

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

Anomaly Tables, 2011

Final Report

June 28, 2013

Deo Bencio



MATHEMATICA
Policy Research

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

Contract Number:
HHSM-500-2005-00025I

Task Number:
HHSM-500-T0002

Mathematica Reference Number:
06759.680

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**

Anomaly Tables, 2011

Final Report

June 28, 2013

Deo Bencio

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research

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

SPECIAL NOTE TO MAXPC 2011 USERS
06/28/2013

Sixteen states are not included in MAXPC 2011 because their MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date of May 15, 2013. The cut-off date was established to provide time to produce the MAXPC deliverables by the contractual deadlines. The 16 states are:

- Arizona
- California
- Colorado
- Florida
- Idaho
- Kansas
- Maine
- Massachusetts
- Nebraska
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New Mexico
- North Dakota
- Ohio
- Rhode Island
- Utah

The following states were processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files. Records excluded are IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2011 that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q4.

- District of Columbia
- Hawaii
- Indiana
- Maryland
- New York
- West Virginia

The following states were also processed without the full complement of data. Along with the excluded records described above, we excluded similar records that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q3.

- Illinois
- Minnesota
- Texas
- Vermont

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
NPPES	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.

2011 MAXPC ANOMALY TABLES

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

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
Alabama	667	512	50,975	2,865	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0
Alaska	109	75	21,592 ^c	184	99.1	100.0	68.4	100.0	96.3	93.3	67.1	100.0
Arizona	AZ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Arkansas	468	641	48,929	1,728	75.9	99.2	81.8	99.9	75.9	99.2	81.7	99.9
California	CA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Colorado	CO was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Connecticut	634	778	51,891	2,677	99.8	100.0	87.0	99.9	99.8	100.0	86.6	99.9
Delaware	117 ^d	73	9,511	287	98.3	97.3	89.9	99.7	98.3	94.5	88.6	99.7
District of Columbia	172	220	9,621	1,447 ^e	98.8	99.1	71.7	99.9	98.8	99.1	71.7	99.9
Florida	FL was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Georgia	1,212	719	112,968	8,360 ^e	98.8	99.7	98.5	99.6	98.8	99.7	98.5	99.6
Hawaii	249	80	12,367	529	94.0	96.3	69.0	94.7	94.0	96.3	69.0	94.7
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Illinois	1,060	2,233	149,873	3,748	90.2	65.2	72.1	96.7	90.2	65.2	72.0	96.7
Indiana	806	2,035	58,393	2,731	100.0	100.0	96.5	99.9	100.0	100.0	95.4	99.9
Iowa	680	1,360	67,256	13,712	88.5	99.2	97.3	97.2	88.2	99.2	81.5	97.2
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Kentucky	766	748	59,109	3,178	100.0	100.0	90.9	99.3	100.0	100.0	90.9	99.3
Louisiana	1,306	1,283 ^f	47,565	1,658 ^g	90.7	31.9 ^h	90.7	27.2 ⁱ	76.4	31.3 ^h	85.8	26.3 ^j
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Maryland	465	530	97,503	2,647	94.0	98.3	60.3	99.6	93.8	98.3	49.6	99.6
Massachusetts	MA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Michigan	1,975	1,194	205,939	27,396 ^e	82.5	91.5	38.1	84.7	82.5	91.5	38.1	82.5
Minnesota	759	1,494	119,594	2,974	92.5	98.7	91.6	99.8	92.2	97.8	48.8	99.8
Mississippi	664	531	34,634	1,762	99.4	99.6	99.6	99.1	99.4	99.6	99.4	99.1
Missouri	874	1,097	64,339	5,609	69.2	99.1	82.1	94.7	65.0	99.1	49.3	94.7
Montana	368	248	18,509	714	100.0	100.0	97.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.6	100.0
Nebraska	NE was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Nevada	397	242	24,748	1,053	100.0	99.6	99.9	99.8	100.0	99.6	95.3	99.8
New Hampshire	NH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											

Table 1. General Issues in MAXPC 2011

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 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
New Mexico	NM was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
New York	2,019	3,400	272,853	14,456 ^e	89.7	95.3	94.5	99.5	89.7	95.3	94.1	99.5
North Carolina	877	1,823	105,377	4,438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Ohio	OH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Oklahoma	884	889	56,918	2,168	99.7	99.7	96.1	99.9	99.7	99.7	94.5	99.9
Oregon	325	347	66,742 ^c	1,501	93.8	95.1	59.9	99.1	93.8	95.1	59.9	99.1
Pennsylvania	849	1,936	100,668	7,383	99.5	99.9	89.8	99.9	99.5	99.9	89.8	99.9
Rhode Island	RI was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
South Carolina	4,147 ^d	291	50,142 ^c	28,149 ^e	100.0	80.4	64.0	94.6	99.8	80.1	38.7	94.3
South Dakota	358	311	18,320	649 ^e	100.0	100.0	83.1	96.0	100.0	100.0	80.8	96.0
Tennessee	1,828	1,000	75,677	16,224	92.6	93.4	75.5	99.9	92.6	93.4	75.5	99.9
Texas	823	1,926	115,920	9,086	91.3	99.4	76.5	100.0	91.3	98.9	74.8	100.0
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Vermont	189	137	16,404	489	98.9	100.0	99.2	100.0	98.9	100.0	99.1	100.0
Virginia	1,349	384	80,144	1,815	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	96.0	100.0
Washington	545	534	68,353	2,607	97.1	99.1	99.9	97.7	97.1	99.1	99.5	97.7
West Virginia	400	495	33,077	1,512	100.0	95.4	96.8	99.9	100.0	95.2	96.8	99.9
Wisconsin	473	411	47,656	1,390	98.9	99.0	62.9	100.0	98.9	99.0	62.9	100.0
Wyoming	239	148	22,305	5,449	100.0	100.0	84.5	97.9	100.0	100.0	84.4	97.8

NOTE: The following states were processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files. Records excluded are IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2011 that were adjudicated in FFY2012 Q4: District of Columbia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, New York, and West Virginia. The following states were also processed without the full complement of data. Along with the excluded records described above, we excluded similar records that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q3: Illinois, Minnesota, Texas, and Vermont.

