

**Medicaid Analytic Extract
Provider Characteristics
(MAXPC) File**

Anomaly Tables, 2010

Final Report

May 31, 2013

Deo Bencio



MATHEMATICA
Policy Research

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Contract Number:
HHSM-500-2005-000251

Task Number:
HHSM-500-T0002

Mathematica Reference Number:
06759.660

Submitted to:
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
7500 Security Boulevard, B2-29-04
Baltimore, MD 21244-1850
Project Officer: Cara Petroski

Submitted by:
Mathematica Policy Research
1100 1st Street, NE
12th Floor
Washington, DC 20002-4221
Telephone: (202) 484-9220
Facsimile: (202) 863-1763
Project Director: Julie Sykes

**Medicaid Analytic Extract
Provider Characteristics
(MAXPC) File**

Final Report

May 31, 2013

Deo Bencio

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

SPECIAL NOTE TO MAXPC 2010 USERS
5/31/2013

Six states are not included in MAXPC 2010, because their MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems. The six states are:

- Idaho
- Kansas
- Maine
- New Jersey
- North Dakota
- Utah

The following state was processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files:

- Massachusetts: Excludes IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2010 that were adjudicated in FFY2011 Q3 and Q4.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

ACRONYMS

CMS	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
HIPAA	Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
ID	Identification/identifier
IP	Inpatient
LT	Long-term care
MAX	Medicaid Analytic Extract
MAXPC	MAX Provider Characteristics File
MSIS	Medicaid Statistical Information System
NPI	National Provider Identifier
NPES	National Plan and Provider Enumeration System
OT	Other services
RX	Drug

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

INTRODUCTION

The Medicaid Statistical Information System (MSIS) files and the corresponding research-friendly Medicaid Analytic Extract (MAX) files support a wide range of studies on Medicaid enrollment, service use, and expenditures. There is currently considerable interest at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) in also examining health reform proposals, program integrity, and access-to-care issues among certain types of Medicaid providers. However, it has not been possible to easily conduct provider-based research activities because the provider identification numbers collected in MSIS are largely unedited, undocumented, and state specific.

The advent of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) mandated covered entities such as health care providers, health plans, and health care clearinghouses to obtain and use a National Provider Identifier (NPI) in all administrative and financial HIPAA transactions.¹ The NPI is a unique 10-digit, sequentially assigned national identification number, unstructured so as not to carry in any way information such as the state or medical specialty of the health care provider who “owns” the identifier. Beginning in February 2009, states were required to include NPIs on claims submitted to MSIS. The main limitation of this identifier, however, is that certain classes of nonmedical providers are not required to obtain an NPI. Nonetheless, the availability of the NPI on MSIS claims makes the development of a uniform provider characteristic file more feasible. The MAX Provider Characteristics (MAXPC) file is such a file.

As MAXPC files for each state are created, a set of validation tables is developed to help determine whether linkages are working in the expected manner. As the validation tables are reviewed, a set of norms or expected values begins to form, based on data reported by a collection of states. The more validation tables that are produced, the better the estimate of expected values becomes. The expected values thus become benchmarks with which validation table values are compared. When a validation table measure for a state compares negatively to benchmarks, it can be said that an anomalous condition exists. These anomalous conditions are then reported in the anomaly tables; the tables are updated when unusual or abnormal data issues are spotted. By definition, anomalies vary from one year to the next, driven entirely by data from the state as well as from other states.

¹CMS. “National Provider Identifier (NPI) Overview.” Available at [<http://www.cms.gov/nationalProvIdentstand/>].

Measures in the Anomaly Tables

There are eight categories of measures in the anomaly tables:

- General issues—measures that could show potential problems with the linkage of individual provider IDs. These measures include the number of provider IDs, the percentage of provider IDs with NPIs, and the percentage linked to NPPES.
- Utilization-level issues—measures that could show potential problems with the linkage of individual provider IDs, related to utilization levels. These measures include the average number of claims per provider and the average number of beneficiaries with claims per provider.
- Cross-provider issues—measures that pertain to the source of provider IDs. These include the percentage of providers that are billing providers in IP, LT, OT, and RX; servicing providers in OT; and prescribing providers in RX; and whether provider IDs are billing NPIs in IP, LT, and RX or servicing NPI in OT.
- NPI-related issues—measures that could indicate potential problems with the source of NPIs. These measures include the number of legacy provider IDs with NPIs and the percentages of these where the NPI source is from MSIS, from the NPPES file, and from a state provider file.
- NPPES-linkage issues—measures that could indicate potential problems with linkage with NPPES. These measures include the number of provider IDs linked to NPPES, the percentage linked to NPPES using NPIs, and the percentage of in-state providers.
- Provider taxonomy issues—measures that could indicate potential problems related to a provider's primary taxonomy. These measures show the number and percentage of provider IDs with primary taxonomy, the percentage of providers who are individuals or groups of individuals, and the percentage of providers who are nonindividuals.
- Individual provider entity issues—measures that could show potential problems related to an individual provider's entity. These measures include the number and percentage of provider IDs with the entity type "individual" and, of these, the percentage who are sole proprietors.
- Organizational provider entity issues—measures that could show potential problems related to an organizational provider's entity. These measures include the number and percentage of provider IDs with the entity type "organization" and, of these, the percentage that are subparts.

Measures under each category will be updated as necessary. Each of the state's measures is compared against benchmarks for that measure; when a state's measure is determined to lie outside (either above or below) a benchmark, the cell containing the measure is highlighted to indicate a potentially anomalous condition. It is up to individual researchers to assess whether a certain condition must be dealt with for their particular study.

2010 MAXPC ANOMALY TABLES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table 1. General Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs				Percent with NPI				Percent Linked to NPES			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^b	RX ^b	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^b	RX ^b
Alabama	590	523	47,397	2,819	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0
Alaska	109	79	15,008	182	98.2	98.7	91.1	100.0	94.5	93.7	89.3	100.0
Arizona	905	286	52,151	2,354	99.6	100.0	91.6	100.0	99.6	100.0	91.6	100.0
Arkansas	441	641	44,992	1,683	89.3	99.7	72.7	100.0	89.3	99.7	72.7	100.0
California	2,882	3,007	763,626	20,556	78.5	48.8	87.3	98.8	32.5 ^c	24.5 ^c	9.6 ^c	35.5 ^c
Colorado	455	453	43,901	23,096	96.9	100.0	97.4	99.4	96.9	100.0	97.2	99.2
Connecticut	770	793	48,371	2,580 ^e	99.9	99.9	88.0	100.0	99.9	99.9	87.5	100.0
Delaware	58 ^f	65	8,291	275	98.3	98.5	82.5	100.0	98.3	95.4	81.6	100.0
District of Columbia	161	236	8,832	463	97.5	98.3	71.2	99.6	97.5	98.3	71.1	99.6
Florida	3,140	1,543	138,141	8,345	96.1	99.9	93.0	99.8	96.0	99.5	92.8	99.7
Georgia	1,184 ^f	789 ^g	108,833	4,828 ^h	98.5	99.7	98.3	97.9	98.5	99.7	98.3	97.5
Hawaii	243	64 ⁱ	12,420	479	93.4	95.3	68.2	96.7	93.4	95.3	68.2	96.7
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Illinois	1,277	2,296	147,362	3,774	90.8	66.5	69.7	96.7	90.8	66.5	69.7	96.7
Indiana	849	2,033	56,753	2,742	100.0	100.0	97.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0	100.0
Iowa	735	1,390	64,366	13,097	99.2	100.0	97.4	97.2	98.9	100.0	81.1	97.2
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Kentucky	766	775	56,341	2,731	99.6	99.9	90.3	99.2	99.6	99.9	90.3	99.2
Louisiana	1,282	1,925	44,464	2,408	91.8	54.2 ^j	91.7	51.5 ^k	78.5	48.3 ^d	88.4	50.8 ^l
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Maryland	455	486	92,158	2,643	93.4	98.1	62.3	99.6	92.7	98.1	51.0	99.6
Massachusetts	619	1,040	62,596	2,534 ^m	99.8	100.0	99.1	100.0	99.8	100.0	99.1	100.0
Michigan	1,654 ^f	1,325	198,167	16,106 ^h	81.0	90.0	36.2	75.0	80.8	89.7	36.1	67.5
Minnesota	880	1,644	118,305	2,939	92.2	96.6	92.2	99.6	92.0	95.4	48.4 ^c	99.6
Mississippi	684	521	30,680	1,756	99.0	98.8	99.6	99.3	99.0	98.8	99.4	99.3
Missouri	913	1,077	59,506	5,623	69.3	98.1	82.7	94.9	63.9	98.1	52.9	94.9
Montana	306	262	17,482	708	100.0	100.0	97.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.6	100.0
Nebraska	289	362	30,747	581	8.0	11.9	4.2	25.5	8.0	11.9	4.2	25.5
Nevada	431	239	20,683	1,047	100.0	99.2	99.9	99.9	100.0	99.2	94.2	99.9
New Hampshire	194	200	19,899	680	73.7	98.5	85.7	94.6	1.5 ^c	1.5 ^c	4.7 ^c	94.6

