

**MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.**

Independent Bill Review  
P.O. Box 138006  
Sacramento, CA 95813-8006  
Fax: (916) 605-4280



---

**INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION**

April 12, 2016

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

IBR Case Number:	CB16-0000443	Date of Injury:	09/23/2014
Claim Number:	[REDACTED]	Application Received:	03/16/2016
Assignment Date:	04/05/2016		
Claims Administrator:	[REDACTED]		
Date(s) of service:	09/11/2015 – 09/11/2015		
Provider Name:	[REDACTED]		
Employee Name:	[REDACTED]		
Disputed Codes:	G6056		

Dear [REDACTED]

MAXIMUS Federal Services has completed the Independent Bill Review (“IBR”) of the above workers’ compensation case. This letter provides you with the IBR Final Determination and explains how the determination was made.

**Final Determination: UPHOLD. MAXIMUS Federal Services has determined that no additional reimbursement is warranted. The Claims Administrator’s determination is upheld and the Claim Administrator does not owe the Provider additional reimbursement. A detailed explanation of the decision is provided later in this letter.**

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its expert reviewer is deemed to be the Final Determination of the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers’ Compensation. This determination is binding on all parties. In certain limited circumstances, you can appeal the Final Determination. Appeals must be filed with the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board within 20 days from the date of this letter. For more information on appealing the final determination, please see California Labor Code Section 4603.6(f).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, M.D., M.P.H.  
Medical Director

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

## **DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

Pertinent documents reviewed to reach the determination:

- The Independent Bill Review Application
- The original billing itemization
- Supporting documents submitted with the original billing
- Explanation of Review in response to the original bill
- Request for Second Bill Review and documentation
- Supporting documents submitted with the request for second review
- The final explanation of the second review
- OMFS

## **HOW THE IBR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE**

MAXIMUS Federal Services Chief Coding Specialist reviewed the case file and researched pertinent coding and billing standards to reach a determination. In some cases a physician reviewer was employed to review the clinical aspects of the care to help make a determination. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/services.

## ANALYSIS AND FINDING

Based on review of the case file the following is noted:

- **ISSUE IN DISPUTE: Provider seeking remuneration for G6056 performed on 09/11/2015.**
- EORs indicate services denied as “included” in the value of another services (G0431 Urine Drug Screen Qualitative) performed on the same day.
- HCPCS G6056 is a quantitative test not inclusive to reported Qualitative Drug Screening G0431.
- Submitted results relating to G0431(performed on same day) indicates **qualitative “negative”** results for opiates and metabolites. HCPCS G0656 Opiate(s), drug and metabolites, (including nalorphine) represent both qualitative and quantitative analysis.
- IBR documentation request includes a letter from the Provider’s Billing Representative with an explanation as to the “need” for reported HCPCS G6056.
- **Administrative Rules § 9792.6.** Utilization Review Standards – Definition (a) “Authorization” means assurance that appropriate reimbursement will be made for an approved specific course of proposed medical treatment to cure or relieve the effects of the industrial injury pursuant to section 4600 of the Labor Code, subject to the provisions of section 5402 of the Labor Code, based on either a completed “Request for Authorization,” DWC Form RFA, as contained in California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 9785.5, or a request for authorization of medical treatment accepted as complete by the claims administrator under section 9792.9.1(c)(2), that has been transmitted by the treating physician to the claims administrator. Authorization shall be given pursuant to the timeframe, procedure, and notice requirements of California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 9792.9.1, and may be provided by utilizing the indicated response section of the “Request for Authorization,” DWC Form RFA if that form was initially submitted by the treating physician.
- Authorization from the Claims Administrator approving the specific course of treatment relating to G6056 was not submitted for IBR.
- Authorization for G6056 service is required for reimbursement; IBR unable to determine medical necessity.
- **Based on the aforementioned documentation and guidelines, reimbursement for G6056 is not indicated.**

The table on page 4 describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: G6056**

<b>Date of Service</b> 09/11/2015 Laboratory Services						
<b>Service Code</b>	<b>Provider Billed</b>	<b>Plan Allowed</b>	<b>Dispute Amount</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Workers' Comp Allowed Amt.</b>	<b>Notes</b>
G6056	\$39.72	\$0.00	\$31.78	1	\$0.00	<b>Refer to Analysis</b>

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]