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

^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 The number of OT servicing provider IDs increased more than 30 percent in AK, OR, and SC in 2011.

^d The number of IP billing provider IDs increased more than 30 percent in DE and SC in 2011.

^e The number of RX billing provider IDs increased more than 30 percent in DC, GA, MI, NY, SC, and SD in 2011.

^f The number of LT billing provider IDs decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^g The number of RX billing provider IDs decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^h The percentage of LT billing provider IDs with an NPI and the percentage of of these IDs linked to NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

ⁱ The percentage of RX billing provider IDs with an NPI and the percentage of these IDs linked to NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

Table 2. Utilization Levels in MAXPC 2011

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	495.3	1,146.7	1,302.0	6,924.2	378.1	116.3	229.0	680.0
Alaska	200.3	234.1	511.9	6,256.2	168.7	33.2	82.0	648.6
Arizona	AZ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Arkansas	522.6	2,516.8	1,502.7	5,770.6	434.3	99.9	211.0	803.3
California	CA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Colorado	CO was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Connecticut	622.7	759.1	1,268.0	7,822.5	376.3	92.6	177.5	651.6
Delaware	172.2	712.1	1,876.0	8,159.0	145.0	86.0	209.0	911.5
District of Columbia	425.1	621.1 ^b	1,931.1	3,241.9 ^c	326.3	61.7 ^d	262.9	307.6
Florida	FL was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Georgia	506.4	3,210.9 ^b	845.5	4,170.2	435.6	105.7	179.5	513.9
Hawaii	307.3	29.0	1,215.6	9,303.9	170.2	7.5	207.2	1,141.4
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Illinois	702.8	753.6	1,055.3	13,878.3	521.1	93.2	231.2	1,516.4
Indiana	535.9	846.8	1,175.2	10,874.9	382.5	50.5	205.3	997.6
Iowa	204.1	217.4	654.9	931.1 ^e	170.2	29.6	106.5	103.6
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Kentucky	903.7 ^f	1,134.6	1,288.7	9,055.9	366.9	98.7	242.3	785.0 ^g
Louisiana	484.0	659.8 ^b	2,131.9	16,234.8 ^e	330.3	83.6	375.6	1,501.7
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Maryland	654.3	850.9	655.5	5,128.5	445.4	116.9	86.3	497.2
Massachusetts	MA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Michigan	327.2	639.9	888.6	1,363.1	218.9	91.8	136.3	194.4
Minnesota	331.9	678.5	1,018.3	8,615.9	265.8	44.4	118.4	736.6
Mississippi	401.0	983.0	1,771.8	6,848.3	320.0	106.6	309.5	893.5
Missouri	436.5	1,159.1	1,040.2	5,490.4	332.7	78.6	155.7	531.7
Montana	124.9	493.4	580.5	3,269.1	105.7	44.9	97.6	321.8
Nebraska	NE was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Nevada	240.1	621.8	463.2	3,776.7	165.2	69.0	89.1	264.8

Table 2. Utilization Levels in MAXPC 2011

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 Hampshire	NH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
New Mexico	NM was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
New York	2,120.1	6,942.5	1,600.3	8,923.4 ^c	799.8	97.4	239.0	806.9
North Carolina	797.3	1,187.2	1,961.1	7,273.7	644.5	62.6	281.7	838.7
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Ohio	OH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Oklahoma	395.0	1,452.4	1,170.5	6,404.2	303.2	68.7	187.1	871.1
Oregon	403.7	566.8	490.4	6,515.4	341.3	68.5	103.8	581.1
Pennsylvania	477.0	1,783.6	516.8	2,653.9	269.7	99.1	89.3	228.1
Rhode Island	RI was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
South Carolina	30.7 ^h	575.0	703.0	354.4	26.2 ⁱ	70.4	111.8	68.9
South Dakota	134.9	350.5	332.7	1,887.9	115.6	43.5	79.5	261.7
Tennessee	363.1	1,204.6 ^b	1,184.5	1,659.6	191.6	76.0	244.5	209.0
Texas	1,064.3	1,882.9	2,103.9	8,709.3	851.6	69.1	313.5	1,132.1
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.							
Vermont	194.9	729.9	789.8	8,974.8	144.3	56.3	121.5	752.5
Virginia	389.8	1,129.3	697.6	5,686.8	178.4	85.3	148.9	557.2
Washington	427.8	1,312.0	1,230.4	6,806.1	319.6	101.5	202.3	557.1
West Virginia	335.0	508.8	917.2	8,547.8	215.6	66.9	139.7	643.7
Wisconsin	322.5	637.3	1,079.2	10,384.7	263.6	80.3	199.7	1,011.9
Wyoming	121.8	413.0	255.8	224.8	102.5	39.6	43.7	38.8

NOTE: The following states were processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files. Records excluded are IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2011 that were adjudicated in FFY2012 Q4: District of Columbia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, New York, and West Virginia. The following states were also processed without the full complement of data. Along with the excluded records described above, we excluded similar records that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q3: Illinois, Minnesota, Texas, and Vermont.