Table 1. General Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs				Percent with NPI				Percent Linked to NPPES			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^b	RX ^b	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^b	RX ^b
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
New Mexico	1,079	478	58,663	6,834 ^h	98.8	99.8	83.2	99.9	98.8	99.8	83.1	99.9
New York	2,381	3,345	270,533	9,538	87.4	94.7	92.8	99.3	87.3	94.7	92.6	99.3
North Carolina	754	1,770	102,817	4,343	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Ohio	1,268 ^f	2,825	126,113 ⁿ	7,704	84.5	97.1	71.4	95.6	40.5 ^c	30.5 ^c	35.1 ^c	12.0 ^c
Oklahoma	860	889	45,186	2,149	99.9	99.7	94.8	99.9	99.9	99.7	92.7	99.9
Oregon	334	348	47,710	1,497	95.2	95.1	84.0	99.2	95.2	95.1	84.0	99.2
Pennsylvania	832	1,843	97,737	7,615	99.3	99.9	89.5	99.9	99.3	99.9	89.5	99.9
Rhode Island	1,184	310	13,909 ⁿ	233	6.6	97.7	56.6	97.0	6.6	97.7	55.4	97.0
South Carolina	242	287	25,807	19,952 ^h	100.0	80.1	47.9	93.9	100.0	80.1	47.9	93.5
South Dakota	361	325	14,350	408	100.0	100.0	83.0	69.4	100.0	100.0	82.6	69.4
Tennessee	1,745	962	73,001	15,542	92.6	94.4	75.6	99.9	92.6	94.4	75.6	99.9
Texas	886	1,930	112,155	8,744	90.5	99.4	75.1	99.9	90.4	98.8	74.1	99.9
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Vermont	197	140	15,869	486	98.5	99.3	99.1	99.8	98.5	99.3	99.0	99.8
Virginia	1,347	378	78,368	1,768	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.7	100.0	95.7	100.0
Washington	517	552 ⁱ	68,491	2,609	95.7	55.8 ^j	99.0	96.3	95.7	55.8 ^d	98.5	96.3
West Virginia	420	483	33,271	1,559	98.8	99.8	96.2	99.9	98.8	99.6	96.2	99.9
Wisconsin	452	421	46,918	1,406	97.8	98.8	61.0	99.8	97.8	98.8	61.0	99.8
Wyoming	280	176	20,519	5,401	100.0	100.0	83.5	97.8	100.0	100.0	83.4	97.6

NOTE: The following state was processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files: Massachusetts: Excludes IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2010 that were adjudicated in FFY2011 Q3 and Q4.

^a Values less than 80 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^b Values less than 50 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^c Low percentage of records linked to NPPES relative to the percentage of records with NPIs indicate a problem in the reporting of NPIs.

^d The percent of LT provider IDs linked to NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in CA, LA, and WA in 2010.

^e The number of RX billing provider IDs decreased more than 30 percent in CT in 2010. The discrepancy in the numbers between 2009 and 2010 is attributed to the erroneous reporting of prescribing provider IDs instead of billing provider IDs in 2009.

^f The number of IP provider IDs increased more than 30 percent in DE, GA, MI, and OH in 2010.

^g The number of LT provider IDs increased more than 30 percent in GA in 2010.

^h The number of RX billing provider IDs increased more than 30 percent in GA, MI, NM, and SC in 2010.

ⁱ The number of LT provider IDs decreased more than 30 percent in HI and WA in 2010.

^j The percentage of LT provider IDs with NPIs decreased more than 30 percentage in LA and WA in 2010.

^k The percentage of RX billing provider IDs with NPIs decreased more than 30 percentage in LA in 2010.

^l The percentage of RX billing provider IDs linked to NPPES decreased more than 30 percentage in LA in 2010.

^m The number of RX billing provider IDs decreased more than 30 percent in MA in 2010.

ⁿ The number of OT servicing provider IDs increased more than 30 percent in OH and RI in 2010.

Table 2. Utilization Levels in MAXPC 2010

State	Average Number of Claims Per Provider ID ^a				Average Number of Beneficiaries with Claims Per Provider ID ^a			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX
Alabama	557.8	1,124.2	1,251.0	6,779.5	432.8	114.1	226.9	666.3
Alaska	199.1	205.6	620.3	6,166.0	170.2	31.3	109.1	613.1
Arizona	505.5	1,001.4 ^b	1,244.6	11,293.0	414.1	137.5	230.4	1,362.8
Arkansas	563.8	2,500.7	1,539.7	5,915.9	461.7	97.5	218.6	819.6
California	335.2	1,064.6	399.1	3,517.6	239.6	55.1	62.2	423.2
Colorado	337.8	2,456.1	1,233.9	384.1	284.1	74.8	193.4	60.3
Connecticut	600.3	751.8	1,191.8	7,499.0 ^c	352.1	87.5	158.4	609.8 ^c
Delaware	230.0	764.5	1,668.6	7,795.1	186.4	80.1	205.3	872.7
District of Columbia	448.3 ^d	385.6	1,691.0 ^e	4,727.3 ^f	341.3 ^d	46.7	202.5 ^e	306.3 ^f
Florida	384.7	901.2	1,714.3	6,304.0	286.5	98.4	263.2	659.8
Georgia	537.0	1,933.7 ^g	942.4	4,373.0 ^h	466.4	106.4	207.7	678.1
Hawaii	368.9 ⁱ	37.1 ^j	1,167.3	9,273.7 ^f	178.0	9.3 ^j	203.3	1,137.6 ^f
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.							
Illinois	707.6	851.1	1,052.6	13,992.4	511.6	99.9	227.7	1,480.8
Indiana	485.4	818.4	1,207.3	10,531.0	370.9	50.1	203.5	972.2
Iowa	227.4	260.8	612.8	659.4	187.7	31.6	104.2	88.0
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.							
Kentucky	445.6	1,019.3	1,261.8	9,864.0	362.2	137.2 ^k	282.4	1,146.4 ^l
Louisiana	499.2	422.1	2,163.4	10,914.8	341.4	71.3 ^k	380.1	1,403.0
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.							
Maryland	758.4	967.3	663.7	4,641.3	476.4	121.0	85.5	458.7
Massachusetts	522.0	832.8 ^b	1,890.1 ^e	8,196.1 ^m	365.8	113.3	232.5 ^e	678.4
Michigan	304.9 ^d	607.7 ^b	886.3	1,316.1 ^f	208.6 ^d	91.8	137.1 ⁿ	168.1 ^f
Minnesota	282.9	636.8	1,041.1	12,060.1 ^m	221.6	42.5	114.3	651.9
Mississippi	396.6	1,034.4	1,607.7	6,612.8	312.6	109.3	307.0	891.0
Missouri	441.1 ^d	1,140.6	1,142.8	5,333.4 ^f	339.8 ^d	78.2	163.3	523.7 ^f
Montana	160.2	455.3	505.3	2,953.4	132.2	42.8	89.6	285.9
Nebraska	178.7	301.0	366.0	5,077.4	144.9	36.2	74.8	539.1
Nevada	223.3	627.9	538.6	3,444.8	158.3	67.4	98.9	257.6
New Hampshire	198.2	843.6	688.9	4,343.6	164.8	69.7	94.3	430.9

