



American Orthotic & Prosthetic Association

www.AOPAnet.org

AOPA In Advance SmartBrief

Breaking News

October 25, 2016

AOPA Headlines:

[New Feature Coming to the AOPA in Advance: Smartbrief](#)

[Patient Care in the 21st Century](#)

[Present at the 2017 AOPA World Congress](#)

[Register for AOPA's 2017 Webinar Series](#)

[Revised Coding for the C—Leg](#)

[Coding Reminder for Prosthetic Covers and Skins](#)

[Join the Coding & Billing Experts in Las Vegas!](#)

[Noridian Release Prepayment Review Results](#)

[HHS Request to U.S. District Court Rejected](#)

[AHRQ Announces Systematic Review of Clinical Literature on Lower Limb Prostheses](#)

[Upcoming Events](#)

New Feature Coming to the AOPA in Advance: Smartbrief

The *O&P Almanac's* Member Spotlight highlights two AOPA member companies every month, and has been a very popular feature with our members. As an association that always puts members first, AOPA wants to give your business the credit it deserves for what you do especially well and share your company's story. The *AOPA in Advance: Smartbrief* will start featuring AOPA members who go above and beyond for their patients and the community, or who have a unique approach that is working. Have a great website or marketing team? Are you staying on top of industry trends, or doubling down on a traditional approach to O&P? What are you doing that is WORKING? Inspire your colleagues in the industry and share your best practices.

What makes your business unique? What are you doing better than your competitors? Email landerson@AOPAnet.org with your company name, what you are doing well, and let's get your story out there. Check next Tuesday's issue for one company's amazing website!

A facility's website is the first chance at making an impression with potential patients and referral sources, long before they even walk in the door. Websites increase visibility, credibility, and provide much needed information about the business.

AOPA members are always forward-looking, and we want to recognize members who do something especially well. AOPA would like to share the fine-tuned [website created by AtlanticProCare](#) in Portland, Maine. Their website features information for patients and providers, including their approach, staff profiles, and other patient resources. The site also features patient and provider testimonials, which provide a compelling case for the service care they provide. AtlanticProCare also started a blog this year, where they include advocacy issues, O&P technology, and other items of interest to O&P professionals and patients. A recent post took readers behind the scenes into their lab. Check it out and get some ideas for your website at www.AtlanticProCare.com.

What makes your business unique? Contact landerson@AOPAnet.org to have your business featured next month!



Clinical Areas

Our Approach

For Patients

For Providers

Contact

Blog

The Lab: Where the Magic Happens

September 13, 2016 | JP Donovan



Our patients come in, meet with our team, discuss their needs and goals, we do some evaluation and measurement, and then POOF! A new prosthetic limb appears.

At least that can be how it seems. But in reality, there's a lot of work going in our lab, behind the scenes. This is where we do the highly technical, exacting work that results in a new precision prosthesis that soon becomes a very intimate part of patient's daily lives.

Having our fully operational lab onsite means we can control the production of our custom prosthetic limbs precisely and with our hands on at all times. Unlike many "shops" that simply send the prosthesis away to have it made, we can control the process and maintain only the highest degree of quality and development standards. We also have greater control over the time it takes as well.

Our lab is a clean, orderly place that houses all of our inventory, stocks of supplies and componentry. It was built using lean manufacturing principles and is fully CAD/CAM integrated, which enables us to:

- Optimize the efficiency of our team and of our patients' time
- Design on the highest tech software for truly custom and innovative prostheses
- Eliminate the need for dusty, inaccurate and unreliable plaster models through our AtlanticProCare [Clear-Vu™](#) socket technology
- Harvest data over time -- such as the quantification of a patient's physical changes -- which is highly valuable in the delivery of care
- Maintain the highest levels of accuracy, consistency and repeatability
- Drive process improvements

The Lead Technician runs the lab, and communication with the lab is through the same EMR the rest of the team uses. Fully integrated into the team, our technicians are highly skilled and trained to use precision techniques in developing prostheses.

This technology and the teamwork that underlies it are what made it possible for us to create our [Rapid Ambulation Method](#) care platform that delivers a new prosthesis in one visit.

A lot of people would love to see what happens in the lab. But that would be kind of like a magician showing you how he did the card trick. It would take all the magic out of that moment when we walk back into the room with a brand new, custom-fit, highly engineered prosthesis for you.

Featured Posts



Speak Up.