^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 ID increased more than 30 percent in DC, GA, LA, and TN in 2011.

^c The average number of RX claims per provider ID decreased more than 30 percent in DC and NY in 2011.

^d The average number of beneficiaries with LT claims per provider ID increased more than 30 percent in DC in 2011.

^e The average number of RX claims per provider ID increased more than 30 percent in IA and LA in 2011.

^f The average number of IP claims per provider ID increased more than 30 percent in KY in 2011.

^g The average number of beneficiaries with RX claims per provider ID decreased more than 30 percent in KY in 2011.

^h The average number of IP claims per provider ID decreased more than 30 percent in SC in 2011.

ⁱ The average number of beneficiaries with IP claims per provider ID decreased more than 30 percent in SC in 2011.

Table 3. Prevalence of Provider IDs in MAXPC 2011

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	71,940	50.2	49.8	50.8	49.2	62.6	7.7	37.4	50.2	0.0	49.8
Alaska	24,328	100.0	99.1	100.0	97.3	64.0	6.1	36.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Arizona	AZ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Arkansas	55,429	54.9	45.1	52.6	47.4	54.7	20.7	45.3	50.2	0.0	49.8
California	CA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Colorado	CO was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Connecticut	74,789	50.2	49.8	51.0	49.0	57.1	23.8	42.9	59.3	29.9	40.7
Delaware	12,743	48.7 ^a	98.3	97.3	97.3	99.4	13.4	89.7	100.0	0.0	99.7
District of Columbia	11,538	50.6	49.4	58.2	41.8	54.9	44.2	45.1	19.4 ^b	0.9	80.6
Florida	FL was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Georgia	159,948	54.1	45.9	49.8 ^c	50.2	68.4	5.4 ^d	31.6	51.2 ^b	30.2	48.8
Hawaii	14,662	51.0	49.0	51.3	48.8	55.3	48.8	44.7	50.9	0.4	49.1
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Illinois	211,070	43.9	56.1	41.2	58.8	63.8	0.0	36.2	25.9	0.6	74.1
Indiana	83,862	47.9	52.1	53.1	46.9	49.7	11.8	50.3	49.7	0.6	50.3
Iowa	85,724	56.5	43.5	51.9	48.1	58.8	23.2	43.0	7.5	0.0	92.5
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Kentucky	69,241	50.3	49.7	51.3	48.7	79.3	34.3 ^e	46.5	55.9	1.4	44.1
Louisiana	56,931	39.4	60.6	68.2 ^f	31.8 ^g	47.5	24.3	52.5	73.0 ^h	0.0	27.0 ⁱ
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Maryland	104,685	52.3	47.7	48.1	51.9	69.4	13.5	30.6	50.9	1.0	49.1
Massachusetts	MA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Michigan	250,224	67.1	33.7	56.0	44.7	80.3	63.3	20.0	78.1	48.8 ^j	71.9
Minnesota	190,520	50.2	49.8	51.2	48.8	22.8	21.3	77.2	50.0	4.5	50.0
Mississippi	48,210	49.7	50.3	49.9	50.1	49.6	16.6	50.4	50.5	2.0	49.5
Missouri	108,690	54.9	45.1	48.3	51.7	82.3	5.1	17.7	51.6	3.2	48.4
Montana	21,029	50.3	49.7	50.0	50.0	52.7	24.5	47.3	50.0	0.0	50.0

Table 3. Prevalence of Provider IDs in MAXPC 2011

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	NE was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Nevada	37,294	50.9	49.1	49.6	50.4	50.1	0.0	49.9	49.9	6.1	50.1
New Hampshire	NH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
New Mexico	NM was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
New York	293,377	50.7	49.3	50.3	49.7	46.9	34.8	53.1	49.3	16.6 ^j	50.7
North Carolina	116,055	50.1	49.9	54.7	45.3	51.9	18.9	48.1	50.2	1.0	49.8
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Ohio	OH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Oklahoma	67,632	50.2	49.8	49.8	50.2	50.3	11.8	49.7	50.0	0.0	50.0
Oregon	80,852	55.1	44.9	54.5	45.5	84.3	39.1 ^e	28.4 ^k	50.6	13.7	49.4
Pennsylvania	166,290	50.6	49.4	53.4	46.6	57.8	20.1	42.2	49.8	2.0	50.2
Rhode Island	RI was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
South Carolina	73,199	100.0	100.0	100.0	8.9	89.1	35.1 ^e	33.9	7.5	83.0	92.5
South Dakota	24,841	50.6	49.4	51.8	48.2	50.2	50.0	49.8	53.3 ^b	0.0	46.7
Tennessee	139,182	49.1	50.9	50.9	49.1	74.5	33.7	26.4	50.5	0.0	49.5
Texas	199,342	99.6	91.3	99.7	99.1	92.4	68.7	71.4	50.2	0.0	49.8
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.										
Vermont	19,304	49.7	50.3	50.4	49.6	48.1	16.0	51.9	50.3	1.0	49.7
Virginia	105,385	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	38.2	50.0	100.0	3.4	100.0
Washington	113,772	51.6	48.4	50.6	49.4	50.0	9.7	50.0	52.2	13.2	47.8
West Virginia	53,692	50.3	49.8	47.5	52.5	50.5	11.6	49.5	47.4	0.0	52.6
Wisconsin	64,079	100.0	98.9	100.0	99.0	99.1	67.6	53.4	100.0	5.6	100.0
Wyoming	26,265	50.2	49.8	50.0	50.0	57.0	9.5	43.0	3.7	0.1	96.3

NOTE: The following states were processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files. Records excluded are IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2011 that were adjudicated in FFY2012 Q4: District of Columbia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, New York, and West Virginia. The following states were also processed without the full complement of data. Along with the excluded records described above, we excluded similar records that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q3: Illinois, Minnesota, Texas, and Vermont.