Table 2. Utilization Levels in MAXPC 2010

State	Average Number of Claims Per Provider ID ^a				Average Number of Beneficiaries with Claims Per Provider ID ^a			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.							
New Mexico	147.5	473.6	680.6	1,455.2	123.4	41.2	104.9	167.8
New York	1,827.3	6,663.0	1,565.9	12,764.2	685.7	100.6	231.8	1,111.3
North Carolina	930.4	1,158.5	1,984.5	7,264.3	754.2	63.2	274.1	805.5
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.							
Ohio	222.2 ^o	530.5	1,086.6	7,231.9 ^f	175.3	69.3	100.6	716.7 ^f
Oklahoma	399.2	1,422.4	1,383.0	6,051.5	311.3	67.6	214.0	833.9
Oregon	393.9	577.0	585.0	5,694.1	335.8	69.8	123.8	508.1
Pennsylvania	424.2 ⁱ	1,678.1 ^b	515.5	2,467.4	259.8	98.9	88.0	218.0
Rhode Island	82.6	293.2	466.2 ^p	7,743.5	37.3	34.9	95.7	730.6
South Carolina	398.2	590.7	790.0	410.3 ^q	328.1	70.4	130.1	66.4 ^q
South Dakota	136.2	345.2	374.8	2,293.0	116.6	42.9	87.3	282.9
Tennessee	318.2	806.2	1,246.7	1,686.4	198.3	77.5	250.8	213.0
Texas	1,102.9	1,818.4	2,193.2	7,835.7	836.2	70.0	322.1	1,137.1
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.							
Vermont	192.8	734.4	805.7	9,277.9	142.2	58.7	124.0	756.2
Virginia	398.2	1,144.3	720.4	5,358.7	178.7	84.6	152.9	542.5
Washington	447.7	1,314.6 ^r	1,273.9 ^e	8,378.2 ^f	330.8	102.0 ^r	207.2 ^e	642.5 ^f
West Virginia	319.8	536.9	907.4	8,275.2	203.4	65.6	136.5	630.7
Wisconsin	380.8	648.2	1,086.9	10,426.5	275.4	82.9	197.3	970.8
Wyoming	112.0	388.9 ^b	278.4	212.8	92.8	36.1	46.7	36.3

NOTE: The following state was processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files:

Massachusetts: Excludes IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2010 that were adjudicated in FFY2011 Q3 and Q4.

^a Values greater or less than two standard deviations from the arithmetic mean are considered anomalous.

^b The average number of LT claims per provider increased more than 30% in AZ, MA, MI, PA, and WY in 2010.

^c The average number of RX claims and the average number of beneficiaries with RX claims increased more than 30% in CT in 2010. The discrepancy in the numbers between 2009 and 2010 is attributed to the erroneous reporting of prescribing provider IDs instead of billing provider IDs in 2009.

^d The average number of IP claims and the average number of beneficiaries with IP claims increased more than 30% in DC, MI, and MO in 2010.

^e The average number of OT claims and the average number of beneficiaries with OT claims increased more than 30% in DC, MA, and WA in 2010.

^f The average number of RX claims and the average number of beneficiaries with RX claims increased more than 30% in DC, HI, MI, MO, OH, and WA in 2010.

^g The average number of LT claims per provider decreased more than 30% in GA in 2010.

^h The average number of RX claims per provider decreased more than 30% in GA in 2010.

ⁱ The average number of IP claims per provider increased more than 30 percent in HI and PA in 2010.

^j The average number of LT claims and the average number of beneficiaries with LT claims decreased more than 30% in HI in 2010.

^k The average number of beneficiaries with LT claims increased more than 30% in KY and LA in 2010.

- ^l The average number of beneficiaries with RX claims increased more than 30% in KY in 2010.
- ^m The average number of RX claims per provider increased more than 30% in MA and MN in 2010.
- ⁿ The average number of beneficiaries with OT claims increased more than 30% in MI in 2010.
- ^o The average number of IP claims and the average number of beneficiaries with IP claims decreased more than 30% in OH in 2010.
- ^p The average number of OT claims per servicing provider ID decreased more than 30 percent in RI in 2010.
- ^q The average number of RX claims and the average number of beneficiaries with RX claims decreased more than 30% in SC in 2010.
- ^r The average number of LT claims and the average number of beneficiaries with LT claims increased more than 30% in WA in 2010.

Table 3. Prevalence of Provider IDs in MAXPC 2010

State	Total Number of Provider IDs in MAX	Percent of IP Provider IDs that are Legacy Billing Provider IDs	Percent of IP Provider IDs that are NPI Billing Provider IDs	Percent of LT Provider IDs that are Legacy Billing Provider IDs	Percent of LT Provider IDs that are NPI Billing Provider IDs	Percent of OT Provider IDs that are OT Servicing Provider IDs	Percent of OT Servicing Provider IDs that are OT Billing Provider IDs	Percent of OT Servicing Provider IDs that are NPI OT Servicing Provider IDs	Percent of RX Provider IDs that are RX Billing Provider IDs	Percent of RX Billing Provider IDs that are RX Prescribing Provider IDs	Percent of RX Billing Provider IDs that are NPI RX Billing Provider IDs
Alabama	68,522	50.3	49.7	50.7	49.3	61.3	6.8	38.7	50.3	0.0	49.7
Alaska	17,632	100.0	97.2	100.0	98.7	51.9	9.5	48.1	100.0	0.0	100.0
Arizona	76,931	49.9	50.1	50.0	50.0	54.4	51.5	45.6	50.0	4.5 ^a	50.0
Arkansas	51,573	55.1	44.9	51.6	48.4	57.1	23.1	42.9	50.1	0.0 ^a	49.9
California	1,067,299	100.0	77.8	100.0	48.1	97.6	81.8	78.1	100.0	3.7 ^a	98.7
Colorado	58,162	49.5	50.5	50.6	49.4	47.3	11.7	52.7	3.7	0.4	96.3
Connecticut	71,199	50.1	49.9	51.1	48.9	56.1	24.0	43.9	58.8 ^b	28.6 ^a	41.2 ^c
Delaware	11,409	100.0	98.3	100.0	98.5	98.1	15.3	82.2	100.0	0.0	100.0
District of Columbia	9,815	50.3	49.7	57.6	42.4	54.7	43.5 ^d	45.3 ^e	50.1	2.4	49.9
Florida	243,260	52.8	47.2	50.2	49.8	54.5	38.1	45.5	50.2	15.5 ^a	49.8
Georgia	143,497	53.4 ^f	46.6 ^g	98.4	54.4 ^h	67.8	35.7	32.2	98.0	34.4 ⁱ	47.3 ^c
Hawaii	14,881	51.0	49.0	51.6	48.4	56.2	48.9	43.8	50.7	0.2 ^a	49.3
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.										
Illinois	239,556	45.1	54.9	42.1	57.9	65.1	0.0	34.9	26.6	0.7	73.4
Indiana	82,869	48.1	51.9	53.5	46.5	49.7	12.2	50.3	49.7	0.7	50.3
Iowa	81,584	50.3	49.7	51.2	48.8	57.8	23.6	43.7	7.7	0.0	92.3
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.										
Kentucky	66,201	50.5	49.5	51.2	48.8	78.6	24.7	46.8	51.0	1.9 ^a	49.0
Louisiana	55,484	39.2	60.8	47.3	52.7	47.4	23.8	52.6	49.5	0.0	50.5
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.										
Maryland	99,424	53.2	46.8	47.5	52.5	68.3	14.2	31.7	52.3	1.9	47.7
Massachusetts	119,623	50.1	49.9	50.5	49.5 ^j	49.5	1.4	50.5 ^e	50.2	0.6 ^a	49.8 ^k
Michigan	266,011	69.0	34.9	61.0	43.0 ^j	94.1	61.9 ^d	17.5	90.2	16.8 ⁱ	57.6 ^k
Minnesota	189,753	50.0	50.0	51.2	48.8	22.0	20.6	78.0	50.0	5.7 ^a	50.0
Mississippi	45,552	49.6	50.4	49.7	50.3	49.0	15.0	51.0	50.3	0.0	49.7
Missouri	103,770	54.8	45.2	49.1	50.9	80.2	6.0	19.8	51.3	4.1	48.7
Montana	20,315	50.3	49.7	50.0	50.0	51.5	22.5	48.5	50.0	0.0	50.0

