

Officers

May 26, 2021

Madelaine A. Feldman, MD, FACP
President

Robert E. Kettler, MD
Ella M. Noel, D.O., F.A.C.O.I.

Gary Feldman, MD
Vice President

Wisconsin Physicians Service Insurance Corporation
1717 W. Broadway

Michael Saitta, MD, MBA
Treasurer

PO Box 1787
Madison, WI 53701-1787

Michael S. Brooks, MD, FACP, FACR
Secretary

RE: Local Coverage Article (LCA) titled Billing and Coding: Complex Drug Administration (A58544)

Directors

Dear Drs. Kettler and Noel:

Kostas Botsoglou, MD
Director

The Coalition of State Rheumatology Organizations (CSRO) is comprised of over 40 state and regional professional rheumatology societies whose mission is to advocate for excellence in the field of rheumatology, ensuring access to the highest quality of care for the management of rheumatologic and musculoskeletal disease. Our coalition serves the practicing rheumatologist.

Mark Box, MD
Director

Aaron Broadwell, MD
Director

We write to share concerns about your recently revised LCA that provides billing and coding guidance for complex drug administration based on the assertion that *“there is inappropriate use of CPT codes 96401-96549 for chemotherapy and other highly complex drug or highly complex biologic agent administration.”*ⁱ

Adrienne Burford Foggs, MD
Director

Sarah Doaty, MD
Director

Challenges with LCA Policy

Harry Gewanter, MD, FAAP, MACR
Director

As the LCA explains, the American Medical Association (AMA) Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) code book describes chemotherapy as including *“other highly complex drugs or highly complex biologic agents,”* that in the context of chemotherapy administration (CPT 96401-96549) would consist of *“certain monoclonal antibody agents, and other biologic response modifiers.”*ⁱⁱ The AMA CPT code book further clarifies that these drugs require advanced clinical skill to prepare, administer, and monitor, given the associated safety warnings and potential for adverse reactions.

Adrienne Hollander, MD
Director

Robert Levin, MD
Director

Amar Majhoo, MD
Director

Moreover, CMS previously issued a one-time notificationⁱⁱⁱ to its Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs) that stating the following:

Gregory Schimizzi, MD
Director

“...chemotherapy administration codes apply to parenteral administration of nonradionuclide anti-neoplastic drugs; and also to anti-neoplastic agents provided for the treatment of noncancer diagnoses (e.g., cyclophosphamide for auto-immune conditions) or to substances such as monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers. The following drugs are commonly considered to fall under the category of monoclonal antibodies: infliximab, rituximab, alemtuzumab, gemtuzumab, and trastuzumab.”

Michael Schweitz, MD
Director

Joshua Stolor, MD
Director

Headquarter Office

The notice was issued in December 2004 when there were only a handful of targeted therapies available for non-cancer diagnoses. Since that time, however, there has been tremendous growth in the availability of monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers for use in autoimmune diseases, such as rheumatoid and psoriatic arthritis.

Ann Marie Moss
Executive Director

Based on the above, ***it is clear that targeted therapies used to treat rheumatic conditions, including Cimzia®, Prolia®, Orencia®, Simponi Aria®, and Stelara®, are highly complex drugs***

and biologic agents. Coding for the administration of these therapies squarely fits the definition of “Chemotherapy and Other Highly Complex Drug or Highly Complex Biological Agent Administration” (CPT codes 96401 – 96549). Unfortunately, the LCA concludes otherwise and directs clinicians to inappropriately “down-code” the administration of these drugs using “Therapeutic Prophylactic, and Diagnostic Injections and Infusions” codes (CPT codes 96365 – 96379).

Challenges with LCA Process

Usually, LCAs are coupled with local coverage determinations (LCD) “to provide coding/billing information to help implement the coverage policy” which MACs are required to publish “at the same time they publish the proposed LCD.”^{iv} Unfortunately, this LCA was issued in the absence of an LCD. As a result, it:

- 1) Made a change in coverage policy for drug administration services without issuing a proposed LCD;
- 2) Circumvented the usual notice-and-comment that affords stakeholders a meaningful opportunity to provide feedback on proposed changes in coverage policy;
- 3) Sidestepped consultation with the Contractor Advisory Committee (CAC), healthcare professional experts, and professional societies;
- 4) Failed to meet the evidentiary content requirement required in every proposed LCD; and,
- 5) Eliminated the opportunity for stakeholders to submit a formal reconsideration of the coverage policy.