In MAX 2011, 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 2011, 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 IP provider IDs that are billing provider IDs on IP claims decreased more than 30 percent in DE in 2011.

^b The percentage of RX billing provider IDs decreased more than 30 percent in DC, GA, and SD in 2011.

^c The percentage of LT provider IDs that are billing provider IDs decreased more than 30 percent in GA in 2011.

^d The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs that are also billing provider IDs on OT claims decreased more than 30 percent in GA in 2011.

^e The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs that are also billing provider IDs on OT claims increased more than 30 percent in KY, OR, and SC in 2011.

^f The percentage of LT provider IDs that are billing provider IDs increased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^g The percentage of LT provider IDs that are NPI billing provider IDs on LT claims decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^h The percentage of RX billing provider IDs increased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

ⁱ The percentage of RX billing provider IDs that are also NPI billing provider IDs on RX claims decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^j The percentage of RX billing provider IDs that are also prescribing provider IDs on RX claims increased more than 30 percent in MI and NY in 2011.

^k The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs that are also NPI servicing provider IDs on OT claims decreased more than 30 percent in OR in 2011.

Table 4. NPI-Related Issues in MAXPC 2011

	Number of Provider IDs with NPIs				Percent NPI Source=MSIS ^a				Percent NPI Source=NPPES ^b				Percent NPI Source=State Provider File ^c			
State	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX	IP	LT	OT	RX
Alabama	666	512	50,961	2,865	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	108	75	14,768	184	100.0	97.3	97.2	100.0	0.0	2.7	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arizona	AZ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Arkansas	355	636	40,029	1,726	88.5	99.8	94.7	100.0	11.5 ^d	0.2	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
California	CA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Colorado	CO was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Connecticut	633	778	45,169	2,675	100.0	98.1	99.8	99.9	0.0	1.9	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delaware	115	71	8,546	286	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
District of Columbia	170	218	6,902	1,445 ^e	98.8	99.1	94.6	100.0	1.2	0.9	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Florida	FL was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Georgia	1,197	717	111,231	8,328 ^e	99.8	99.9	99.7	100.0	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hawaii	234	77	8,531	501	100.0	100.0	97.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Illinois	956	1,455	107,988	3,623	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indiana	806	2,035	56,349	2,729	95.8	99.3	84.4	99.0	0.4	0.3	6.3	0.2	3.8	0.3	9.3	0.8
Iowa	602	1,349	65,428	13,326	98.2	99.1	99.2	95.5	1.8	0.9	0.8	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Kentucky	766	748	53,704	3,155	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	1,185	409 ^f	43,145	451 ^g	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Maryland	437	521	58,822	2,636	96.8	99.8	99.2	100.0	3.2	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Massachusetts	MA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Michigan	1,630	1,093	78,552	23,213 ^e	97.5	99.0	91.4	93.2	2.5	1.0	8.6	6.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minnesota	702	1,474	109,571	2,969	94.7	99.2	96.4	99.7	5.3	0.8	3.6	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mississippi	660	529	34,487	1,746	99.4	99.8	99.9	100.0	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missouri	605	1,087	52,818	5,314	80.7	97.4	95.2	97.3	19.3	2.6	4.8	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montana	368	248	18,060	714	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	NE was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															

Table 4. NPI-Related Issues in MAXPC 2011

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
Nevada	397	241	24,722	1,051	99.7	99.2	100.0	99.8	0.3	0.8	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Hampshire	NH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
New Mexico	NM was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
New York	1,811	3,239	257,818	14,390 ^e	97.2	96.6	97.7	99.6	2.8	3.4	2.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Carolina	877	1,823	105,340	4,437	99.7	99.9	99.9	100.0	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Ohio	OH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Oklahoma	881	886	54,697	2,165	99.9	99.7	99.4	99.9	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oregon	305	330	40,007	1,488	97.4	97.9	99.0	99.7	2.6	2.1	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	845	1,935	90,395	7,377	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	RI was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
South Carolina	4,145	234	32,093	26,643	100.0	11.5	84.5	99.9	0.0	88.5	15.5 ⁱ	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Dakota	358	311	15,222	623	100.0	100.0	92.1	98.9	0.0	0.0	7.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tennessee	1,693	934	57,162	16,203	100.0	100.0	99.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Texas	751	1,914	88,624	9,086	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Vermont	187	137	16,270	489	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.6	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Virginia	1,349	384	80,144	1,815	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	529	529	68,316	2,546	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	400	472	32,029	1,511	99.5	99.8	96.4	100.0	0.5	0.2	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wisconsin	468	407	29,954	1,390	100.0	100.0	97.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wyoming	239	148	18,848	5,335	100.0	100.0	98.1	98.5	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

NOTE: The following states were processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files. Records excluded are IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2011 that were adjudicated in FFY2012 Q4: District of Columbia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, New York, and West Virginia. The following states were also processed without the full complement of data. Along with the excluded records described above, we excluded similar records that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q3: Illinois, Minnesota, Texas, and Vermont.

^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 percentage of IP provider IDs in which the NPI source is NPPES increased more than 30 percent in AR in 2011.

^e The number of RX billing provider IDs with NPIs increased more than 30 percent in DC, GA, MI, and NY in 2011.