Table 3. Prevalence of Provider IDs in MAXPC 2010

State	Total Number of Provider IDs in MAX	Percent of IP Provider IDs that are Legacy Billing Provider IDs	Percent of IP Provider IDs that are NPI Billing Provider IDs	Percent of LT Provider IDs that are Legacy Billing Provider IDs	Percent of LT Provider IDs that are NPI Billing Provider IDs	Percent of OT Provider IDs that are OT Servicing Provider IDs	Percent of OT Servicing Provider IDs that are OT Billing Provider IDs	Percent of OT Servicing Provider IDs that are NPI OT Servicing Provider IDs	Percent of RX Provider IDs that are RX Billing Provider IDs	Percent of RX Billing Provider IDs that are RX Prescribing Provider IDs	Percent of RX Billing Provider IDs that are NPI RX Billing Provider IDs
Nebraska	38,320	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	45.2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nevada	33,106	51.3	48.7	49.8	50.2	50.2	0.0	49.8	50.0	8.3 ^a	50.0
New Hampshire	32,221	63.9	36.1	52.0	48.0	58.3	18.5	41.7	50.3	0.0	49.7
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.										
New Mexico	77,268	62.7	37.3	61.1	38.9	70.9	34.2	29.1	53.4	0.5	46.6
New York	298,536	48.8	51.2	50.3	49.7	48.1	33.2	51.9	50.0	1.2	50.0
North Carolina	113,897	50.1	49.9	54.2	45.8	52.3	19.3	47.7	50.1	0.9	49.9
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.										
Ohio	162,722	41.9	58.1	49.8	50.2	63.5	9.8	36.5	45.8	0.1	54.2
Oklahoma	56,220	50.2	49.8	50.1	49.9	51.0	14.7	49.1	50.0	0.0	50.0
Oregon	76,668	54.8	45.2	55.5	44.5	76.9	17.3 ^d	40.6	50.6	11.6	49.4
Pennsylvania	173,976	51.1	48.9	53.5	46.5	58.0	20.9	42.0	51.3	1.8	48.7
Rhode Island	28,176	100.0	4.9	100.0	94.8 ^j	100.0	42.0	55.9 ^e	100.0	17.2 ^a	96.6 ^k
South Carolina	41,107	100.0	100.0	100.0	10.8	100.0	21.3	0.0	6.4 ^l	93.8 ⁱ	93.6 ^k
South Dakota	21,962	50.4	49.6	52.0	48.0	47.4	47.2	52.6	84.3	0.0	15.7
Tennessee	138,621	48.1	51.9	50.2	49.8	73.5	33.2	27.0	50.6	0.0	49.4
Texas	190,482	99.8	90.4	99.6	99.1	93.0	74.4	70.2	50.2	0.0	49.8
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.										
Vermont	18,704	49.7	50.3	50.0	50.0	48.5	16.3	51.5	50.4	0.4 ^a	49.6
Virginia	102,658	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	39.7	50.0	100.0	3.1 ^a	100.0
Washington	114,956	52.0	48.5 ^m	51.3	48.9 ^j	51.3	12.2 ⁿ	49.7 ^e	52.7	15.8 ⁱ	47.3 ^k
West Virginia	53,789	50.0	50.0	49.9	50.1	50.4	11.7	49.6	49.2	0.0	50.8
Wisconsin	63,037	100.0	97.3	100.0	98.8	99.2	69.3	52.6	100.0	6.4 ^a	99.8
Wyoming	24,433	50.4	49.6	50.6	49.4	57.2	10.5	42.8	3.9	0.0	96.1

NOTE: The following state was processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files:

Massachusetts: Excludes IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2010 that were adjudicated in FFY2011 Q3 and Q4.

In MAX 2010, each of the four types of claims contains the following types of provider IDs:

IP: Legacy Billing Provider IDs, NPI Billing Provider IDs

LT: Legacy Billing Provider IDs, NPI Billing Provider IDs

OT: Legacy Servicing Provider IDs, NPI Servicing Provider IDs, Legacy Billing Provider IDs

RX: Legacy Billing Provider IDs, NPI Billing Provider IDs, Legacy Prescribing Provider IDs

Historically, states have reported state-specific legacy provider IDs in the billing, servicing, and prescribing provider ID fields in MSIS. Starting in FY2009, states were required to report the corresponding NPI billing provider ID in IP, LT, and RX, and the NPI servicing provider ID in OT. In MAX 2010, some states chose to report the same provider ID in both the legacy provider ID field and the NPI provider ID field. States that show an even distribution of legacy provider IDs and NPIs (50/50) are reporting both types of provider IDs. Distributions near or around 100% indicate that the state is reporting the same provider ID in both fields.

^a The percentage of RX billing provider IDs that are also prescribing provider IDs on RX claims decreased more than 30% in AZ, AR, CA, CT, FL, HI, KY, MA, MN, NV, RI, VT, VA, and WI in 2010.

^b The percentage of RX billing provider IDs increased more than 30% in CT in 2010.

^c The percentage of RX billing provider IDs that are also NPI billing provider IDs on RX claims decreased more than 30% in CT and GA in 2010.

^d The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs that are also billing provider IDs on OT claims increased more than 30% in DC, MI, and OR in 2010.

^e The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs that are also NPI servicing provider IDs on OT claims increased more than 30% in DC, MA, RI, and WA in 2010.

^f The percentage of IP provider IDs that are billing provider IDs on IP claims decreased more than 30% in GA in 2010.

^g The percentage of IP provider IDs that are NPI billing provider IDs on IP claims decreased more than 30% in GA in 2010.

^h The percentage of LT provider IDs that are NPI billing provider IDs on LT claims decreased more than 30% in GA in 2010.

ⁱ The percentage of RX billing provider IDs that are also prescribing provider IDs on RX claims increased more than 30% in GA, MI, SC, and WA in 2010.

^j The percentage of LT provider IDs that are NPI billing provider IDs on LT claims increased more than 30% in MA, MI, RI, and WA in 2010.

^k The percentage of RX billing provider IDs that are also NPI billing provider IDs on RX claims increased more than 30% in MA, MI, RI, SC, and WA in 2010.

^l The percentage of RX billing provider IDs decreased more than 30% in SC in 2010.

^m The percentage of IP provider IDs that are NPI billing provider IDs on IP claims increased more than 30% in WA in 2010.

ⁿ The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs that are also billing provider IDs on OT claims decreased more than 30% in WA in 2010.

Table 4. NPI-Related Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs with NPIs				Percent NPI Source=MSIS ^a				Percent NPI Source=NPPEs ^b				Percent NPI Source=State Provider File ^c			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX
Alabama	590	523	47,392	2,819	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Alaska	107	78	13,671	182	99.1	100.0	96.3	100.0	0.9	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arizona	901	286	47,790	2,354	100.0	100.0	98.8	100.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arkansas	394	639	32,723	1,683	99.0	99.7	93.3	100.0	1.0	0.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
California	2,261	1,467	666,401	20,310	99.2	98.6	99.1	99.9	0.8	1.4	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colorado	441	453	42,740	22,964	99.8	100.0	97.3	96.9	0.2	0.0	2.7	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Connecticut	769	792	42,543	2,579 ^d	100.0	98.4	99.7	99.8	0.0	1.6	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delaware	57	64	6,843	275	100.0	100.0	99.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
District of Columbia	157	232	6,292	461	100.0	99.6	94.3	100.0	0.0	0.4	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Florida	3,018	1,541	128,537	8,326	99.6	99.5	98.6	100.0	0.4	0.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Georgia	1,166	787	107,013	4,725	99.7	100.0	99.7	99.8	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hawaii	227	61 ^e	8,475	463	99.6	100.0	97.1	100.0	0.4	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Illinois	1,159	1,527	102,704	3,648	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indiana	849	2,033	55,321	2,742	95.9	99.4	83.6	99.1	0.5	0.3	6.5	0.2	3.7	0.3	9.9	0.7
Iowa	729	1,390	62,704	12,736	99.0	100.0	99.1	95.1	1.0	0.0	0.9	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Kentucky	763	774	50,887	2,710	100.0	100.0	99.6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisiana	1,177	1,044 ^e	40,763	1,241 ^f	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.8	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Maryland	425	477	57,418	2,632	96.5	99.8	99.1	100.0	3.5	0.2	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Massachusetts	618	1,040	62,058	2,533	100.0	100.0 ^g	100.0	100.0 ^h	0.0	0.0 ⁱ	0.0 ^j	0.0 ^k	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Michigan	1,339	1,192	71,720	12,080	97.5	98.3	89.4	86.6	2.5	1.7	10.6 ^l	13.4 ^m	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minnesota	811	1,588	109,049	2,927	95.1	98.4	96.4	99.4	4.9	1.6	3.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mississippi	677	515	30,556	1,743	99.4	99.8	99.9	99.9	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missouri	633	1,057	49,222	5,336	79.9	96.8	94.6	96.7	20.1 ⁿ	3.2	5.4	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montana	306	262	17,054	708	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nebraska	23	43	1,287	148	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nevada	431	237	20,672	1,046	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Hampshire	143	197	17,051	643	97.9	98.5	94.7	72.9	2.1	1.5	5.3	27.1 ^m	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
New Mexico	1,066	477	48,780	6,830	100.0	100.0	99.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York	2,080	3,169	250,947	9,476	96.6	96.3	97.4	99.4	3.4	3.7	2.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Carolina	754	1,770	102,784	4,343	99.7	100.0	99.7	99.9	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0