July 19, 2016

Recent Posts



The Lab: Where the Magic Happens
September 13, 2016



Speak Up.
July 19, 2016



Our Robot Overlords
June 3, 2016



Contrasts
May 10, 2016



The Finish Line
April 21, 2016



Limb Loss Awareness

Present at the 2017 AOPA World Congress

Share Your Expertise * Advance Your Career * Improve Patient Care

AOPA is seeking high-quality education presentations for the second O&P World Congress to be held September 6-9, 2017 at the Mandalay Bay Resort in Las Vegas, Nevada, USA. Your submissions, based on sound research and strong empirical data, will set the stage for a



broad curriculum of highly valued clinical and scientific offerings at the 2017 World Congress. All free paper abstracts for the 2017 World Congress must be submitted electronically through the links below. Abstracts submitted by email or fax will not be considered. All abstracts will be considered for both podium and poster presentations. The review committee will grade each submission via a blind review process, based on the criteria below and reach a decision regarding acceptance of abstracts.

- Relevance, level of interest in topic
- Quality of Scientific Content
- Quality of Clinical Content

The Business Program deadline for submission is February 1, 2017. All other papers are due March 1, 2017.

Clinical Free Papers – Those wishing to present an Orthotic, Prosthetic or Pedorthic Free Paper should [submit here](#) to have their paper considered for presentation at the 2017 World Congress. The top scoring papers will compete for the prestigious Thranhardt Award.

Technician Program – If you would like your Technical education paper considered for submission in the Technical Track, please [submit your paper here](#).

Symposia – **If you are interested in organizing a Symposium, then please [submit here](#).**

Business Education Program – Please [submit your business education paper here](#). The top papers will be considered for the prestigious Sam E. Hamontree, CP (E) Business Education Award.



Peer Review Process

The business education committee will review and grade each submission through a blind review process based on the criteria below and reach a decision regarding acceptance of the paper.

- Current Climate in O&P/Healthcare
- Quality of Format, Content, Delivery
- Experience with topic based on bio submitted

Contact AOPA Headquarters at 571/431-0876 or TCarlson@AOPAnet.org with questions about the submission process or the World Congress in general.

WEBINAR WEDNESDAYS



AOPA's 2017 Webinar topics have been announced! Register for the whole series to earn 1.5 credits and get 2 free Webinars! Just \$990 for members and \$1990 for non-members.

January 11- O&P Clinical Documentation: Who Needs to Document and What You Need to Document

February 8 - LSO/TLSO Policy

March 8 - Marketing Your Business

April 12 - Grassroots Advocacy

May 10- Modifiers: What do they mean and when to use them

June 14- Internal Audits: The Why and the How of Conducting Self-Audits

July 12 - Know Your Resources: Where to Look to Find the Answers

August 9 - What the Medicare Audit Data Tells Us & How to Avoid Common Errors

September 13 - ABC Inspections & Accreditation

October 11 - AFO/KAFO Policy

November 8 -Gift Giving: Show Your Thanks & Remain Compliant

December 13 - New Codes & Other Updates for 2018

REGISTER NOW

Questions? Contact rgleeson@AOPAnet.org. Looking for 2016 webinars or individual webinars? [Visit here.](#)

Revised Coding for the C—Leg

The Durable Medical Equipment Medicare Administrative Contractors (DME MAC) and the Pricing, Data Analysis and Coding (PDAC) contractor recently released a joint statement providing revised coding for the C-Leg. For claims with a date of service on or after October 6, 2016 the following codes are the only codes that may be used to describe the C-Leg for billing purposes:

- L5828 - ADDITION, ENDOSKELETAL KNEE-SHIN SYSTEM, SINGLE AXIS, FLUID SWING AND STANCE PHASE CONTROL
- L5845 - ADDITION, ENDOSKELETAL, KNEE-SHIN SYSTEM, STANCE FLEXION FEATURE, ADJUSTABLE
- L5848 - ADDITION TO ENDOSKELETAL KNEE-SHIN SYSTEM, FLUID STANCE EXTENSION, DAMPENING FEATURE, WITH OR WITHOUT ADJUSTABILITY
- L5856 - ADDITION TO LOWER EXTREMITY PROSTHESIS, ENDOSKELETAL KNEE-SHIN SYSTEM, MICROPROCESSOR CONTROL FEATURE, SWING AND STANCE PHASE, INCLUDES ELECTRONIC SENSOR(S), ANY TYPE

The revised coding announcement removes the HCPCS code L5930 (ADDITION, ENDOSKELETAL SYSTEM, HIGH ACTIVITY KNEE CONTROL FRAME), from the previous list of approved HCPCS codes. Suppliers are also reminded that the use of a miscellaneous code, L5999, may not be used to describe any features of the C-Leg.

Suppliers are also reminded that any and all HCPCS codes assigned to a product by the DME MACs or PDAC must be billed when a claim is submitted to Medicare for payment.

View the complete joint statement [here](#).

Questions? Contact Joe McTernan at jmcternan@AOPANet.org or Devon Bernard at dbernard@AOPANet.org.

