


# Office of Medicaid BOARD OF HEARINGS

**Appellant Name and Address:**



<b>Appeal Decision:</b>	Denied	<b>Appeal Number:</b>	2406144
<b>Decision Date:</b>	5/30/2024	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	05/20/2024
<b>Hearing Officer:</b>	Marc Tonaszuck		

**Appearance for Appellant:**

 Mother of Minor Appellant (In-person)

**Appearance for MassHealth:**

Dr. Harold Kaplan, DentaQuest (Virtually)



*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>	Orthodontic Services
<b>Decision Date:</b>	5/30/2024	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	05/20/2024
<b>MassHealth's Rep.:</b>	Dr. Harold Kaplan, DentaQuest	<b>Appellant's Rep.:</b>	Mother
<b>Hearing Location:</b>	Springfield MassHealth Enrollment Center	<b>Aid Pending:</b>	No

### Authority

This hearing was conducted pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapters 119E and 30A, and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

### Jurisdiction

Through a notice dated 03/20/2024, MassHealth informed the appellant that it denied a request for prior authorization of comprehensive orthodontic treatment (Exhibit 1). A timely appeal was filed on the appellant's behalf on 04/16/2024<sup>1</sup> (130 CMR 610.015(B); Exhibit 2). Denial of a request for prior approval is a valid basis for appeal (130 CMR 610.032).

### Action Taken by MassHealth

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

### Issue

Did MassHealth correctly deny the appellant's prior authorization request for comprehensive orthodontic treatment to pursuant to 130 CMR 420.431(C)?

---

<sup>1</sup> The appellant is a minor child who was represented in these proceedings by her mother.

## Summary of Evidence

Dr. Harold Kaplan, the MassHealth orthodontic consultant, is a licensed orthodontist from DentaQuest, who appeared virtually at the fair hearing. The appellant, a minor child, did not appear at the fair hearing. She was represented in this matter by her mother. Exhibits 1-4 were admitted into the hearing record.

Dr. Kaplan testified for MassHealth that the appellant's provider, [REDACTED], requested prior authorization for comprehensive orthodontic treatment on behalf of the appellant, who is under [REDACTED] years of age. He stated that MassHealth only provides coverage for comprehensive orthodontic treatment when there is a severe and handicapping malocclusion. The appellant's request was considered after reviewing the oral photographs and written information submitted by the appellant's orthodontic provider. This information was applied to a standardized Handicapping Labio-Lingual Deviations (HLD) Index that is used to make an objective determination of whether the appellant has a severe and handicapping malocclusion. The representative testified that the HLD Index uses objective measurements taken from the subject's teeth to generate an overall numeric score. A severe and handicapping malocclusion typically reflects a minimum score of 22. MassHealth submitted into evidence: HLD MassHealth Form; the HLD Index; PA packet; photos; and X-rays (Exhibit 4).

MassHealth testified that according to the prior authorization request, the appellant's orthodontic provider reported that the appellant had an HLD score of 6 points, which did not reach the minimum score of 22 required for MassHealth payment of the orthodonture. The appellant's treating orthodontist identified neither an auto-qualifying situation indicated on the HLD Index form, nor did he provide additional "medical necessity" documentation with the request.

MassHealth/DentaQuest received the PA request with attachments on 03/15/2024 and it was reviewed by an orthodontist. The DentaQuest orthodontist agreed with the appellant's treating orthodontist that the appellant did not have a demonstrated severe or handicapping malocclusion. The request was denied by DentaQuest on 03/20/2024.

At the fair hearing, Dr. Kaplan testified that he reviewed the appellant's materials that were provided to MassHealth with the prior authorization request from the orthodontist. The DentaQuest orthodontist testified that his review confirmed the provider's conclusion that the appellant's HLD score did not reach the score of 22 necessary for a determination of a severe and handicapping malocclusion. He also testified that there was no information provided to show that a different result is warranted. As a result, he upheld MassHealth's/DentaQuest's denial of the request for comprehensive orthodontic services.

The appellant's mother appeared in person at the fair hearing. She testified that the appellant "has

a hard time at school due to her teeth. She needs an expander and braces. She is made fun of at school.” The mother stated the appellant “covers her mouth,” and is “picked on a lot.” The mother testified that “braces will help her out and give her confidence.”