^f The number of LT provider IDs with NPIs decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^g The number RX billing provider IDs with NPIs decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^h The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs in which the NPI source is NPPES increased more than 30 percent in SC in 2011.

Table 5. NPPES-Linkage Issues in MAXPC 2011

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	666	512	50,944	2,865	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	36.3	100.0	77.7	91.6
Alaska	105	70	14,478	184	100.0	97.1	97.1	100.0	35.2	52.9	58.5	64.7
Arizona	AZ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Arkansas	355	636	39,961	1,726	88.5	99.8	94.7	100.0	41.4	97.5	77.1	87.3
California	CA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Colorado	CO was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Connecticut	633	778	44,954	2,675	100.0	98.1	99.8	99.9	20.2	94.5	72.3	83.6
Delaware	115	69	8,422	286	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	11.3	75.4	60.3	65.4
District of Columbia	170	218	6,898	1,445 ^d	98.8	99.1	94.6	100.0	25.9	67.9	55.4	17.5 ^e
Florida	FL was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date. z											
Georgia	1,197	717	111,223	8,328 ^d	99.8	99.9	99.7	100.0	33.3	99.2	85.1	70.6
Hawaii	234	77	8,530	501	100.0	100.0	97.1	100.0	85.5	100.0	88.1	93.4
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Illinois	956	1,455	107,981	3,623	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	42.2	98.5	75.8	82.7
Indiana	806	2,035	55,686	2,729	99.6	99.7	93.6	99.8	47.8	99.6	75.5	87.5
Iowa	600	1,349	54,801	13,325	98.2	99.1	99.0	95.5	43.5	95.3	62.1	66.0
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Kentucky	766	748	53,704	3,155	100.0	100.0	99.6	100.0	28.1	99.1	64.5	84.1
Louisiana	998	401 ^f	40,833	436 ^g	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	36.0	99.8	83.8	96.1
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Maryland	436	521	48,373	2,636	96.8	99.8	99.0	100.0	32.1	97.9	77.4	87.5
Massachusetts	MA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Michigan	1,630	1,093	78,492	22,613 ^d	97.5	99.0	91.4	93.0	38.7	98.1	85.9	73.5
Minnesota	700	1,461	58,307	2,969	94.7	99.2	93.3	99.7	42.7	95.5	81.9	73.2
Mississippi	660	529	34,416	1,746	99.4	99.8	99.9	100.0	47.0	94.7	62.1	91.0
Missouri	568	1,087	31,723	5,312	79.4	97.4	92.0	97.3	71.8	99.1	82.4	88.9
Montana	368	248	18,060	714	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	38.0	94.4	61.1	76.8
Nebraska	NE was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Nevada	397	241	23,581	1,051	99.7	99.2	100.0	99.8	45.1	56.0	74.1	83.6
New Hampshire	NH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											

Table 5. NPPES-Linkage Issues in MAXPC 2011

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 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
New Mexico	NM was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
New York	1,811	3,239	256,761	14,390 ^d	97.2	96.6	97.7	99.6	40.6	95.3	83.0	96.6
North Carolina	877	1,823	105,334	4,437	99.7	99.9	100.0	100.0	40.5	97.5	88.0	92.6
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Ohio	OH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Oklahoma	881	886	53,803	2,165	99.9	99.7	99.4	99.9	43.6	97.5	75.9	81.2
Oregon	305	330	40,007	1,488	97.4	97.9	99.0	99.7	53.1	97.3	75.1	89.9
Pennsylvania	845	1,935	90,393	7,377	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	59.8	99.2	88.6	95.0
Rhode Island	RI was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
South Carolina	4,140	233	19,412	26,531	100.0	11.2	74.4	99.9	77.0 ^h	99.1	77.6	53.5
South Dakota	358	311	14,798	623	100.0	100.0	91.8	98.9	39.7	96.8	58.7	67.3
Tennessee	1,693	934	57,155	16,203	100.0	100.0	99.4	100.0	56.3	98.1	75.5	20.0
Texas	751	1,904	86,699	9,086	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	71.2	99.7	93.7	98.5
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Vermont	187	137	16,259	489	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.6	23.0	73.0	54.0	59.9
Virginia	1,348	384	76,956	1,815	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.7	95.3	70.1	86.1
Washington	529	529	67,997	2,546	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	40.3	95.8	80.2	90.1
West Virginia	400	471	32,029	1,511	99.5	99.8	96.4	100.0	36.0	86.4	50.4	68.8
Wisconsin	468	407	29,954	1,390	100.0	100.0	97.5	100.0	31.6	98.8	69.7	86.0
Wyoming	239	148	18,832	5,327	100.0	100.0	98.1	98.5	25.5	77.0	35.5	33.0

NOTE: The following states were processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files. Records excluded are IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2011 that were adjudicated in FFY2012 Q4: District of Columbia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, New York, and West Virginia. The following states were also processed without the full complement of data. Along with the excluded records described above, we excluded similar records that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q3: Illinois, Minnesota, Texas, and Vermont.

^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 RX billing provider IDs linked to NPPES increased more than 30 percent in DC, GA, MI, and NY in 2011.

^e The percentage of RX billing provider IDs that are In-State decreased more than 30 percent in DC in 2011.

^f The number of LT provider IDs linked to NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^g The number of RX billing provider IDs linked to NPPES decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^h The percentage of IP billing provider IDs that are In-State increased more than 30 percent in SC in 2011.