Table 4. NPI-Related Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs with NPIs				Percent NPI Source=MSIS ^a				Percent NPI Source=NPPES ^b				Percent NPI Source=State Provider File ^c			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Ohio	1,072	2,742	90,030	7,366	82.9	85.0	99.4	91.8	17.1 ⁿ	15.0 ^p	0.6	8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oklahoma	859	886	42,849	2,147	100.0	99.9	99.1	99.8	0.0	0.1	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oregon	318	331	40,061	1,485	97.2	95.5	99.1	99.7	2.8	4.5	0.9	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	826	1,842	87,444	7,608	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	78	303	7,870	226	74.4	97.0	98.8	99.6	25.6	3.0	1.2	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Carolina	242	230	12,371	18,725	100.0	13.5	98.4	99.9	0.0	86.5	1.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Dakota	361	325	11,906	283	100.0	100.0	89.7	45.6	0.0	0.0	10.3	54.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tennessee	1,615	908	55,206	15,530	100.0	100.0	99.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Texas	802	1,918	84,257	8,738	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.9	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Vermont	194	139	15,730	485	100.0	100.0	99.7	99.8	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Virginia	1,347	378	78,368	1,768	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	495	308 ^e	67,788	2,512	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
West Virginia	415	482	31,998	1,557	99.5	100.0	95.7	100.0	0.5	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wisconsin	442	416	28,607	1,403	100.0	100.0	97.8	100.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wyoming	280	176	17,131	5,281	100.0	100.0	97.7	98.5	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

NOTE: The following state was processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files:

Massachusetts: Excludes IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2010 that were adjudicated in FFY2011 Q3 and Q4.

^a Values less than 90 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^b Values greater than 10 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^c Values greater than 5 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^d The number of RX billing provider IDs with NPIs decreased more than 30 percent in CT in 2010. The discrepancy in the numbers between 2009 and 2010 is attributed to the erroneous reporting of prescribing provider IDs instead of billing provider IDs in 2009.

^e The number of LT provider IDs with NPIs decreased more than 30 percent in HI, LA, and WA in 2010.

^f The number of RX billing provider IDs with NPIs decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2010.

^g The percentage of LT provider IDs where the source of the NPI is MSIS increased more than 30 percent in MA in 2010.

^h The percentage of RX billing provider IDs where the source of the NPI is MSIS increased more than 30 percent in MA in 2010.

ⁱ The percentage of LT provider IDs where the source of the NPI is NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in MA in 2010.

^j The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs where the source of the NPI is NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in MA in 2010.

^k The percentage of RX billing provider IDs where the source of the NPI is NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in MA in 2010.

^l The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs where the source of the NPI is NPPES increased more than 30 percent in MI in 2010.

^m The percentage of RX billing provider IDs where the source of the NPI is NPPES increased more than 30 percent in MI and NH in 2010.

ⁿ The percentage of IP billing provider IDs where the source of the NPI is NPPES increased more than 30 percent in MO and OH in 2010.

^p The percentage of LT billing provider IDs where the source of the NPI is NPPES increased more than 30 percent in OH in 2010.

Table 5. NPPES-Linkage Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs Linked to NPPES				Percent Linked to NPPES Via NPI				Percent Provider Is In-State			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^a	RX ^a	IP ^b	LT ^a	OT ^c	RX ^c
Alabama	590	523	47,370	2,819	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	40.7	98.5	77.8	92.0
Alaska	103	74	13,405	182	99.0	100.0	96.2	100.0	33.0	50.0	60.4	67.0
Arizona	901	286	47,788	2,354	100.0	100.0	98.8	100.0	31.0	93.0	79.3	89.4
Arkansas	394	639	32,707	1,683	99.0	99.7	93.3	100.0	49.0	97.2	77.7	87.8
California	936	736 ^d	73,286	7,305	98.1	97.1	92.0	99.8	33.7	99.3	88.4	78.4
Colorado	441	453	42,652	22,922	99.8	100.0	97.3	96.9	39.5	98.5	87.4	76.1
Connecticut	769	792	42,327	2,579 ^e	100.0	98.4	99.7	99.8	16.4	94.7	71.1	83.4
Delaware	57	62	6,768	275	100.0	100.0	99.7	100.0	15.8	77.4	66.2	66.2
District of Columbia	157	232	6,280	461	100.0	99.6	94.3	100.0	27.4	67.7	55.5	49.0
Florida	3,014 ^z	1,535	128,262	8,322	99.6	99.6	98.7	100.0	40.3	99.6	91.4	97.8
Georgia	1,166	787	107,002	4,709	99.7	100.0	99.7	99.8	37.6	98.5	83.9	94.7
Hawaii	227	61 ^d	8,475	463	99.6	100.0	97.1	100.0	91.2	100.0	88.4	95.2
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Illinois	1,159	1,527	102,693	3,648	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	36.4	98.4	73.7	82.2
Indiana	849	2,033	54,491	2,742	99.5	99.7	93.4	99.8	48.8	99.6	75.5	86.6
Iowa	727	1,390	52,197	12,735	99.0	100.0	98.9	95.1	35.8	95.0	61.3	63.4
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Kentucky	763	774	50,887	2,710	100.0	100.0	99.6	100.0	29.0	99.1	63.2	84.2
Louisiana	1,006	930	39,327	1,223 ^f	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.8	37.2	99.6	84.3	94.2
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Maryland	422	477	46,956	2,632	96.4	99.8	99.0	100.0	34.4	97.1	77.6	88.7
Massachusetts	618	1,040	62,034	2,533	100.0	100.0 ^g	100.0	100.0 ^h	40.3	93.7	88.7	95.0
Michigan	1,337	1,189	71,445	10,868	97.5	98.3	89.3	85.1	42.4	96.2	83.8	61.5
Minnesota	810	1,568	57,306	2,926	95.1	98.4	93.2	99.4	35.8	94.6	81.9	75.4
Mississippi	677	515	30,496	1,743	99.4	99.8	99.9	99.9	42.8	96.1	60.9	90.7
Missouri	583	1,057	31,466	5,334	78.2	96.8	91.5	96.7	73.8	99.3	82.3	89.8
Montana	306	262	17,054	708	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	47.7	91.6	61.7	75.1
Nebraska	23	43	1,287	148	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	78.3	100.0	92.9	87.2
Nevada	431	237	19,479	1,046	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	42.2	56.1	67.8	84.8
New Hampshire	3	3	935	643	0.0	0.0	4.2 ⁱ	72.9	66.7	100.0	82.1	76.7

Table 5. NPPES-Linkage Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs Linked to NPPES				Percent Linked to NPPES Via NPI				Percent Provider Is In-State			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^a	RX ^a	IP ^b	LT ^a	OT ^c	RX ^c
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
New Mexico	1,066	477	48,777	6,830	100.0	100.0	99.4	100.0	28.0	81.8	60.2	16.1
New York	2,079	3,169	250,487	9,476	96.6	96.3	97.4	99.4	44.9	95.2	82.0	97.0
North Carolina	754	1,770	102,775	4,343	99.7	100.0	99.9	100.0	46.4	97.5	88.0	93.0
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Ohio	514	863	44,210	924	64.4	52.5	98.9	34.7	85.2	100.0	88.9	94.2
Oklahoma	859	886	41,875	2,147	100.0	99.9	99.0	99.8	44.2	96.4	69.4	81.1
Oregon	318	331	40,061	1,485	97.2	95.5	99.1	99.7	50.0	98.8	72.5	89.9
Pennsylvania	826	1,842	87,434	7,608	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	60.8	99.5	88.0	94.8
Rhode Island	78	303	7,702	226	74.4	97.0	98.8	99.6	25.6	98.3	66.2	86.3
South Carolina	242	230	12,371	18,650	100.0	13.5	98.4	99.9	37.2	99.1	78.4	62.7
South Dakota	361	325	11,856	283	100.0	100.0	89.7	45.6	40.4	95.7	66.6	74.9
Tennessee	1,615	908	55,194	15,530	100.0	100.0	99.1	100.0	62.4	97.9	73.8	20.5
Texas	801	1,907	83,141	8,738	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.9	71.3	99.7	93.1	98.6
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Vermont	194	139	15,712	485	100.0	100.0	99.7	99.8	22.7	74.8	54.3	61.0
Virginia	1,343	378	74,984	1,768	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	51.3	95.8	69.3	86.4
Washington	495	308 ^d	67,455	2,512	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	43.2	92.2	81.9	91.1
West Virginia	415	481	31,998	1,557	99.5	100.0	95.7	100.0	33.5	84.6	49.8	68.0
Wisconsin	442	416	28,607	1,403	100.0	100.0	97.8	100.0	31.0	98.6	69.2	85.2
Wyoming	280	176	17,117	5,273	100.0	100.0	97.7	98.5	23.9	69.3	32.3	32.2

NOTE: The following state was processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files:

Massachusetts: Excludes IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2010 that were adjudicated in FFY2011 Q3 and Q4.

