Office of Medicaid BOARD OF HEARINGS

Appellant Name and Address:



Appeal Decision: Denied **Appeal Number:** 2306048

Decision Date: 09/11/2023 **Hearing Date:** 08/22/2023

Hearing Officer: Alexandra Shube

Appearance for Appellant:

Pro se

Appearance for MassHealth:

Dr. Harold Kaplan



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

Appeal Decision: Denied Issue: Prior Authorization –

Orthodontics

Decision Date: 09/11/2023 **Hearing Date:** 08/22/2023

MassHealth's Rep.: Dr. Harold Kaplan Appellant's Rep.:

Pro se

Hearing Location: Tewksbury **Aid Pending:** No

MassHealth

Enrollment Center

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 July 13, 2023, MassHealth denied the appellant's request for prior authorization of comprehensive orthodontic treatment (see 130 CMR 420.431 and Exhibits 1 and 4). The appellant filed this appeal in a timely manner on July 21, 2023 (see 130 CMR 610.015(B) and Exhibit 2). Denial of a request for prior approval is a valid basis for appeal (see 130 CMR 610.032).

Action Taken by MassHealth

MassHealth denied the appellant's request for prior authorization of comprehensive orthodontic treatment.

Issue

The appeal issue is whether MassHealth was correct, pursuant to 130 CMR 420.431, in determining that the appellant is ineligible for comprehensive orthodontic treatment.

Page 1 of Appeal No.: 2306048

Summary of Evidence

The appellant is a minor MassHealth member who appeared at hearing with her mother. MassHealth was represented at hearing by Dr. Harold Kaplan, an orthodontic consultant from DentaQuest, the MassHealth dental contractor.

The appellant's provider submitted a prior authorization request for comprehensive orthodontic treatment, including photographs and x-rays, on July 12, 2023. As required, the provider completed the MassHealth Handicapping Labio-Lingual Deviations ("HLD") Form, which requires a total score of 22 or higher for approval or that the appellant has one of the conditions that warrant automatic approval of comprehensive orthodontic treatment. The provider indicated he found an impaction where eruption is impeded but extraction is not indicated (excluding third molars) and crowding of 10mm or more, in either the maxillary or mandibular arch (excluding third molars), both conditions that warrant automatic approval of comprehensive orthodontic treatment. As he found autoqualifying conditions, the provider did not score the remainder of the HLD Form.

When DentaQuest evaluated this prior authorization request on behalf of MassHealth, its orthodontists determined there was no impaction, crowding of 10mm or more, or any other autoqualifying condition. DentaQuest found that the appellant had an HLD score of 13. The DentaQuest HLD Form reflects the following scores:

Conditions Observed	Raw Score	Multiplier	Weighted Score
Overjet in mm	2	1	2
Overbite in mm	4	1	4
Mandibular Protrusion in	1	5	5
mm			
Open Bite in mm	0	4	0
Ectopic Eruption (# of	0	3	0
teeth, excluding third			
molars)			
Anterior Crowding	Maxilla: n/a	Flat score of 5	0
	Mandible: n/a	for each	
Labio-Lingual Spread, in	2	1	2
mm (anterior spacing)			
Posterior Unilateral	0	Flat score of 4	0
Crossbite			
Posterior Impactions or	0	3	0
congenitally missing			
posterior teeth (excluding			
3 rd molars)			
Total HLD Score			13

Page 2 of Appeal No.: 2306048

Because it found an HLD score below the threshold of 22 and no autoqualifying condition, MassHealth denied the appellant's prior authorization request on July 13, 2023.

At hearing, Dr. Kaplan completed an HLD form based on an in-person examination of the appellant and a review of the x-rays and photographs. He determined that the appellant's overall HLD score was 13, reflecting the same breakdown as DentaQuest. He also did not see any evidence of any autoqualifying conditions. He explained that an impaction means the teeth will not come into the mouth and it is currently too early to tell whether the appellant's teeth are impacted because the roots are not fully formed yet. MassHealth needs to see the condition in the mouth before approving treatment because it does not cover orthodontics preventively. Based on the x-rays, Dr. Kaplan believed it would be another three to four months before the roots were formed and one could tell whether the teeth are impacted or not. If they are not impacted, they will come into the mouth in the wrong position (an ectopic eruption), which would also give the appellant additional points in her HLD score.

Additionally, Dr. Kaplan explained that while the appellant has some crowding (about 6mm worth), she does not have 10mm or more of crowding. Therefore, the autoqualifying condition of crowding of 10mm or more, in either the maxillary or mandibular arch (excluding third molars), is not applicable.

The appellant's mother responded that the appellant had pre-braces to prevent the issue with the impacted teeth but it did not help. Her dentist told her the appellant needs braces as soon as possible. She wants to prevent the problem before it arises.

Dr. Kaplan advised the appellant that she may be re-examined every six months and has until the age of 21 to be treated. Because the appellant's HLD score is below 22 and there were no autoqualifiers present, the appellant does not have a handicapping malocclusion and MassHealth will not pay for comprehensive orthodontic treatment at this time. Dr. Kaplan explained that while the appellant's bite would be improved with braces, it is not severe enough for MassHealth to pay for it.