Table 6. Provider Taxonomy Issues in MAXPC 2011

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	664	507	49,822	2,785	99.7	99.0	97.8	97.2	0.0	0.0	88.2	6.8	100.0	100.0	11.8	93.2
Alaska	105	68	14,229	176	100.0	97.1	98.3	95.7	1.0	1.5	94.2	2.3	99.0	98.5	5.8	97.7
Arizona	AZ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Arkansas	352	628	39,522	1,704	99.2	98.7	98.9	98.7	0.3	1.0	91.6	7.8	99.7	99.0	8.4	92.2
California	CA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Colorado	CO was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Connecticut	623	762	43,845	2,581	98.4	97.9	97.5	96.5	0.3	0.0	87.6	4.5	99.7	100.0	12.4	95.5
Delaware	112	66	8,294	278	97.4	95.7	98.5	97.2	0.9	1.5	90.8	2.2	99.1	98.5	9.2	97.8
District of Columbia	170	216	6,735	1,419 ^g	100.0	99.1	97.6	98.2	4.7	0.0	72.4	0.5	95.3	100.0	27.6	99.5
Florida	FL was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Georgia	1,191	717	109,383	8,228 ^g	99.5	100.0	98.3	98.8	0.3	0.0	87.4	19.3 ^h	99.7	100.0	12.6	80.7
Hawaii	234	77	8,279	490	100.0	100.0	97.1	97.8	8.1	3.9	81.0	3.3	91.9	96.1	19.0	96.7
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Illinois	951	1,418	106,133	3,560	99.5	97.5	98.3	98.3	0.3	0.0	83.9	3.5	99.7	100.0	16.1	96.5
Indiana	804	2,007	55,010	2,703	99.8	98.6	98.8	99.0	0.2	0.2	86.5	1.3	99.8	99.8	13.5	98.7
Iowa	592	1,325	54,040	13,146	98.7	98.2	98.6	98.7	0.3	0.3	86.6	87.2	99.7	99.7	13.4	12.8 ⁱ
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Kentucky	766	742	53,059	3,095	100.0	99.2	98.8	98.1	0.0	0.4	84.3	4.5	100.0	99.6	15.7	95.5
Louisiana	994	400 ^j	40,316	425 ^k	99.6	99.8	98.7	97.5	0.0	0.3	79.5	5.2	100.0	99.8	20.5	94.8
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Maryland	434	507	47,497	2,564	99.5	97.3	98.2	97.3	0.0	0.2	86.7	1.8	100.0	99.8	13.3	98.2
Massachusetts	MA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Michigan	1,627	1,068	76,963	22,379 ^g	99.8	97.7	98.1	99.0	5.8	2.5	77.3	62.4	94.2	97.5	22.7	37.6
Minnesota	694	1,431	57,372	2,920	99.1	97.9	98.4	98.3	0.6	0.3	73.2	2.1	99.4	99.7	26.8	97.9
Mississippi	658	529	33,892	1,720	99.7	100.0	98.5	98.5	0.3	0.4	85.3	8.0	99.7	99.6	14.7	92.0
Missouri	562	1,082	31,017	5,248	98.9	99.5	97.8	98.8	23.1	0.0	58.6	25.4	76.9	100.0	41.4	74.6
Montana	364	242	17,694	696	98.9	97.6	98.0	97.5	0.0	0.0	81.1	1.7	100.0	100.0	18.9	98.3
Nebraska	NE was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Nevada	397	233	23,251	1,040	100.0	96.7	98.6	99.0	0.0	0.0	87.9	1.5	100.0	100.0	12.1	98.5
New Hampshire	NH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
New Mexico	NM was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
New York	1,798	3,219	251,678	14,100 ^g	99.3	99.4	98.0	98.0	0.2	1.9	90.6	36.8 ^h	99.8	98.1	9.4	63.2 ⁱ
North Carolina	877	1,782	103,602	4,309	100.0	97.8	98.4	97.1	0.0	0.3	77.8	2.5	100.0	99.7	22.2	97.5

Table 6. Provider Taxonomy Issues in MAXPC 2011

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 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Ohio	OH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Oklahoma	877	862	53,051	2,083	99.5	97.3	98.6	96.2	0.0	0.2	87.8	4.0	100.0	99.8	12.2	96.0
Oregon	305	315	39,232	1,438	100.0	95.5	98.1	96.6	0.7	0.6	91.6	2.3	99.3	99.4	8.4	97.7
Pennsylvania	840	1,797	89,091	7,254	99.4	92.9	98.6	98.3	0.7	0.4	85.1	16.8	99.3	99.6	14.9	83.2
Rhode Island	RI was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
South Carolina	4,118	233	19,242	26,187	99.5	100.0	99.1	98.7	94.1 ^m	0.0	97.4	99.3	5.9 ⁿ	100.0	2.6	0.7
South Dakota	356	298	14,582	611	99.4	95.8	98.5	98.1	0.6	0.7	77.9	2.8	99.4	99.3	22.1	97.2
Tennessee	1,672	916	56,326	16,135	98.8	98.1	98.5	99.6	1.4	0.7	70.7	1.0	98.6	99.3	29.3	99.0
Texas	746	1,875	85,344	8,947	99.3	98.5	98.4	98.5	1.9	0.2	81.2	2.7	98.1	99.8	18.8	97.3
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.															
Vermont	187	133	15,829	475	100.0	97.1	97.4	97.1	0.0	0.0	95.9	3.6	100.0	100.0	4.1	96.4
Virginia	1,331	372	75,426	1,751	98.7	96.9	98.0	96.5	2.2	0.0	84.2	2.9	97.8	100.0	15.8	97.1
Washington	529	519	67,187	2,504	100.0	98.1	98.8	98.4	0.0	0.0	89.9	1.8	100.0	100.0	10.1	98.2
West Virginia	400	467	31,584	1,470	100.0	99.2	98.6	97.3	0.0	0.4	84.9	3.5	100.0	99.6	15.1	96.5
Wisconsin	466	404	29,418	1,363	99.6	99.3	98.2	98.1	0.2	0.0	69.1	2.1	99.8	100.0	30.9	97.9
Wyoming	233	142	18,565	5,246	97.5	95.9	98.6	98.5	0.0	0.0	93.7	97.4	100.0	100.0	6.3	2.6

NOTE: The following states were processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files. Records excluded are IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2011 that were adjudicated in FFY2012 Q4: District of Columbia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, New York, and West Virginia. The following states were also processed without the full complement of data. Along with the excluded records described above, we excluded similar records that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q3: Illinois, Minnesota, Texas, and Vermont.