Coding Reminder for Prosthetic Covers and Skins

Each of the DME MACs (Durable Medical Equipment Medicare Administrative Contractors) continue to report a high volume of claims containing codes that describe prosthetic covers (L5704-L5707) and protective covering systems (L5962, L5964, and L5966), even though they have stated that the medical need for both of these protective features on a single prosthesis is rare. The DME MACs contend that custom shaped protective covers (L5704-L5707) provide sufficient protection and waterproofing for normal daily usage of a prosthesis and that the addition of an outer surface covering system, commonly referred to as a skin, is only medically necessary when there are unusually harsh environmental situations that warrant additional protection.

The DME MACs want to remind suppliers that there must be documentation to support medical necessity of a protective outer surface covering system (L5962, L5964, and L5966) and this documentation must indicate the type of extraordinary activities that would justify the need for extra protection; beyond that of everyday usage in a typical environment.

Also, when billing for the L5962, L5964 or L5966, you must include information on your claim regarding the type of protective cover provided (i.e., manufacturer name, make, model or type).

Questions regarding this issue may be directed to Joe McTernan at jmcternan@aopanet.org or Devon Bernard at dbernard@aopanet.org

Join the Coding & Billing Experts in Las Vegas!

The AOPA Coding & Billing Experts are Coming to Las Vegas!

AOPA's next Coding & Billing Seminar will be in Las Vegas! Don't miss this opportunity to get the most up-to-date information to advance your O&P practitioners' and billing staff's coding knowledge.

Join your Colleagues November 14-15 in Las Vegas!

At this seminar you will:

- Receive up-to-date information on Prior Authorization and other Hot Topics
- Ensure your Proof of Delivery meets Medicare Requirements
- Learn how to assess risk areas in your practice

- Learn successful appeal strategies and hints to avoid claim denials
- Practice coding complex devices, including repairs and adjustment
- Attend break-out sessions for practitioners and office staff
- Earn 14 CEs

Register Now

Noridian Releases Prepayment Review Results

Noridian, the Jurisdiction D Durable Medical Equipment Medicare Administrative Contractor (DME MAC), recently released their quarterly results of its review for claims involving the HCPCS codes L1832, L1843, L0648 and L4361.

Between April 2016 and July 2016 Noridian reviewed 161 claims involving the L1832 and 152 claims were denied; resulting in a 99% error/denial rate. The previous denial/error rate was 100%. The review of claims involving the L1843 had a denial/error rate of 98%; 111 of 112 claims were denied.

The top four denial reasons were listed as:

- Documentation submitted didn't justify the need for a custom fitted brace
- Documentation did not support the presence of knee instability or that the beneficiary is ambulatory
- Documentation was not submitted in response to the Additional Documentation Request
- Invalid/Incomplete/Missing proof of delivery

Noridian released their quarterly results of its prepayment review for L0648 and L0650. Between April 2016 and July 2016 Noridian reviewed 275 claims involving the L0648 and 186 claims were denied; resulting in a 64% error/denial rate. The previous quarter's denial rate (January-April) was 74%. The review of claims involving the L0650 had a denial/error rate of 83%; 425 of 512 reviewed claims were denied. The previous quarter's denial rate (January-April) was 82%.

Some of the top denial reasons listed included:

- Invalid/Missing/Incomplete detailed written orders
- Documentation was not submitted in response to the Additional Documentation Request
- Invalid/Incomplete/Missing proof of delivery

Noridian also released their quarterly results for claims involving HCPCS code L4361 (walking boot, pneumatic and/or vacuum, with or without joints, with or without interface material, prefabricated, off-the-shelf). Between April 2016 and July 2016 Noridian reviewed 378 claims on the L4361, and 270 were denied. This resulted in a claim denial/error rate of 73%.

The top four denial reasons were listed as:

- Invalid/Missing/Incomplete detailed written orders
- Documentation was not submitted in response to the Additional Documentation Request
- Invalid/Incomplete/Missing proof of delivery
- Documentation didn't support basic coverage criteria (patient was ambulatory, patient had a weakness/deformity of the ankle, potential to benefit, etc.)

Based on the high denial/error rates Noridian will continue with the prepayment review for all of those codes.

HHS Request to U.S. District Court Rejected

In 2014, the American Hospital Association filed suit in the federal District Court seeking relief because HHS and the Office of Medicare Hearings and Appeals (OMHA) have for many years egregiously exceeded the statutory provision which assures a provider who must return money to Medicare as a result of an audit a final ALJ decision within 90 days after filing a request for ALJ appeal. Originally, the District Court dismissed the case, but early this year the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals reversed that decision and ordered that the case should go forward in the District Court.

HHS/OMHA asked for a delay of over a year (until September 30, 2017) citing proposed regs (to which both AOPA and the O&P Alliance responded) intended to reduce the backlog--which are somewhat problematic in their own right. The Court ruled not to approve HHS' request for such a delay, but rather that case will go forward with a hearing in two weeks.