Conclusion

We strongly oppose NGS’ revised coverage policy for complex drug administration, as described in the aforementioned LCA. Moreover, we are deeply disappointed in the process used to establish this coverage policy by unilaterally issuing an LCA. This is not in the spirit of the transparency and increased stakeholder engagement intended by Congress in revising the LCD process by way of the 21st Century Cures Act, nor of CMS’ improvements to the LCD process following stakeholder feedback to its Request for Information (RFI) in the CY 2018 Physician Fee Schedule. **We urge you to withdraw this billing and coding article, or, at a minimum, eliminate the aforementioned drugs from the policy.**

Please do not hesitate to contact us, should you require additional information.

Sincerely,



Madelaine A. Feldman, MD
President



Michael C. Schweitz, MD
Federal Advocacy Chair

ⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Transmittals/downloads/R129OTN.pdf>

^{iv} <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/Downloads/pim83c13.pdf>

Officers

May 26, 2021

Madelaine A. Feldman, MD, FACR
President

Leland Garrett, MD, FACP, FASN, CPC

Gary Feldman, MD
Vice President

Miguel Brito, MD, FCAP, FASCP

Palmetto GBA

Attn: Medical Affairs, AG -275

Michael Saitta, MD, MBA
Treasurer

P.O. Box 100305

Columbia, SC 29202-3305

Michael S. Brooks, MD, FACP, FACR
Secretary

RE: Local Coverage Article (LCA) titled Billing and Coding: Complex Drug Administration (A58527)

Directors

Dear Drs. Garrett and Brito:

Kostas Botsoglou, MD
Director

The Coalition of State Rheumatology Organizations (CSRO) is comprised of over 40 state and regional professional rheumatology societies whose mission is to advocate for excellence in the field of rheumatology, ensuring access to the highest quality of care for the management of rheumatologic and musculoskeletal disease. Our coalition serves the practicing rheumatologist.

Mark Box, MD
Director

Aaron Broadwell, MD
Director

We write to share concerns about your recently revised LCA that provides billing and coding guidance for complex drug administration based on the assertion that *“there is inappropriate use of CPT codes 96401-96549 for chemotherapy and other highly complex drug or highly complex biologic agent administration.”*ⁱ

Adrienne Burford Foggs, MD
Director

Sarah Doaty, MD
Director

Challenges with LCA Policy

Harry Gewanter, MD, FAAP, MACR
Director

As the LCA explains, the American Medical Association (AMA) Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) code book describes chemotherapy as including *“other highly complex drugs or highly complex biologic agents,”* that in the context of chemotherapy administration (CPT 96401-96549) would consist of *“certain monoclonal antibody agents, and other biologic response modifiers.”*ⁱⁱ

Adrienne Hollander, MD
Director

The AMA CPT code book further clarifies that these drugs require advanced clinical skill to prepare, administer, and monitor, given the associated safety warnings and potential for adverse reactions.

Robert Levin, MD
Director

Amar Majhoo, MD
Director

Moreover, CMS previously issued a one-time notificationⁱⁱⁱ to its Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs) that stating the following:

Gregory Schimizzi, MD
Director

“...chemotherapy administration codes apply to parenteral administration of nonradionuclide anti-neoplastic drugs; and also to anti-neoplastic agents provided for the treatment of noncancer diagnoses (e.g., cyclophosphamide for auto-immune conditions) or to substances such as monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers. The following drugs are commonly considered to fall under the category of monoclonal antibodies: infliximab, rituximab, alemtuzumab, gemtuzumab, and trastuzumab.”

Michael Schweitz, MD
Director

Joshua Stolor, MD
Director

Headquarter Office

The notice was issued in December 2004 when there were only a handful of targeted therapies available for non-cancer diagnoses. Since that time, however, there has been tremendous growth in the availability of monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers for use in autoimmune diseases, such as rheumatoid and psoriatic arthritis.

Ann Marie Moss
Executive Director

Based on the above, ***it is clear that targeted therapies used to treat rheumatic conditions, including Cimzia®, Prolia®, Orencia®, Simponi Aria®, and Stelara®, are highly complex drugs***

and biologic agents. Coding for the administration of these therapies squarely fits the definition of “Chemotherapy and Other Highly Complex Drug or Highly Complex Biological Agent Administration” (CPT codes 96401 – 96549). Unfortunately, the LCA concludes otherwise and directs clinicians to inappropriately “down-code” the administration of these drugs using “Therapeutic Prophylactic, and Diagnostic Injections and Infusions” codes (CPT codes 96365 – 96379).