^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 RX billing provider IDs with NPPES primary taxonomy codes increased more than 30 percent in DC, GA, MI, and NY in 2011.

^h The percentage of RX billing provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy for individuals or groups of individuals increased more than 30 percent in GA and NY in 2011. These results are inconsistent with expected taxonomy codes for RX billing provider IDs.

ⁱ The percentage of RX billing provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy for nonindividuals increased more than 30 percent in IA in 2011. Despite the increase, this result is still inconsistent with expected taxonomy codes for RX billing provider IDs.

^j The number of LT provider IDs with primary taxonomy decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^k The number of RX billing provider IDs with NPPES primary taxonomy decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^l The percentage of RX billing provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy for nonindividuals decreased more than 30 percent in NY in 2011. These results are inconsistent with expected taxonomy codes for RX billing provider IDs.

^m The percentage of IP billing provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy for individuals or groups of individuals increased more than 30 percent in SC in 2011. These results are inconsistent with expected taxonomy codes for IP billing provider IDs.

ⁿ The percentage of IP billing provider IDs with an NPPES primary taxonomy for nonindividuals decreased more than 30 percent in SC in 2011. These results are inconsistent with expected taxonomy codes for IP billing provider IDs.

Table 7. Individual Provider Entity Issues in MAXPC 2011

[illegible]

Table 7. Individual Provider Entity Issues in MAXPC 2011

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 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
New Mexico	NM was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
New York	1	57	221,365	4,795 ^d	0.1	1.8	86.2	33.3	100.0	36.8 ⁱ	30.5	15.9 ^e
North Carolina	0	2	73,963	4	0.0	0.1	70.2	0.1	0.0	100.0	19.1	100.0
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Ohio	OH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Oklahoma	0	0	45,958 ^j	2	0.0	0.0	85.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	25.7 ^h	100.0
Oregon	2	2	36,124	7	0.7	0.6	90.3	0.5	0.0	0.0	17.6	57.1
Pennsylvania	0	0	75,894	218	0.0	0.0	84.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	16.2	33.9
Rhode Island	RI was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
South Carolina	3,886	0	18,684 ^j	25,917 ^d	93.9	0.0	96.2	97.7	10.0	0.0	12.1	17.2
South Dakota	0	0	10,176	1	0.0	0.0	68.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	10.1	0.0
Tennessee	10	1	37,323	8	0.6	0.1	65.3	0.0	20.0	100.0	19.4	50.0
Texas	6	1	68,634	50	0.8	0.1	79.2	0.6	33.3	100.0	24.8	88.0
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Vermont	0	0	15,451	2	0.0	0.0	95.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	21.9	0.0
Virginia	1	0	62,074	4	0.1	0.0	80.7	0.2	100.0	0.0	15.2	100.0
Washington	0	0	58,285	0	0.0	0.0	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.6	0.0
West Virginia	0	0	26,656	0	0.0	0.0	83.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.9	0.0
Wisconsin	0	0	19,578	0	0.0	0.0	65.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.7	0.0
Wyoming	0	0	17,354	5,118	0.0	0.0	92.2	96.1	0.0	0.0	16.9	18.4

NOTE: The following states were processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files. Records excluded are IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2011 that were adjudicated in FFY2012 Q4: District of Columbia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, New York, and West Virginia. The following states were also processed without the full complement of data. Along with the excluded records described above, we excluded similar records that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q3: Illinois, Minnesota, Texas, and Vermont.

^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 increased more than 30 percent in GA, KY, MI, NY, and SC in 2011.

^e The number of RX billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type which are sole proprietorships decreased more than 30 percent in GA and NY in 2011.

^f The number of IP billing provider IDs with entity type of individual increased more than 30 percent in MI in 2011.

^g The number of IP billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type which are sole proprietorships increased more than 30 percent in MO in 2011.

^h The percentage of OT servicing provider IDs that are of individual entity type which are sole proprietorships increased more than 30 percent in NV and OK in 2011.

ⁱ The percentage of LT billing provider IDs that are of individual entity type which are sole proprietorships increased more than 30 percent in NY in 2011.

^j The number of OT servicing provider IDs that are of individual entity type increased more than 30 percent in OK and SC in 2011.

