

# Office of Medicaid BOARD OF HEARINGS

**Appellant Name and Address:**



<b>Appeal Decision:</b>	Denied	<b>Appeal Number:</b>	2206033
<b>Decision Date:</b>	9/20/2022	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	09/14/2022
<b>Hearing Officer:</b>	Thomas J. Goode		

**Appearance for Appellant:**  
Mother

**Appearance for MassHealth:**  
Dr. Harold Kaplan, DMD



*The Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Executive Office of Health and Human Services  
Office of Medicaid  
Board of Hearings  
100 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02171*

# APPEAL DECISION

<b>Appeal Decision:</b>	Denied	<b>Issue:</b>	Orthodontics
<b>Decision Date:</b>	9/20/2022	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	09/14/2022
<b>MassHealth's Rep.:</b>	Dr. Harold Kaplan	<b>Appellant's Rep.:</b>	Mother
<b>Hearing Location:</b>	Remote		

## Authority

This hearing was conducted pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 118E, Chapter 30A, and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

## Jurisdiction

Through a notice dated August 8, 2022, MassHealth denied Appellant's request for prior authorization of comprehensive orthodontic treatment (130 CMR 420.431 and Exhibit 1). Appellant filed this appeal in a timely manner on August 11, 2022 (130 CMR 610.015; Exhibit 2). Denial of a request for prior authorization is valid grounds for appeal (130 CMR 610.032).

## Action Taken by MassHealth

MassHealth denied Appellant's request for prior authorization for comprehensive orthodontic treatment.

## Issue

The appeal issue is whether MassHealth was correct, pursuant to 130 CMR 420.431, in denying Appellant's prior authorization request for comprehensive orthodontic services.

## Summary of Evidence

MassHealth was represented at hearing by Dr. Harold Kaplan an orthodontic consultant from DentaQuest, which is the MassHealth dental contractor. Dr. Kaplan testified that he is a licensed orthodontist with many years of clinical experience. On August 4, 2022, Appellant's orthodontic provider submitted a prior authorization request for comprehensive orthodontic treatment with

X-rays and photographs. Appellant's orthodontic provider completed the Handicapping Labio-Lingual Deviations (HLD) Form which requires a total score of 22 or higher for approval and recorded a score of 6 points (Exhibit 1, p. 12). Appellant's orthodontic provider's HLD Form does not record any autoqualifiers and excludes a medical necessity narrative (*Id.*, p. 13). Dr. Kaplan testified that a DentaQuest reviewing orthodontist completed HLD measurements based on photographs and X-rays and arrived at a score of 9 points. Dr. Kaplan testified that he carefully reviewed and measured the photographs and X-rays and calculated a score of 10 points. Dr. Kaplan added that photographs show that Appellant's teeth are in good alignment with no crowding or other conditions evident. As the HLD scoring submitted by Appellant's orthodontist, DentaQuest and Dr. Kaplan agree that there are fewer than 22 points, the prior authorization request was denied.

Appellant was represented by her mother who stated that she feels Appellant needs braces because she has an overbite and a gap in her rear teeth. She added that Appellant's dentist referred her for orthodontics but told her the prior authorization request would probably be denied. Appellant's mother stated that Appellant's brother was approved for braces, and she feels Appellant's case should not be reviewed based on HLD scoring.

## **Findings of Fact**

Based on a preponderance of the evidence, I find the following:

1. On August 4, 2022, Appellant's orthodontic provider submitted a prior authorization request for comprehensive orthodontic treatment with X-rays and photographs.
2. Appellant's orthodontic provider completed the Handicapping Labio-Lingual Deviations (HLD) Form which requires a total score of 22 or higher for approval and recorded a score of 6 points
3. Appellant's orthodontic provider's HLD Form does not record any autoqualifiers and excludes a medical necessity narrative.
4. A DentaQuest reviewing orthodontist and Dr. Kaplan completed the HLD measurements based on photographs and X-rays and arrived at scores of 9 points and 10 points, respectively.

## **Analysis and Conclusions of Law**

Regulation 130 CMR 420.431(C)(3) states in relevant part:

The MassHealth agency pays for comprehensive orthodontic treatment only once per member under age 21 per lifetime and only when the member has a handicapping malocclusion. The MassHealth agency determines whether a malocclusion is handicapping based on the clinical standards described in Appendix D of the *Dental Manual*.

Appendix D of the *Dental Manual* is the “Handicapping Labio-Lingual Deviations Form” (HLD), which is described as a quantitative, objective method for measuring malocclusion. The HLD index provides a single score, based on a series of measurements that represent the degree to which a case deviates from normal alignment and occlusion. MassHealth has determined that a score of 22 or higher signifies a handicapping malocclusion. Appellant’s orthodontic provider’s HLD Form does not indicate any autoqualifiers or medical necessity narrative submitted with the request and records a HLD score of 6 points. A DentaQuest reviewing orthodontist and Dr. Kaplan scored 9 and 10 points respectively on the HLD Form. As Appellant’s HLD score is below the required 22 points and no other conditions warranting approval have been identified, the appeal must be DENIED.

## **Order for MassHealth**

None.

## **Notification of Your Right to Appeal to Court**

If you disagree with this decision, you have the right to appeal to Court in accordance with Chapter 30A of the Massachusetts General Laws. To appeal, you must file a complaint with the Superior Court for the county where you reside, or Suffolk County Superior Court, within 30 days of your receipt of this decision.

---

Thomas J. Goode  
Hearing Officer  
Board of Hearings

cc: MassHealth Representative: DentaQuest 1, MA