

Quality Review Tips!



QR Tips August 4, 2022

Co- Reviewer Contact

What is the purpose?

- A Carrier's referral may request reports from two (or more) specialty reviewers to ensure the claimant's conditions have been considered individually and in totality.
- The intention of a Co-Reviewer conference call is to confirm that there is no overt disagreement on the claimant's overall functionality.

What are the expectations?

- The expectation is that each reviewer considers the file related to the conditions within their specialty, then conduct a call with the Co-Reviewer to discuss the case. Each reviewer will document the Co-Reviewer call in their reports (under Co-Reviewer Teleconference)
- Contact information for each Co- Reviewer (s) is provided in referral email. Due to security and privacy purposes, currently only telephonic communications are approved between consultants for direct case discussions.
- Email may be used **ONLY** for the purposes of establishing a date and time for the conference call. It is critical that no personal or private information (including any case numbers) is shared in any email, only the Brown and Brown Absence case number.
- Each reviewer is expected to share their assessment and opinion from the perspective of their specialty. Disagreements should be reconciled; only one reviewer should comment on any one condition to avoid discrepancies.

What needs to be documented?

- Each reviewer will document date and time of call (dates and times must match), Co-Reviewer name and specialty in their respective reports.
- A brief summary of discussion should be stated. Please do not cite another reviewer's opinion (it is apparent in their respective report). Examples:
 - 'The case was reviewed in its totality, and we shared our respective opinions. No disagreement was noted.'
 - 'The case was reviewed in its totality, and we shared our respective opinions. After full discussion, it was agreed that (specialty) reviewer would address the claimant's condition. Agreement was reached on the claimant's overall capacity.'

What if we disagree?

- Disagreements should be reconciled.
- If reviewers disagree regarding capacity related to the same condition, the reviewers must discuss the details and agree which specialist will address the condition in question, with one reviewer deferring to their colleague to opine on the condition in question. For example, the neurology reviewer and IM reviewer differ in their opinions regarding the impact of headaches on a claimant's capacity. The opinion should be deferred to the neurologist.
- Example of a documented Co-Reviewer disagreement: "On 7/17/2022 at 12:16 PM EST, I spoke with Dr. X. The duration of the phone call was 9 minutes. We discussed our respective opinions. There was consensus on functional status in totality in that we both opined that she had restrictions/limitations but could some activities to some degree. The only area of disagreement was related to the claimant's ability to bend, stoop, kneel, crouch, or crawl. I opined that she could perform those activities occasionally. Dr. X opined that she could never perform these activities but stated that she was taking non-neurological conditions into account. Whether a non-neurological condition would result in these restrictions/limitations is out of my realm of expertise and therefore, I could not opine whether I agreed or disagreed with this opinion. There were no other areas of disagreement. "

What if I can't get a hold of the co-reviewer?

- Please contact the Referral Team/ QR Team as soon as possible and we will reach out to your peer reviewer. Completed reports must document that Co-Reviewer contact was established.

Look for our next tip in the upcoming weeks.

We hope this has been helpful and we welcome your feedback and questions.

Thank you,
The QR Team

Bobbie bahern@bbabsence.com 207-747-4311
Julie jmatula@bbabsence.com 207-747-4314
Tracy Tbassett@bbabsence.com 207-747-4342
Robin rthatcher@bbabsence.com 207-747-4323
MaryAnne mtranfaglia@bbabsence.com 207-835-0049