



## Of Language and Reimbursement

John S. Hoff

To cite this article: John S. Hoff (1993) Of Language and Reimbursement, *Oncology Issues*, 8:3, 30-30, DOI: [10.1080/10463356.1993.11904431](https://doi.org/10.1080/10463356.1993.11904431)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463356.1993.11904431>



Published online: 18 Oct 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2



View related articles [↗](#)

Contributors are encouraged to submit a brief outline of proposed articles or to discuss proposed articles with the Managing Editor of *Oncology Issues* prior to submission. Articles are accepted with the understanding that they have not been published, submitted, or accepted for publication elsewhere. Authors submitting an article do so on the understanding that if it is accepted for publication, copyright shall be assigned to the Association.

#### Articles

Articles submitted to *Oncology Issues* for consideration for publication should be no longer than 8 to 10 double-spaced manuscript pages in length. Submissions should include the original manuscript and two duplicate copies. Author(s) identification (title and affiliation) should be included. If there are multiple authors, one author should be designated as correspondent.

#### Review and Corrections

Articles will be reviewed by two or more editorial review board members. Authors will be informed of acceptance, rejection, or need for revision within 6 to 8 weeks, but at times longer delays may be unavoidable. All articles are subject to copyediting. Author corrections and revisions should be kept to a minimum and must be received within seven days of receipt; after this time, no further changes may be made by the author.

Articles should be submitted to: Managing Editor, *Oncology Issues*, 11600 Nebel St., Suite 201, Rockville, MD 20852. Call 301/984-9496 for more information.

#### Illustrations and Tables

Authors are encouraged to submit illustrations, tables, figures, sidebars, etc. that help clarify the text. Tables, figures, and sidebars should be typed on separate pages and their position indicated in the text. Photographs should be unmounted, glossy prints.

Photographs will not be returned unless the author indicates "Please return" on the back of the prints. Photo captions should be listed on a separate page.

#### Footnotes and References

Footnotes should appear at the bottom of the page on which the corresponding text appears and should be cited in the text with an asterisk, dagger, etc. References should be limited in number and submitted on a separate page.

The following form should be used:  
*Books:* Last name of author and first initial; title; editor; publisher; city and state; year of publication.

*Journals and Periodicals:* Last name of author and first initial; title of article; title of journal, number; volume; year of publication.

#### Copies and Reprints

Authors will receive two free copies of the issue in which their article appears. Additional copies of *Oncology Issues* and/or the article are available upon request for a fee.

## Of Language and Reimbursement

by John S. Hoff

**M**ajor issues of coverage and reimbursement are often obscured by the use of language of indeterminate meaning, or of no meaning at all. What care is *appropriate or necessary*? What is *reasonable cost*? What is *proven safe and effective*?

Of particular relevance to oncologists is the meaning of *investigational*. When is a treatment not reimbursable because it is investigational? This issue often comes up in connection with high dose chemotherapy and autologous bone marrow transplants (HDC-ABMT).

An interesting case was recently decided by the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.<sup>1</sup> It demonstrates the vagueness of the word *investigational* and details the issues that must be addressed in deciding what the term means. Most importantly and most disturbingly, the case demonstrates the extent to which reimbursement decisions become the subject of difficult, lengthy, and expensive court proceedings and, consequently, the need for reimbursement rules to be articulated more precisely.

The patient was diagnosed with mediastinal germ cell carcinoma with pulmonary metastases. HDC-ABMT was recommended after the standard dose of chemotherapy had proved unsuccessful. Coverage was provided by an ERISA plan. The administrator of the plan denied coverage for the treatment on the ground that the procedure was investigational. It based its decision on the informed consent form, the protocol document of the medical school, and the literature.

The patient brought an action in District Court. He submitted affidavits from experts that the HDC-ABMT was the standard of care and the best available therapy, and that it

was not experimental or investigative. As is usual in these cases, the District Court found for the patient. It did so on the ground that the plan administrator had not provided an adequate explanation for its denial of coverage. The Court then conducted its own review of the procedure and found that it was not investigational. The plan appealed.

The Court of Appeals agreed with the District Court that the plan administrator did not provide a sufficient explanation for its denial of coverage, but said that the District Court erred in looking into the evidence concerning the nature of the treatment on its own. Instead, it should have required the plan administrator to conduct a better analysis. The Court detailed the issues this analysis should entail. They are instructive. It asked:

- Does the use of a treatment for one type of germ cell cancer make it noninvestigative for other types?
- Does the fact that the treatment was in phase II study make it investigative?
- Is the standard of care to use investigative treatment for patients who do not respond to regular chemotherapy?

To this list should be added the ultimate question: If the standard of care is to use investigative treatment, is it standard care or investigational?

Until the definitions used to delineate insurance coverage are given flesh, either by law if part of a federal basic insurance plan or by more detailed contractual language in private insurance, these issues will continue to bedevil practitioners and patients and require attention by the courts. This case, moreover, demonstrates that even after court review, where an ERISA plan is involved, the decision may ultimately be made by the plan itself—if it goes through the right hoops. ■

*John S. Hoff is ACCC Legal Counsel with Swidler & Berlin in Washington, D.C.*

<sup>1</sup> *Bernards v. United of Omaha Life Insurance Company*, 987 F.2d 486 (8th Cir. 1993)