## Findings of Fact

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

1. The appellant is under [REDACTED] years of age.
2. On 03/15/2024, the appellant’s orthodontic provider, [REDACTED] requested prior authorization for comprehensive orthodontic treatment (full braces).
3. MassHealth provides coverage for comprehensive orthodontic treatment only when there is a severe and handicapping malocclusion.
4. As one determinant of a severe and handicapping malocclusion, MassHealth employs a system of comparative measurements known as the HLD Index score.
5. A HLD Index score of 22 or higher denotes a severe and handicapping malocclusion.
6. The appellant’s orthodontic provider, selected by the appellant, calculated an HLD score of 6 points, based on measurements he took of the appellant’s malocclusion.
7. The appellant’s orthodontic provider did not allege that the appellant had an automatic qualifying condition, nor did he attach a medical necessity narrative to the prior authorization request.
8. DentaQuest reviewed the treating orthodontist’s submission and agreed with him that the appellant’s malocclusion did not meet MassHealth’s requirements for payment for the comprehensive orthodontic treatment.
9. DentaQuest, on behalf of MassHealth, denied the appellant’s request for comprehensive orthodontic treatment on 03/20/2024.
10. A timely appeal of MassHealth’s determination was submitted to the Board of Hearings on 04/16/2024.
11. A fair hearing took place before the Board of Hearings on 05/20/2024.
12. The appellant’s mother appeared in person at the fair hearing. The appellant did not appear.

13. MassHealth's representative at the fair hearing is an orthodontist employed by DentaQuest, MassHealth's dental contractor. He appeared virtually.
14. Using measurements taken from the appellant's oral photographs, X-rays, and other submitted materials, the MassHealth representative, a licensed orthodontist, determined that the appellant did not have a an HLD score of 22 or above or an automatic qualifying condition.
15. There was no other documentation of medical necessity for the comprehensive orthodontic treatment provided to MassHealth.
16. The DentaQuest orthodontist concluded that the appellant does not have a severe and handicapping malocclusion.

## Analysis and Conclusions of Law

The party appealing an administrative decision bears the burden of demonstrating the decision's invalidity (██████ v. *Board of Appeals of Motor Vehicle Liability Policies and Bonds*, 27 Mass. App. Ct. 470, 474 (1989)).

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

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

When requesting prior authorization for comprehensive orthodontic treatment, the provider submits, among other things, a completed HLD Index recording form which documents the results of applying the clinical standards described in Appendix D of the Dental Manual. In order for MassHealth to pay for orthodontic treatment, the appellant's malocclusion must be severe and handicapping as indicated by an automatic qualifier on the HLD index or a minimum HLD index score of 22. Alternatively, verification of medical necessity not addressed by the HLD Index can also qualify a child for comprehensive orthodonture.

All orthodontists who reviewed this submission, including the appellant's provider, agree that the appellant does not meet MassHealth's criteria for payment of comprehensive orthodontics. The appellant's treating orthodontist calculated an overall HLD Index score of 6 points, well below the threshold of 22 necessary for MassHealth payment. DentaQuest, when reviewing the submission, agreed with the appellant's provider. The MassHealth orthodontist at the fair

hearing testified that he agreed with the appellant's provider in that the HLD score did not reach or exceed a 22. In addition, he testified credibly that no other information was provided to show medical necessity.

The appellant's mother testified that the appellant has several issues involving her mental health; however, she did not cite any specific documented medical problems that the appellant experiences because of her malocclusion. Moreover, there was no medical necessity documentation that might show that comprehensive orthodontia would alleviate the appellant's conditions. Neither the appellant nor her orthodontist submitted orthodontic documentation to show that the appellant meets MassHealth's requirement that he have a severe, handicapping malocclusion. The appellant's provider, an orthodontist who was chosen by the appellant, indicated on the HLD Index form that the appellant's malocclusion does not meet the requirements of any of the automatic qualifiers, or meet the minimum HLD score of 22.

It is the burden of the appellant (or appeal representative) to show that there exists a medical necessity for the requested comprehensive orthodonture. None of the orthodontists who reviewed this case reached a determination that the appellant's malocclusion is severe or handicapping, pursuant to the relevant regulations. There is nothing in the hearing record to show that the appellant's current situation meets MassHealth criteria for payment of comprehensive orthodontics. 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.

---

Marc Tonaszuck  
Hearing Officer  
Board of Hearings

cc:  
MassHealth Representative: DentaQuest 1, MA