Findings of Fact

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

- 1. On July 12, 2023, the appellant's orthodontic provider submitted a prior authorization request for comprehensive orthodontic treatment to MassHealth (Exhibit 4).
- 2. The provider completed a Handicapping Labio-Lingual Deviations Form for the appellant and indicated he found an impaction where eruption is impeded but extraction is not indicated (excluding third molars) and crowding of 10mm or more, in either the maxillary or

Page 3 of Appeal No.: 2306048

- mandibular arch (excluding third molars), both conditions that warrant automatic approval of comprehensive orthodontic treatment. He did not calculate an HLD score. (Exhibit 4).
- 3. When DentaQuest evaluated the prior authorization request on behalf of MassHealth, its orthodontists determined that the appellant did not have an impaction, crowding of 10mm or more, or any other autoqualifying condition and calculated an HLD score of 13 (Exhibit 4).
- 4. MassHealth approves requests for comprehensive orthodontic treatment when the member has an HLD score of 22 or more or has one of the conditions that warrant automatic approval of comprehensive orthodontic treatment (Testimony).
- 5. On July 13, 2023, MassHealth notified the appellant that the prior authorization request had been denied (Exhibits 1 and 4).
- 6. On July 21, 2023, the appellant filed a timely appeal of the denial (Exhibit 2).
- 7. At hearing, a MassHealth orthodontic consultant examined the appellant in person and reviewed the provider's paperwork, photographs, and x-rays and found an HLD score of 13. He did not see any evidence of an impaction because it was too early to tell as the roots were not fully formed. He also did not see any evidence of crowding of 10mm or more or any other autoqualifying condition. (Testimony).
- 8. The appellant had crowding of about 6mm (Testimony).
- 9. The appellant's HLD score is below 22.
- 10. The appellant does not have any of the conditions that warrant automatic approval of comprehensive orthodontic treatment (cleft palate; impinging overbite with evidence of occlusal contact into the opposing soft tissue; impaction where eruption is impeded but extraction is not indicated (excluding third molars); severe traumatic deviation; overjet greater than 9 mm; reverse overjet greater than 3.5 mm; crowding of 10mm or more in either the maxillary or mandibular arch (excluding 3rd molars); spacing of 10mm or more in either the maxillary or mandibular arch (excluding 3rd molars); anterior crossbite of 3 or more maxillary teeth per arch; posterior crossbite of 3 or more maxillary teeth per arch; two or more congenitally missing teeth (excluding third molars) of at least one tooth per quadrant; lateral open bite 2mm or more of 4 or more teeth per arch; anterior open bite 2mm or more of 4 or more teeth per arch).

Page 4 of Appeal No.: 2306048

Analysis and Conclusions of Law

130 CMR 420.431(C)(3) states, in relevant part, as follows:

The MassHealth agency pays for comprehensive orthodontic treatment, subject to prior authorization, once per member per lifetime for a member younger than 21 years old and only when the member has a handicapping malocclusion. The MassHealth agency determines whether a malocclusion is handicapping based on clinical standards for medical necessity as described in Appendix D of the Dental Manual.

(Emphasis added).

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. MassHealth will also approve a prior authorization request, without regard for the HLD numerical score, if there is evidence of one of the following automatic qualifying conditions: cleft palate; impinging overbite with evidence of occlusal contact into the opposing soft tissue; impaction where eruption is impeded but extraction is not indicated (excluding third molars); severe traumatic deviation; overjet greater than 9 mm; reverse overjet greater than 3.5 mm; crowding of 10mm or more in either the maxillary or mandibular arch (excluding 3rd molars); spacing of 10mm or more in either the maxillary or mandibular arch (excluding 3rd molars); anterior crossbite of 3 or more maxillary teeth per arch; posterior crossbite of 3 or more maxillary teeth per arch; two or more congenitally missing teeth (excluding third molars) of at least one tooth per quadrant; lateral open bite 2mm or more of 4 or more teeth per arch; or anterior open bite 2mm or more of 4 or more teeth per arch.

The appellant's provider indicated he found autoqualifiers of impaction where eruption is impeded but extraction is not indicated (excluding third molars) and crowding of 10mm or more, in either the maxillary or mandibular arch (excluding third molars) and did not calculate an HLD score. After reviewing the provider's submission, MassHealth found an HLD score of 13 and no autoqualifiers. Upon review of the prior authorization documents and an examination of the appellant at hearing, Dr. Kaplan found an HLD score of 13 and no autoqualifiers.

Dr. Kaplan's measurements and testimony are credible and his determination of the overall HLD score and the lack of autoqualifiers is consistent with the evidence. As he explained, it is too soon to determine whether the teeth are impacted because the roots are not fully formed. Additionally, the appellant only has about 6mm of crowding, which does not meet the threshold for the

Page 5 of Appeal No.: 2306048

autoqualifier of 10mm or more of crowding.

All the appellant's HLD scores fall below the necessary 22 points. The appellant also does not have any of the conditions that warrant automatic approval of comprehensive orthodontic treatment.

As the appellant does not qualify for comprehensive orthodontic treatment under the HLD guidelines, MassHealth was correct in determining that she does not have a handicapping malocclusion. Accordingly, this appeal is 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.

Alexandra Shube Hearing Officer Board of Hearings

cc:

MassHealth Representative: DentaQuest 1, MA

Page 6 of Appeal No.: 2306048