^a Values less than 90 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^b Values less than 20 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^c Values less than 75 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^d The number of LT provider IDs linked to NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in CA, HI, LA, and WA in 2010.

^e The number of RX billing provider IDs linked to NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in CT in 2010. The discrepancy in the numbers between 2009 and 2010 is attributed to the erroneous reporting of prescribing provider IDs instead of billing provider IDs in 2009.

^f The number of RX billing provider IDs linked to NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2010.

^g The percentage of LT provider IDs linked to NPPES via the NPI increased more than 30 percent in MA in 2010.

^h The percentage of RX billing provider IDs linked to NPPES via the NPI increased more than 30 percent in MA in 2010.

ⁱ The number of OT servicing provider IDs linked to NPPES via the NPI decreased more than 30 percent in NH in 2010.

Table 6. Provider Taxonomy Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs with Primary Taxonomy				Percent with Primary Taxonomy				Percent Individual or Group of Individuals				Percent Nonindividuals			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^a	RX ^a	IP ^b	LT ^b	OT ^c	RX ^{b,d}	IP ^e	LT ^e	OT ^f	RX ^{e,d}
Alabama	588	508	46,266	2,723	99.7	97.1	97.7	96.6	0.0	0.0	88.6	7.3	100.0	100.0	11.4	92.7
Alaska	103	72	13,136	172	100.0	97.3	98.0	94.5	1.0	2.8	93.9	5.2	99.0	97.2	6.1	94.8
Arizona	899	278	46,967	2,334	99.8	97.2	98.3	99.2	0.8	0.0	86.8	0.7	99.2	100.0	13.2	99.3
Arkansas	390	631	32,250	1,659	99.0	98.7	98.6	98.6	0.3	1.0	89.5	8.0	99.7	99.0	10.5	92.0
California	932	732 ^g	71,526	7,193	99.6	99.5	97.6	98.5	1.3	0.5 ^g	54.7	3.5	98.7	99.5 ^h	45.3	96.5
Colorado	437	447	42,147	22,625	99.1	98.7	98.8	98.7	0.7	0.0	89.5	95.6	99.3	100.0	10.5	44.1
Connecticut	757	776	41,196	2,468	98.4	98.0	97.3	95.7	0.5	0.0	87.5	3.9	99.5	100.0	12.5	96.1
Delaware	57	59	6,671	267	100.0	95.2	98.6	97.1	0.0	1.7	91.7	1.9	100.0	98.3	8.3	98.1
District of Columbia	157	230	6,128	445	100.0	99.1	97.6	96.5	6.4	0.0	75.2	1.1	93.6	100.0	24.8	98.9
Florida	2,994	1,521	126,112	8,130	99.3	99.1	98.3	97.7	1.7	0.0	84.0	1.7	98.3	100.0	16.0	98.3
Georgia	1,162	786	105,096	4,622	99.7	99.9	98.2	98.2	1.1	0.0	86.4	4.2	98.9	100.0	13.6	95.8
Hawaii	227	61 ^j	8,187	449	100.0	100.0	96.6	97.0	9.3	6.6	81.1	2.4	90.7	93.4	18.9	97.6
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Illinois	1,150	1,488	100,714	3,570	99.2	97.4	98.1	97.9	0.2	0.0	82.5	3.6	99.8	100.0	17.5	96.4
Indiana	843	2,002	53,712	2,706	99.3	98.5	98.6	98.7	0.8	0.2	86.3	1.1	99.2	99.8	13.7	98.9
Iowa	721	1,364	51,378	12,535	99.2	98.1	98.4	98.4	0.3	0.4	86.6	93.2	99.7	99.6	13.4	6.8
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Kentucky	763	768	50,161	2,643	100.0	99.2	98.6	97.5	0.0	0.4	84.9	3.4	100.0	99.6	15.1	96.6
Louisiana	1,001	926 ^j	38,754	1,192 ^k	99.5	99.6	98.5	97.5	0.1	0.3	80.8	7.0	99.9	99.7	19.2	93.0
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Maryland	420	463	45,956	2,544	99.5	97.1	97.9	96.7	0.2	0.2	86.8	1.8	99.8	99.8	13.2	98.2
Massachusetts	614	1,032	60,202	2,477	99.4	99.2	97.0	97.8	0.0	0.0	91.8	0.6	100.0	100.0	8.2	99.4
Michigan	1,330	1,163	69,853	10,766	99.5	97.8	97.8	99.1	4.9	2.2	75.5	28.4 ^l	95.1	97.8	24.5	71.6
Minnesota	806	1,535	56,221	2,848	99.5	97.9	98.1	97.3	0.2	0.6	73.1	2.2	99.8	99.4	26.9	97.8
Mississippi	675	515	30,032	1,709	99.7	100.0	98.5	98.0	0.6	0.0	87.2	8.1	99.4	100.0	12.8	91.9
Missouri	578	1,052	30,698	5,262	99.1	99.5	97.6	98.7	23.9	0.0	58.5	27.2	76.1	100.0	41.5	72.8
Montana	304	256	16,658	688	99.3	97.7	97.7	97.2	0.0	0.0	83.1	2.0	100.0	100.0	16.9	98.0
Nebraska	23	41	1,272	148	100.0	95.3	98.8	100.0	13.0	9.8	67.2	6.8	87.0	90.2	32.8	93.2
Nevada	429	227	19,113	1,031	99.5	95.8	98.1	98.6	0.0	0.0	84.9	1.7	100.0	100.0	15.1	98.3
New Hampshire	3	3	884 ^m	637	100.0	100.0	94.5	99.1	0.0	0.0	57.1 ⁿ	1.9	100.0	100.0	42.9	98.1
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
New Mexico	1,057	464	47,480	6,783	99.2	97.3	97.3	99.3	2.9	1.7	68.2	0.8	97.1	98.3	31.8	99.2
New York	2,051	3,150	244,807	9,225	98.7	99.4	97.7	97.4	0.9	2.0	90.6	7.4	99.1	98.0	9.4	92.6
North Carolina	754	1,729	100,722	4,183	100.0	97.7	98.0	96.3	0.0	0.3	75.8	2.5	100.0	99.7	24.2	97.5

Table 6. Provider Taxonomy Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs with Primary Taxonomy				Percent with Primary Taxonomy				Percent Individual or Group of Individuals				Percent Nonindividuals			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^a	RX ^a	IP ^b	LT ^b	OT ^c	RX ^{b,d}	IP ^e	LT ^e	OT ^f	RX ^{e,d}
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Ohio	507	847	43,680	884	98.6	98.1	98.8	95.7	1.2	0.0	89.9	4.8	98.8	100.0	10.1	95.2
Oklahoma	853	862	41,173	2,044	99.3	97.3	98.3	95.2	0.0	0.2	84.2	4.4	100.0	99.8	15.8	95.6
Oregon	318	315	39,168	1,435	100.0	95.2	97.8	96.6	1.9	0.6	91.5	2.6	98.1	99.4	8.5	97.4
Pennsylvania	817	1,702	85,992	7,449	98.9	92.4	98.4	97.9	1.1	0.4	85.0	17.3	98.9	99.6	15.0	82.7
Rhode Island	77	297	7,506	223	98.7	98.0	97.5	98.7	16.9	0.7	90.8	2.2	83.1	99.3	9.2	97.8
South Carolina	240	230	12,243	18,395	99.2	100.0	99.0	98.6	0.4	0.0	98.6	99.3 ^l	99.6	100.0	1.4	0.7
South Dakota	359	310	11,661	278	99.4	95.4	98.4	98.2	0.6	0.6	77.0	3.2	99.4	99.4	23.0	96.8
Tennessee	1,584	887	54,313	15,400	98.1	97.7	98.4	99.2	1.0	0.7	69.5	1.1	99.0	99.3	30.5	98.9
Texas	792	1,878	81,577	8,591	98.9	98.5	98.1	98.3	3.7	0.2	80.9	2.7	96.3	99.8	19.1	97.3
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.															
Vermont	194	135	15,233	471	100.0	97.1	97.0	97.1	0.0	0.0	95.9	3.6	100.0	100.0	4.1	96.4
Virginia	1,324	365	73,292	1,699	98.6	96.6	97.7	96.1	2.2	0.0	84.1	3.1	97.8	100.0	15.9	96.9
Washington	493	302 ^j	66,547	2,457	99.6	98.1	98.7	97.8	0.0	0.0	89.1	2.0	100.0	100.0	10.9	98.0
West Virginia	415	477	31,467	1,507	100.0	99.2	98.3	96.8	0.0	0.4	84.9	3.5	100.0	99.6	15.1	96.5
Wisconsin	439	413	28,018	1,362	99.3	99.3	97.9	97.1	0.5	0.0	69.6	2.4	99.5	100.0	30.4	97.6
Wyoming	270	164	16,794	5,178	96.4	93.2	98.1	98.2	0.0	0.0	93.4	97.2	100.0	100.0	6.6	2.8

NOTE: The following state was processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files:

Massachusetts: Excludes IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2010 that were adjudicated in FFY2011 Q3 and Q4.