Table 8. Organizational Provider Entity Issues in MAXPC 2011

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	666	512	6,794	2,843	100.0	100.0	13.3	99.2	9.9	12.5	12.0	20.6
Alaska	105	70	909	182	100.0	100.0	6.3	98.9	14.3 ^d	11.4	8.9	28.6
Arizona	AZ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Arkansas	354	636	4,451	1,710	99.7	100.0	11.1	99.1	4.5	5.0	16.1	33.9
California	CA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Colorado	CO was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Connecticut	631	778	8,701	2,604	99.7	100.0	19.4	97.3	6.7	9.1	8.2	17.7
Delaware	113	69	966 ^e	282	98.3	100.0	11.5	98.6	8.8	8.7	12.8	34.0
District of Columbia	169	218	2,907	1,434	99.4	100.0	42.1	99.2	3.6	2.8	5.7	13.5 ^f
Florida	FL was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Georgia	1,191	717	15,539	6,884	99.5	100.0	14.0	82.7	6.6	9.2	12.0	30.2 ^f
Hawaii	224	77	2,910	493	95.7	100.0	34.1	98.4	11.6	2.6	7.3	15.4
Idaho	ID was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Illinois	955	1,455	18,047	3,595	99.9	100.0	16.7	99.2	11.7	12.1	19.8	31.9
Indiana	806	2,035	10,145	2,719	100.0	100.0	18.2	99.6	10.0	6.8	14.4	28.9
Iowa	598	1,349	11,787	1,958	99.7	100.0	21.5	14.7	7.5	11.3	10.5	21.9
Kansas	KS was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Kentucky	766	746	10,013	3,064	100.0	99.7	18.6	97.1	9.1	19.2	12.5	18.1
Louisiana	998	401 ^g	12,302	432 ^h	100.0	100.0	30.1	99.1	9.3	5.5	6.0	39.6 ⁱ
Maine	ME was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Maryland	436	521	11,285	2,630	100.0	100.0	23.3	99.8	6.4	7.9	9.8	13.1
Massachusetts	MA was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Michigan	1,595	1,090	37,705	11,518	97.9	99.7	48.0	50.9	10.0	14.2	10.2	28.7
Minnesota	699	1,461	17,416	2,949	99.9	100.0	29.9	99.3	10.3	16.2	11.4	28.8
Mississippi	658	527	7,373 ^e	1,726	99.7	99.6	21.4	98.9	13.4	20.9	13.2	33.5
Missouri	535	1,086	25,840	5,071	94.2	99.9	81.5	95.5	13.6	7.7	13.2	29.4
Montana	368	248	3,575	706	100.0	100.0	19.8	98.9	10.1	21.8	11.7	14.2
Nebraska	NE was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Nevada	397	241	3,005	1,042	100.0	100.0	12.7	99.1	16.1 ^d	11.6	16.9	33.4
New Hampshire	NH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
New Jersey	NJ was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
New Mexico	NM was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
New York	1,810	3,180	34,407	9,539	99.9	98.2	13.4	66.3	13.1	11.0	9.1	16.3
North Carolina	877	1,821	31,139	4,429	100.0	99.9	29.6	99.8	11.4	6.6	10.1	20.1

Table 8. Organizational Provider Entity Issues in MAXPC 2011

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
North Dakota	ND was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Ohio	OH was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Oklahoma	879	884	7,676	2,151	99.8	99.8	14.3	99.4	8.2	6.6	12.1	30.2
Oregon	303	328	3,785	1,469	99.3	99.4	9.5	98.7	20.1	16.8	13.8	16.9
Pennsylvania	844	1,935	14,342	7,145	99.9	100.0	15.9	96.9	9.2	10.7	11.2	15.6
Rhode Island	RI was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
South Carolina	252	233	692 ^e	484	6.1	100.0	3.6	1.8	10.7	15.5 ^j	7.7	7.6
South Dakota	358	311	4,605	618	100.0	100.0	31.1	99.2	7.8	25.1	9.9	18.1
Tennessee	1,680	933	19,707	16,189	99.2	99.9	34.5	99.9	19.0	31.9	8.1	63.1
Texas	742	1,903	17,806	9,004	98.8	99.9	20.5	99.1	8.9	4.3	11.4	30.2
Utah	UT was not included in MAXPC 2011 because the corresponding MSIS files were unavailable or contained significant data problems at the production cut-off date.											
Vermont	187	137	786	485	100.0	100.0	4.8	99.2	8.0	5.8	6.9	15.1
Virginia	1,347	384	14,708	1,804	99.9	100.0	19.1	99.4	9.7	13.5	10.5	21.2
Washington	529	529	9,600	2,534	100.0	100.0	14.1	99.5	13.6	17.0	14.1	22.3
West Virginia	400	471	5,305	1,506	100.0	100.0	16.6	99.7	7.0	6.4	10.4	14.9
Wisconsin	468	407	10,314	1,381	100.0	100.0	34.4	99.4	9.4	11.3	13.8	32.2
Wyoming	239	148	1,432	186	100.0	100.0	7.6	3.5	11.7	20.3	8.2	10.2

NOTE: The following states were processed without the full complement of seven quarters of data typically used when processing MAX files. Records excluded are IP, LT, OT, and RX claims with service dates in 2011 that were adjudicated in FFY2012 Q4: District of Columbia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, New York, and West Virginia. The following states were also processed without the full complement of data. Along with the excluded records described above, we excluded similar records that were adjudicated in FFY 2012 Q3: Illinois, Minnesota, Texas, and Vermont.

^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 IP provider IDs that are subparts increased more than 30 percent in AK and NV in 2011.

^e The number of OT servicing provider IDs with entity type of organization increased more than 30 percent in DE, MS, and SC in 2011.

^f The percentage of organizational RX provider IDs that are subparts increased more than 30 percent in DC and GA in 2011.

^g The number of LT provider IDs with entity type of organization decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^h The number of RX billing provider IDs with entity type of organization decreased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

ⁱ The percentage of organizational RX provider IDs that are subparts increased more than 30 percent in LA in 2011.

^j The percentage of organizational LT provider IDs that are subparts increased more than 30 percent in SC in 2011.

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