Court Sees Likelihood that the Backlog and Delay in ALJ Decisions Will Grow, Despite Various Efforts by HHS/OMHA Proposed Rule

In his ruling rejecting the HHS request for delay, District Court Judge Boasberg said that even with the administrative changes proposed by HHS/OMHA, it would not reverse the backlog, but rather that the ALJ backlog/delay would nonetheless probably get worse, not better over several years. The increased claim settlement efforts, and appointing attorneys to undertake adjudication of appeals in the proposed regs, would, the Court said, at best reduce the growth of the backlog. The specifics of the delay are daunting. Without any remedial actions by either HHS/OMHA or Congress the projected number of appeal cases awaiting ALJ hearing would reach nearly 1.1 million. HHS reports average delay in 2016 is 850 days, but OMHA says in the third quarter of this year it took 935 day for appeals to get through the first three levels of appeal, not getting to a final ALJ decision. Reports from O&P patient care appellants seems to run closer to 4 years waiting time to get to an ALJ decision! HHS proposed changes to the RAC program, but these would impact just 7 percent of RAC cases. Finally, the judge underscored that several Congressional initiatives, e.g., the AFIRM bill had not moved much closer to enactment in the 7+ months since the Circuit Court of Appeals decision, nor did it appear likely that significant budget increases to hire substantially more ALJs would be enacted anytime soon.

The Appeals of RAC Decisions, and the Related Interest Due if Provider Wins May Be Making the Program Much Less Financially Beneficial to the Federal Government Than Many Think

As [a report from Dobson-DaVanzo](#) last year demonstrated, with the long ALJ delays, coupled with the 11% annual interest payable by the government on the amount the government recouped if the provider prevails, the actual yield to the government from the audits is greatly reduced, and perhaps close to being fully consumed by its costs. For example, RAC auditors receive something in range of a 13% bounty on whatever they claw back. If the case is reversed after the ALJ decision 4 years later, CMS would pay the 11%, which when compounded amounts to a 51.8% interest over the 4 years. In this scenario CMS may be able to secure the return of the RAC auditor commissions. Dobson-DaVanzo's work identified at least 58% of O&P RAC appeals are won at the ALJ level (this is the highest success rate among all provider subgroups, and could perhaps be higher, as only verified ALJ wins could be affirmatively identified)-this coupled with the above

large interest due, would appear to largely obliterate any net long-term CMS gains from all the RAC efforts in O&P.

One concluding note is that two bills supported by AOPA would help alleviate some of the adverse impact of RAC audits on O&P professionals. S.829/H.R. 1530 would assure that CMS must recognize the orthotist/prosthetist notes of patient visits as a legitimate part of the medical record for purposes of determining medical necessity. H.R. 1526 would help reduce the cash flow devastation of audits and extended wait for appeals by establishing the maximum amount of recoupment that CMS could claw back **before** a final ALJ appeal decision to 50% of the contested amount until such time as HHS/CMS/OMHA are operating within the clear terms of the statute and assuring delivery of final ALJ decisions within the stated 90 days.

AHRQ Announces Systematic Review of Clinical Literature on Lower Limb Prostheses

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), the “government agency tasked with producing evidence to improve the quality of healthcare while working with partners to ensure that the evidence is understood and used,” recently announced that it will be initiating a systematic review for lower limb prostheses. The systematic review will be performed through the Evidence Based Practice Center Program of the AHRQ—they will likely select a firm to conduct the review under contract-- and the stated purpose of the systematic review is “to examine the available clinical evidence that defines practices in the care of beneficiaries who require lower limb prostheses (LLP).”

While the announcement does not tie the systematic review to the work of the inter-agency taskforce assigned to review the delayed draft Local Coverage Determination (LCD) that was released by the DME MACs in the summer of 2015, it is very likely that the initiation of the systematic review for lower limb prostheses is related to the work of this taskforce.

AOPA will be working toward a timely and substantive meeting with representatives of the AHRQ in order to discuss existing systematic reviews for lower limb prostheses that have recently been completed through AOPA funding as well as the ongoing work and comprehensive systematic literature reviews and simulation modeling being conducted by the RAND Corporation including its assessment of the cost effectiveness of prosthetic intervention, as well as both previous and new cost effectiveness studies based on Medicare data that have been developed by Dobson DaVanzo.

Upcoming AOPA Events

November 9, 2016 *Don't Miss Out: Are You Billing For Everything You Can?*
AOPA Webinar
[Learn more and register here](#)

November 14-15, 2016 *Coding & Billing Seminar*
Las Vegas, NV
[Learn more and register here](#)

December 14, 2016 *New Codes and What Lies Ahead for 2017*
AOPA Webinar
[Learn more and register here](#)