Challenges with LCA Process

Usually, LCAs are coupled with local coverage determinations (LCD) “to provide coding/billing information to help implement the coverage policy” which MACs are required to publish “at the same time they publish the proposed LCD.”^{iv} Unfortunately, this LCA was issued in the absence of an LCD. As a result, it:

- 1) Made a change in coverage policy for drug administration services without issuing a proposed LCD;
- 2) Circumvented the usual notice-and-comment that affords stakeholders a meaningful opportunity to provide feedback on proposed changes in coverage policy;
- 3) Sidestepped consultation with the Contractor Advisory Committee (CAC), healthcare professional experts, and professional societies;
- 4) Failed to meet the evidentiary content requirement required in every proposed LCD; and,
- 5) Eliminated the opportunity for stakeholders to submit a formal reconsideration of the coverage policy.

Conclusion

We strongly oppose NGS’ revised coverage policy for complex drug administration, as described in the aforementioned LCA. Moreover, we are deeply disappointed in the process used to establish this coverage policy by unilaterally issuing an LCA. This is not in the spirit of the transparency and increased stakeholder engagement intended by Congress in revising the LCD process by way of the 21st Century Cures Act, nor of CMS’ improvements to the LCD process following stakeholder feedback to its Request for Information (RFI) in the CY 2018 Physician Fee Schedule. **We urge you to withdraw this billing and coding article, or, at a minimum, eliminate the aforementioned drugs from the policy.**

Please do not hesitate to contact us, should you require additional information.

Sincerely,



Madelaine A. Feldman, MD
President



Michael C. Schweitz, MD
Federal Advocacy Chair

ⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Transmittals/downloads/R129OTN.pdf>

^{iv} <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/Downloads/pim83c13.pdf>

Officers

May 26, 2021

Madeline A. Feldman, MD, FACP
President

Eileen Moynihan, MD, FACP, FACRh
Janet Lawrence, MD

Gary Feldman, MD
Vice President

Noridian Healthcare Solutions, LLC
900 42nd Street S.

Michael Saitta, MD, MBA
Treasurer

PO Box 6781
Fargo, ND 58103-6781

Michael S. Brooks, MD, FACP, FACR
Secretary

RE: Local Coverage Article (LCA) titled Billing and Coding: Complex Drug Administration (A58532 and A58533)

Directors

Dear Drs. Moynihan and Lawrence:

Kostas Botsoglou, MD
Director

The Coalition of State Rheumatology Organizations (CSRO) is comprised of over 40 state and regional professional rheumatology societies whose mission is to advocate for excellence in the field of rheumatology, ensuring access to the highest quality of care for the management of rheumatologic and musculoskeletal disease. Our coalition serves the practicing rheumatologist.

Mark Box, MD
Director

Aaron Broadwell, MD
Director

We write to share concerns about your recently revised LCA that provides billing and coding guidance for complex drug administration based on the assertion that *“there is inappropriate use of CPT codes 96401-96549 for chemotherapy and other highly complex drug or highly complex biologic agent administration.”*ⁱ

Adrienne Burford Foggs, MD
Director

Sarah Doaty, MD
Director

Challenges with LCA Policy

Harry Gewanter, MD, FAAP, MACR
Director

As the LCA explains, the American Medical Association (AMA) Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) code book describes chemotherapy as including *“other highly complex drugs or highly complex biologic agents,”* that in the context of chemotherapy administration (CPT 96401-96549) would consist of *“certain monoclonal antibody agents, and other biologic response modifiers.”*ⁱⁱ The AMA CPT code book further clarifies that these drugs require advanced clinical skill to prepare, administer, and monitor, given the associated safety warnings and potential for adverse reactions.

Adrienne Hollander, MD
Director

Robert Levin, MD
Director

Amar Majjhoo, MD
Director

Moreover, CMS previously issued a one-time notificationⁱⁱⁱ to its Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs) that stating the following:

Gregory Schimizzi, MD
Director

“...chemotherapy administration codes apply to parenteral administration of nonradionuclide anti-neoplastic drugs; and also to anti-neoplastic agents provided for the treatment of noncancer diagnoses (e.g., cyclophosphamide for auto-immune conditions) or to substances such as monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers. The following drugs are commonly considered to fall under the category of monoclonal antibodies: infliximab, rituximab, alemtuzumab, gemtuzumab, and trastuzumab.”