^a Values less than 90 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^b Values more than 5 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^c Values less than 75 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^d The vast majority of provider IDs reported in the RX files are prescribing provider IDs thereby driving up the percentage of claims for individuals or groups of individuals, and driving down the percentage of claims for nonindividuals.

^e Values less than 95 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^f Values more than 25 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^g The number of LT provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy decreased more than 30 percent in CA in 2010. The NPPES primary taxonomy code found among LT provider IDs linked with NPPES appear to appropriately be for nonindividuals.

^h The number of LT provider IDs with taxonomy codes for nonindividuals increased more than 30 percent in CA in 2010.

ⁱ The percentage of RX billing provider IDs with NPPES primary taxonomy code for nonindividuals decreased more than 30 percent in CO in 2010.

^j The number of LT provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy decreased more than 30 percent in HI, LA, and WA in 2010.

^k The number of RX billing provider IDs with NPPES primary taxonomy codes decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2010.

^l The percentage of RX billing provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy for individuals or groups of individuals increased more than 30 percent in MI and SC in 2010. These results are inconsistent with expected taxonomy codes for RX billing provider IDs.

^m The number of OT servicing provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy decreased more than 30 percent in NH in 2010.

ⁿ The number of OT servicing provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy code for individuals or groups of individuals decreased more than 30 percent in NH in 2010.

Table 7. Individual Provider Entity Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs with Entity Type=Individual				Percent Provider Entity Type=Individual				Percent Sole Proprietorships			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^b	RX ^c	IP	LT	OT	RX
Alabama	0	0	41,102	10	0.0	0.0	86.8	0.4	0.0	0.0	15.9	80.0
Alaska	0	0	12,408	3	0.0	0.0	92.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	18.8	66.7
Arizona	1	0	39,993	4	0.1	0.0	83.7	0.2	0.0	0.0	19.7	50.0
Arkansas	1	0	28,120	10	0.3	0.0	86.0	0.6	100.0	0.0	22.8	40.0
California	9	3	14,224	67	1.0	0.4	19.4	0.9	22.2	66.7	44.0	77.6 ^d
Colorado	0	0	36,234	21,636	0.0	0.0	85.0	94.4	0.0	0.0	15.0	16.2
Connecticut	0	0	34,017	53 ^e	0.0	0.0	80.4	2.1 ^e	0.0	0.0	16.3	49.1 ^d
Delaware	0	0	6,098	0	0.0	0.0	90.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5	0.0
District of Columbia	2	0	3,737	1	1.3	0.0	59.5	0.2	50.0	0.0	26.4	0.0
Florida	17	0	100,460	32	0.6	0.0	78.3	0.4	35.3	0.0	25.0	37.5
Georgia	7	0	90,372	18 ^f	0.6	0.0	84.5	0.4	57.1 ^g	0.0	18.8	83.3
Hawaii	9	0	5,556	5	4.0	0.0	65.6	1.1	11.1	0.0	37.5	20.0 ^h
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Illinois	0	0	83,736	20	0.0	0.0	81.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	15.7	80.0
Indiana	0	0	43,756	0	0.0	0.0	80.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.9	0.0
Iowa	0	0	40,688	11,556	0.0	0.0	78.0	90.7	0.0	0.0	11.1	10.2
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Kentucky	0	0	41,557	41	0.0	0.0	81.7	1.5	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.6 ^h
Louisiana	2	2	27,792	26	0.2	0.2	70.7	2.1	0.0	50.0	23.5	53.8
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Maryland	0	0	35,958	0	0.0	0.0	76.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.1	0.0
Massachusetts	0	0	55,094	0	0.0	0.0	88.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0
Michigan	15 ⁱ	1	34,330	1,482 ^f	1.1	0.1	48.1	13.6 ^j	20.0	0.0	20.9	13.2 ^h
Minnesota	1	0	39,761	0	0.1	0.0	69.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.3	0.0
Mississippi	4	0	25,224	16	0.6	0.0	82.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	19.8	75.0
Missouri	41	0	6,247	294	7.0	0.0	19.9	5.5	36.6	0.0	36.3	50.0
Montana	0	0	13,968	2	0.0	0.0	81.9	0.3	0.0	0.0	19.5	0.0
Nebraska	3	5	712	6	13.0	11.6	55.3	4.1	33.3	20.0	35.4	33.3
Nevada	0	0	16,239	4	0.0	0.0	83.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	19.2	100.0
New Hampshire	0	0	447	0	0.0	0.0	47.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.5	0.0

Table 7. Individual Provider Entity Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs with Entity Type=Individual				Percent Provider Entity Type=Individual				Percent Sole Proprietorships			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^b	RX ^c	IP	LT	OT	RX
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
New Mexico	13	0	15,836	5	1.2	0.0	32.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	26.5	100.0
New York	4	53 ^k	216,146	213	0.2	1.7	86.3	2.2	25.0	22.6 ^l	29.8	43.7
North Carolina	0	2	69,738	5	0.0	0.1	67.9	0.1	0.0	100.0	19.0	100.0
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Ohio	2	0	38,024	18 ^f	0.4	0.0	86.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	15.9	55.6
Oklahoma	0	0	33,814	2	0.0	0.0	80.7	0.1	0.0	0.0	19.4	100.0
Oregon	2	2	36,063	9	0.6	0.6	90.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	17.3	66.7
Pennsylvania	0	0	73,015	286	0.0	0.0	83.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	15.8	29.7
Rhode Island	9	1	6,809	0	11.5	0.3	88.4	0.0	22.2	100.0	16.9	0.0
South Carolina	0	0	12,095	18,207 ^f	0.0	0.0	97.8	97.6	0.0	0.0	13.5	16.1
South Dakota	0	0	7,897	0	0.0	0.0	66.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.6	0.0
Tennessee	6	1	35,886	13	0.4	0.1	65.0	0.1	66.7	100.0	18.8	30.8
Texas	20	1	65,297	49	2.5	0.1	78.5	0.6	25.0	100.0	24.7	87.8
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Vermont	0	0	14,907	2	0.0	0.0	94.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	21.7	0.0
Virginia	1	0	60,188	4	0.1	0.0	80.3	0.2	100.0	0.0	14.9	100.0
Washington	0	0	55,529	0	0.0	0.0	82.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.6	0.0
West Virginia	0	0	26,584	0	0.0	0.0	83.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.3	0.0
Wisconsin	0	0	18,821	1	0.0	0.0	65.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	12.4	100.0
Wyoming	0	0	15,649	5,040	0.0	0.0	91.4	95.6	0.0	0.0	17.1	17.6

NOTE: The following state was processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files:

Massachusetts: Excludes IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2010 that were adjudicated in FFY2011 Q3 and Q4.

^a Values more than 5 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^b Values less than 75 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^c The vast majority of provider IDs reported in the RX files are prescribing provider IDs thereby driving up the percentage of claims for individuals or groups of individuals, and driving down the percentage of claims for organizations. For the RX, values more than 5 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^d The number of RX billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type which are sole proprietorships increased more than 30 percent in CA and CT in 2010.

^e The number and percent of RX billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type decreased more than 30 percent in CT in 2010. The discrepancy in the numbers between 2009 and 2010 is attributed to the erroneous reporting of prescribing provider IDs instead of billing provider IDs in 2009.

^f The number of RX billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type increased more than 30 percent in GA, MI, OH, and SC in 2010.

^g The number of IP provider IDs that are of individual entity type which are sole proprietorships increased more than 30 percent in GA in 2010.

