	TION	
Section 413.011(a-d) titled (Guidelines and Medical Policies), and Commission Rule 134.202 titled (Medical Fee Guideline) effective August 1, 2003, set out reimbursement guidelines.						
The Respondent used payment exception codes "M1- TWCC Code: M-No MAR, 01-TWCC Code: O-Denial after reconsideration" and on Reconsideration used: "W4-No additional reimbursement after review of appeal/reconsideration and W10-No maximum allowable defined by fee guideline. Reimbursement made based on insurance carrier fair and reasonable reimbursement methodology."						
1. The HCPCS Level II C code is not available. The Division.						
Division Rule 134.202 (c) relative value, which may decisions, and values assig product features and infor- that due to the unique feat	be based on nat gned for services mation, the man	ionally recognized publi s involving similar work ufacturer has not submit	shed relative value stud or resource commitme ted manufacturing cost	lies, published commi nt. Although RS Mec information on the pr	ission medical dispute dical has submitted roduct. RS Medical states	

provides EOBs from other carriers who have reimbursed the full amount bill at \$250.00 for rental. The EOBs provided by RS Medical only illustrate the highest amount paid by carriers and do not show the full range of payments made by carriers.

MDR does not believe that reimbursement of 100% of the charges is fair and reasonable. Reimbursement of 100% of charges, gives the manufacturer sole control over the amount billed and reimbursed, this is not effective medical cost control for the workers' compensation system. The manufacturer has not provided convincing evidence to justify increased reimbursement. Unless the manufacturer provides convincing evidence to provide for reimbursement otherwise, the Division refers to the other values previously discussed. While the RS4i is not exactly the same as a TENS unit, the RS4i is similar to a TENS unit. Therefore, the Division will use the assigned relative value for a similar type product, E0745, Neuromuscular Stimulator, at a midpoint between the CMS national average payment (\$82.80) multiplied by 1.25 and the national average commercial reimbursement (180.01) for the E0745. The commercial reimbursement is used to recognize the unique features of the RS4i that make the RS4i different from the E0745, Neuromuscular Stimulator.

For date of service in calendar year 2004 and 2005 the Division reimbursement for the RS4i is calculated as follows $82.80 \times 125\% =$ $103.50 + 180.01 \div 2 = 141.76$. The Respondent made a total payment for two DOS in the amount of $300.00 (150.00 \times 2)$. Therefore, no additional reimbursement is recommended.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES IMPACTING DECISION

28 Texas Administrative Code Sec. §413.011(a-d) 28 Texas Administrative Code Sec. §134.202

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.

Decision by:

	Patricia Rodriguez	06/09/2006
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.