Michael Schweitz, MD
Director

Joshua Stolor, MD
Director

Headquarter Office

The notice was issued in December 2004 when there were only a handful of targeted therapies available for non-cancer diagnoses. Since that time, however, there has been tremendous growth in the availability of monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers for use in autoimmune diseases, such as rheumatoid and psoriatic arthritis.

Ann Marie Moss
Executive Director

Based on the above, ***it is clear that targeted therapies used to treat rheumatic conditions, including Cimzia®, Prolia®, Orencia®, Simponi Aria®, and Stelara®, are highly complex drugs***

and biologic agents. Coding for the administration of these therapies squarely fits the definition of “Chemotherapy and Other Highly Complex Drug or Highly Complex Biological Agent Administration” (CPT codes 96401 – 96549). Unfortunately, the LCA concludes otherwise and directs clinicians to inappropriately “down-code” the administration of these drugs using “Therapeutic Prophylactic, and Diagnostic Injections and Infusions” codes (CPT codes 96365 – 96379).

Challenges with LCA Process

Usually, LCAs are coupled with local coverage determinations (LCD) “to provide coding/billing information to help implement the coverage policy” which MACs are required to publish “at the same time they publish the proposed LCD.”^{iv} Unfortunately, this LCA was issued in the absence of an LCD. As a result, it:

- 1) Made a change in coverage policy for drug administration services without issuing a proposed LCD;
- 2) Circumvented the usual notice-and-comment that affords stakeholders a meaningful opportunity to provide feedback on proposed changes in coverage policy;
- 3) Sidestepped consultation with the Contractor Advisory Committee (CAC), healthcare professional experts, and professional societies;
- 4) Failed to meet the evidentiary content requirement required in every proposed LCD; and,
- 5) Eliminated the opportunity for stakeholders to submit a formal reconsideration of the coverage policy.

Conclusion

We strongly oppose NGS’ revised coverage policy for complex drug administration, as described in the aforementioned LCA. Moreover, we are deeply disappointed in the process used to establish this coverage policy by unilaterally issuing an LCA. This is not in the spirit of the transparency and increased stakeholder engagement intended by Congress in revising the LCD process by way of the 21st Century Cures Act, nor of CMS’ improvements to the LCD process following stakeholder feedback to its Request for Information (RFI) in the CY 2018 Physician Fee Schedule. **We urge you to withdraw this billing and coding article, or, at a minimum, eliminate the aforementioned drugs from the policy.**

Please do not hesitate to contact us, should you require additional information.

Sincerely,



Madelaine A. Feldman, MD
President



Michael C. Schweitz, MD
Federal Advocacy Chair

ⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Transmittals/downloads/R129OTN.pdf>

^{iv} <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/Downloads/pim83c13.pdf>

Officers

Madelaine A. Feldman, MD, FACR
President

Gary Feldman, MD
Vice President

Michael Saitta, MD, MBA
Treasurer

Michael S. Brooks, MD, FACP, FACR
Secretary

May 26, 2021

Carolyn Cunningham, M.D.
Stephen D. Boren, MD
National Government Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 7108
Indianapolis, IN 46207

RE: Local Coverage Article (LCA) titled Billing and Coding: Complex Drug Administration (A58620)

Directors

Kostas Botsoglou, MD
Director

Mark Box, MD
Director

Aaron Broadwell, MD
Director

Adrienne Burford Foggs, MD
Director

Sarah Doaty, MD
Director

Harry Gewanter, MD, FAAP, MACR
Director

Adrienne Hollander, MD
Director

Robert Levin, MD
Director

Amar Majjhoo, MD
Director

Gregory Schimizzi, MD
Director

Michael Schweitz, MD
Director

Joshua Stalow, MD
Director

Dear Drs. Cunningham and Boren:

The Coalition of State Rheumatology Organizations (CSRO) is comprised of over 40 state and regional professional rheumatology societies whose mission is to advocate for excellence in the field of rheumatology, ensuring access to the highest quality of care for the management of rheumatologic and musculoskeletal disease. Our coalition serves the practicing rheumatologist.

We write to share concerns about your recently revised LCA that provides billing and coding guidance for complex drug administration based on the assertion that *“there is inappropriate use of CPT codes 96401-96549 for chemotherapy and other highly complex drug or highly complex biologic agent administration.”*ⁱ

Challenges with LCA Policy

As the LCA explains, the American Medical Association (AMA) Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) code book describes chemotherapy as including *“other highly complex drugs or highly complex biologic agents,”* that in the context of chemotherapy administration (CPT 96401-96549) would consist of *“certain monoclonal antibody agents, and other biologic response modifiers.”*ⁱⁱ The AMA CPT code book further clarifies that these drugs require advanced clinical skill to prepare, administer, and monitor, given the associated safety warnings and potential for adverse reactions.