^h The number of RX billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type which are sole proprietorships decreased more than 30 percent in HI, KY, and MI in 2010.

ⁱ The number of IP billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type increased more than 30 percent in MI in 2010.

^j The number and percent of RX billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type increased more than 30 percent in MI in 2010.

^k The number of LT billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type increased more than 30 percent in NY in 2010.

^l The number of LT provider IDs that are of individual entity type which are sole proprietorships decreased more than 30 percent in NY in 2010.

Table 8. Organizational Provider Entity Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs with Entity Type=Organization				Percent Provider Entity Type=Organization				Percent Subpart			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^b	RX ^c	IP	LT	OT	RX
Alabama	590	515	6,098	2,787	100.0	98.5	12.9	98.9	7.1	12.8	13.5	21.0
Alaska	103	74	953	176	100.0	100.0	7.1	96.7	10.7	13.5 ^d	9.5	27.8
Arizona	900	286	7,580	2,338	99.9	100.0	15.9	99.3	12.4	13.3	11.0	37.8
Arkansas	393	639	4,435	1,665	99.7	100.0	13.6	98.9	3.6	5.0	16.2	33.3
California	926	733 ^e	58,895	7,196	98.9	99.6	80.4	98.5	12.0	7.0	12.6	26.1
Colorado	441	451	6,270	1,182	100.0	99.6	14.7	5.2	8.4 ^f	12.9	14.1	32.9
Connecticut	767	792	8,154	2,500	99.7	100.0	19.3	96.9	7.8	8.6	7.8	17.5 ^g
Delaware	57	62	650	271	100.0	100.0	9.6	98.5	7.0	8.1	14.5	35.4
District of Columbia	155	232	2,517	452	98.7	100.0	40.1	98.0	3.9	3.0	6.2	7.1
Florida	2,995	1,535	27,011	8,169	99.4	100.0	21.1	98.2	9.4	15.8	13.2	28.5
Georgia	1,157	786	16,256	4,663	99.2	99.9	15.2	99.0	6.2	9.4	11.5	19.9
Hawaii	218	61 ^h	2,872	456	96.0	100.0	33.9	98.5	14.2 ⁱ	6.6	7.8	15.4
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Illinois	1,158	1,527	18,571	3,606	99.9	100.0	18.1	98.8	10.7	11.6	19.4	31.4
Indiana	849	2,033	10,488	2,726	100.0	100.0	19.2	99.4	10.0	6.0	14.0	28.4
Iowa	723	1,388	11,284	1,103	99.4	99.9	21.6	8.7	8.3	12.2	10.3	18.7
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Kentucky	763	772	9,080	2,646	100.0	99.7	17.8	97.6	8.8	20.6	11.6	19.2
Louisiana	1,003	927 ^h	11,371	1,187 ^j	99.7	99.7	28.9	97.1	10.8	8.7	4.9	25.6
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Maryland	422	477	10,835	2,616	100.0	100.0	23.1	99.4	5.2	7.3	9.4	12.1
Massachusetts	616	1,040	6,746	2,507	99.7	100.0	10.9		15.4 ⁱ	7.3	6.4	19.4
Michigan	1,319	1,186	36,882	9,360	98.7	99.7	51.6	86.1	12.6	14.1	10.0	30.2 ^g
Minnesota	809	1,568	17,352	2,881	99.9	100.0	30.3	98.5	9.5	16.2	11.3	25.9
Mississippi	673	515	5,122	1,719	99.4	100.0	16.8	98.6	12.6	21.2	14.2	32.0
Missouri	539	1,056	25,105	5,025	92.5	99.9	79.8	94.2	16.0	7.5	13.0	28.6
Montana	306	262	3,029	700	100.0	100.0	17.8	98.9	10.8	20.6	12.2	15.4
Nebraska	20	38	575	142	87.0	88.4	44.7	95.9	25.0	10.5 ^d	17.9	28.9
Nevada	431	237	3,171	1,034	100.0	100.0	16.3	98.9	11.1	10.1	16.8	33.1
New Hampshire	3	3	488	641	100.0	100.0	52.2	99.7	0.0	33.3	16.2	21.7

Table 8. Organizational Provider Entity Issues in MAXPC 2010

State	Number of Provider IDs with Entity Type=Organization				Percent Provider Entity Type=Organization				Percent Subpart			
	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP ^a	LT ^a	OT ^b	RX ^c	IP	LT	OT	RX
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
New Mexico	1,049	477	32,693	6,810	98.4	100.0	67.0	99.7	13.0	19.9	7.9	68.8
New York	2,063	3,114	32,920	9,182	99.2	98.3	13.1	96.9	12.3	11.0	9.3	16.5
North Carolina	754	1,768	32,651	4,334	100.0	99.9	31.8	99.8	12.2	6.0	9.1	19.5
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Ohio	512	863	6,081	906	99.6	100.0	13.8	98.1	7.6	10.9	9.1	27.7 ^g
Oklahoma	857	884	7,827	2,118	99.8	99.8	18.7	98.6	9.1	6.8	11.7	30.3
Oregon	316	329	3,813	1,464	99.4	99.4	9.5	98.6	18.4	16.7	12.2	16.5
Pennsylvania	823	1,842	14,121	7,282	99.6	100.0	16.2	95.7	10.2	10.5	10.9	15.1
Rhode Island	69	302	861 ^k	224	88.5	99.7	11.2	99.1	14.5 ⁱ	3.0	8.5	18.3
South Carolina	242	230	229	333	100.0	100.0	1.9	1.8	12.4	9.6	5.7	7.5 ^j
South Dakota	361	323	3,936	281	100.0	99.4	33.2	99.3	8.9	25.4	9.1	20.6
Tennessee	1,605	907	19,103	15,455	99.4	99.9	34.6	99.5	20.2 ^f	31.1 ^d	7.9	61.1
Texas	778	1,906	17,419	8,655	97.1	99.9	21.0	99.1	9.1	4.4	10.8	30.8
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2010 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems.											
Vermont	194	139	757	481	100.0	100.0	4.8	99.2	8.8	7.2	7.1	15.0
Virginia	1,340	377	14,502	1,751	99.8	99.7	19.3	99.0	9.3	14.1	10.0	20.3
Washington	495	308 ^h	11,741	2,490	100.0	100.0	17.4	99.1	11.3	18.2	13.6	22.8
West Virginia	415	481	5,308	1,549	100.0	100.0	16.6	99.5	6.3	6.2	10.1	14.5
Wisconsin	442	416	9,676	1,380	100.0	100.0	33.8	98.4	9.5	11.3	13.5	32.0
Wyoming	280	176	1,385	199	100.0	100.0	8.1	3.8	12.1	20.5 ^d	8.5	10.1

NOTE: The following state was processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files:

Massachusetts: Excludes IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2010 that were adjudicated in FFY2011 Q3 and Q4.

^a Values less than 95 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^b Values more than 25 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^c The vast majority of provider IDs reported in the RX files are prescribing provider IDs thereby driving up the percentage of claims for individuals or groups of individuals, and driving down the percentage of claims for organizations. For the RX, values less than 95 percent are below the expected level and are considered anomalous.

^d The percentage of organizational LT provider IDs that are subparts increased more than 30 percent in AK, NE, TN, and WY in 2010.

^e The number of LT provider IDs with entity type of organization decreased by more than 30 percent in CA in 2010. However, given that the drop is among provider IDs with taxonomy codes for individuals or group individuals, the decrease can be regarded as a positive change from 2009 to 2010.

^f The percentage of organizational IP provider IDs that are subparts decreased more than 30 percent in CO and TN in 2010.

^g The percentage of organizational RX provider IDs that are subparts increased more than 30 percent in CT, MI, and OH in 2010.

^h The number of LT provider IDs with entity type of organization decreased by more than 30 percent in HI, LA, and WA in 2010.

ⁱ The percentage of organizational IP provider IDs that are subparts increased more than 30 percent in HI, MA, and RI in 2010.

^j The number of RX billing provider IDs with entity type of organization decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2010.

^k The number of OT servicing provider IDs with entity type of organization increased more than 30 percent in RI in 2010.

^l The percentage of organizational RX provider IDs that are subparts decreased more than 30 percent in SC in 2010.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

MATHEMATICA Policy Research

www.mathematica-mpr.com

Improving public well-being by conducting high quality, objective research and surveys

Princeton, NJ ■ Ann Arbor, MI ■ Cambridge, MA ■ Chicago, IL ■ Oakland, CA ■ Washington, DC

Mathematica® is a registered trademark of Mathematica Policy Research