Moreover, CMS previously issued a one-time notificationⁱⁱⁱ to its Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs) that stating the following:

“...chemotherapy administration codes apply to parenteral administration of nonradionuclide anti-neoplastic drugs; and also to anti-neoplastic agents provided for the treatment of noncancer diagnoses (e.g., cyclophosphamide for auto-immune conditions) or to substances such as monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers. The following drugs are commonly considered to fall under the category of monoclonal antibodies: infliximab, rituximab, alemtuzumab, gemtuzumab, and trastuzumab.”

Headquarter Office

Ann Marie Moss
Executive Director

The notice was issued in December 2004 when there were only a handful of targeted therapies available for non-cancer diagnoses. Since that time, however, there has been tremendous growth in the availability of monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers for use in autoimmune diseases, such as rheumatoid and psoriatic arthritis.

Based on the above, ***it is clear that targeted therapies used to treat rheumatic conditions, including Cimzia®, Prolia®, Orencia®, Simponi Aria®, and Stelara®, are highly complex drugs and biologic agents.*** Coding for the administration of these therapies squarely fits the definition of “Chemotherapy and Other Highly Complex Drug or Highly Complex Biological Agent

Administration” (CPT codes 96401 – 96549). Unfortunately, the LCA concludes otherwise and directs clinicians to inappropriately “down-code” the administration of these drugs using “Therapeutic Prophylactic, and Diagnostic Injections and Infusions” codes (CPT codes 96365 – 96379).

Challenges with LCA Process

Usually, LCAs are coupled with local coverage determinations (LCD) “to provide coding/billing information to help implement the coverage policy” which MACs are required to publish “at the same time they publish the proposed LCD.”^{iv} Unfortunately, this LCA was issued in the absence of an LCD. As a result, it:

- 1) Made a change in coverage policy for drug administration services without issuing a proposed LCD;
- 2) Circumvented the usual notice-and-comment that affords stakeholders a meaningful opportunity to provide feedback on proposed changes in coverage policy;
- 3) Sidestepped consultation with the Contractor Advisory Committee (CAC), healthcare professional experts, and professional societies;
- 4) Failed to meet the evidentiary content requirement required in every proposed LCD; and,
- 5) Eliminated the opportunity for stakeholders to submit a formal reconsideration of the coverage policy.

Conclusion

We strongly oppose NGS’ revised coverage policy for complex drug administration, as described in the aforementioned LCA. Moreover, we are deeply disappointed in the process used to establish this coverage policy by unilaterally issuing an LCA. This is not in the spirit of the transparency and increased stakeholder engagement intended by Congress in revising the LCD process by way of the 21st Century Cures Act, nor of CMS’ improvements to the LCD process following stakeholder feedback to its Request for Information (RFI) in the CY 2018 Physician Fee Schedule. **We urge you to withdraw this billing and coding article, or, at a minimum, eliminate the aforementioned drugs from the policy.**

Please do not hesitate to contact us, should you require additional information.

Sincerely,



Madelaine A. Feldman, MD
President



Michael C. Schweitz, MD
Federal Advocacy Chair

ⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Transmittals/downloads/R129OTN.pdf>

^{iv} <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/Downloads/pim83c13.pdf>

Officers

May 26, 2021

Madeline A. Feldman, MD, FACR
President

Meredith Loveless, MD
CGS Administrators, LLC

Gary Feldman, MD
Vice President

26 Century Blvd.
Ste. ST610

Michael Saitta, MD, MBA
Treasurer

Nashville, TN 37214-3685

Michael S. Brooks, MD, FACP, FACR
Secretary

RE: Local Coverage Articles titled Billing and Coding: Complex Drug Administration (A58526)

Directors

Dear Dr. Loveless:

Kostas Botsoglou, MD
Director

The Coalition of State Rheumatology Organizations (CSRO) is comprised of over 40 state and regional professional rheumatology societies whose mission is to advocate for excellence in the field of rheumatology, ensuring access to the highest quality of care for the management of rheumatologic and musculoskeletal disease. Our coalition serves the practicing rheumatologist.

Mark Box, MD
Director

Aaron Broadwell, MD
Director

We write to share concerns about your recently revised LCA that provides billing and coding guidance for complex drug administration based on the assertion that *“there is inappropriate use of CPT codes 96401-96549 for chemotherapy and other highly complex drug or highly complex biologic agent administration.”*ⁱ

Adrienne Burford Foggs, MD
Director

Sarah Doaty, MD
Director

Challenges with LCA Policy

Harry Gewanter, MD, FAAP, MACR
Director

As the LCA explains, the American Medical Association (AMA) Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) code book describes chemotherapy as including *“other highly complex drugs or highly complex biologic agents,”* that in the context of chemotherapy administration (CPT 96401-96549) would consist of *“certain monoclonal antibody agents, and other biologic response modifiers.”*ⁱⁱ The AMA CPT code book further clarifies that these drugs require advanced clinical skill to prepare, administer, and monitor, given the associated safety warnings and potential for adverse reactions.

Adrienne Hollander, MD
Director

Robert Levin, MD
Director

Amar Majjhoo, MD
Director

Moreover, CMS previously issued a one-time notificationⁱⁱⁱ to its Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs) that stating the following:

Gregory Schimizzi, MD
Director

“...chemotherapy administration codes apply to parenteral administration of nonradionuclide anti-neoplastic drugs; and also to anti-neoplastic agents provided for the treatment of noncancer diagnoses (e.g., cyclophosphamide for auto-immune conditions) or to substances such as monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers. The following drugs are commonly considered to fall under the category of monoclonal antibodies: infliximab, rituximab, alemtuzumab, gemtuzumab, and trastuzumab.”

Michael Schweitz, MD
Director

Joshua Stalow, MD
Director

Headquarter Office

The notice was issued in December 2004 when there were only a handful of targeted therapies available for non-cancer diagnoses. Since that time, however, there has been tremendous growth in the availability of monoclonal antibody agents and other biologic response modifiers for use in autoimmune diseases, such as rheumatoid and psoriatic arthritis.

Ann Marie Moss
Executive Director

Based on the above, ***it is clear that targeted therapies used to treat rheumatic conditions, including Cimzia®, Prolia®, Orencia®, Simponi Aria®, and Stelara®, are highly complex drugs and biologic agents.*** Coding for the administration of these therapies squarely fits the definition of “Chemotherapy and Other Highly Complex Drug or Highly Complex Biological Agent

Administration” (CPT codes 96401 – 96549). Unfortunately, the LCA concludes otherwise and directs clinicians to inappropriately “down-code” the administration of these drugs using “Therapeutic Prophylactic, and Diagnostic Injections and Infusions” codes (CPT codes 96365 – 96379).

Challenges with LCA Process

Usually, LCAs are coupled with local coverage determinations (LCD) “to provide coding/billing information to help implement the coverage policy” which MACs are required to publish “at the same time they publish the proposed LCD.”^{iv} Unfortunately, this LCA was issued in the absence of an LCD. As a result, it:

- 1) Made a change in coverage policy for drug administration services without issuing a proposed LCD;
- 2) Circumvented the usual notice-and-comment that affords stakeholders a meaningful opportunity to provide feedback on proposed changes in coverage policy;
- 3) Sidestepped consultation with the Contractor Advisory Committee (CAC), healthcare professional experts, and professional societies;
- 4) Failed to meet the evidentiary content requirement required in every proposed LCD; and,
- 5) Eliminated the opportunity for stakeholders to submit a formal reconsideration of the coverage policy.

Conclusion

We strongly oppose NGS’ revised coverage policy for complex drug administration, as described in the aforementioned LCA. Moreover, we are deeply disappointed in the process used to establish this coverage policy by unilaterally issuing an LCA. This is not in the spirit of the transparency and increased stakeholder engagement intended by Congress in revising the LCD process by way of the 21st Century Cures Act, nor of CMS’ improvements to the LCD process following stakeholder feedback to its Request for Information (RFI) in the CY 2018 Physician Fee Schedule. **We urge you to withdraw this billing and coding article, or, at a minimum, eliminate the aforementioned drugs from the policy.**

Please do not hesitate to contact us, should you require additional information.

Sincerely,



Madelaine A. Feldman, MD
President



Michael C. Schweitz, MD
Federal Advocacy Chair

ⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/article-details.aspx?articleId=58620&ver=6>

ⁱⁱⁱ <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Transmittals/downloads/R129OTN.pdf>

^{iv} <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/Downloads/pim83c13.pdf>