

Office of Medicaid BOARD OF HEARINGS

Appellant Name and Address:



Appeal Decision:	Denied	Appeal Number:	2412396
Decision Date:	10/29/2024	Hearing Date:	09/18/2024
Hearing Officer:	Emily Sabo		

Appearances for Appellant:



Appearance for MassHealth:

Dr. Harold Kaplan, DentaQuest



*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:	Dental Services; Comprehensive Orthodontic Treatment
Decision Date:	10/29/2024	Hearing Date:	09/18/2024
MassHealth's Rep.:	Dr. Harold Kaplan	Appellant's Reps.:	Pro se & Father
Hearing Location:	Quincy Harbor South 1	Aid Pending:	No

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 16, 2024, MassHealth denied the Appellant's request for prior authorization for comprehensive orthodontic treatment (see 130 CMR 420.431 and Exhibit 5). The Appellant filed this appeal in a timely manner on August 7, 2024 (see 130 CMR 610.015(B) and Exhibit 2). Denial of assistance is valid grounds for appeal (see 130 CMR 610.032).

Action Taken by MassHealth

MassHealth denied the Appellant's request for coverage of comprehensive orthodontic treatment.

Issue

The appeal issue is whether MassHealth was correct, pursuant to 130 CMR 420.431, in determining that the Appellant does not meet the MassHealth requirements for coverage of comprehensive orthodontic treatment.

Summary of Evidence

The Appellant is a minor and she and her father appeared at the hearing and verified the Appellant's identity. On June 28, 2024, the Appellant's orthodontist submitted a request for prior authorization for orthodontic treatment on behalf of the Appellant. As part of this request, the Appellant's orthodontist completed an Orthodontics Prior Authorization form and a MassHealth Handicapping Labio-Lingual Deviations (HLD) form, and submitted these, along with photographs and x-rays of the Appellant's mouth. Exhibit 5.

At the hearing, MassHealth was represented by an orthodontist consultant with DentaQuest, the contracted agent of MassHealth that makes dental prior authorization determinations. The MassHealth representative testified that MassHealth only covers the cost of orthodontic treatment if there is a severe problem (a handicapping malocclusion). To determine whether there is a handicapping malocclusion, an HLD form is completed by both the orthodontic provider and MassHealth. The HLD form lists 13 auto qualifiers and 9 characteristics with corresponding numerical values. The MassHealth representative testified that for MassHealth to authorize payment for orthodontic treatment, MassHealth would need to find that an individual has an HLD score of at least 22 points or an auto qualifying condition.

The Appellant's provider calculated an HLD score of 16 and did not indicate that the Appellant had any auto qualifying conditions. *Id.* at 10. The Appellant's provider also submitted a letter stating that the Appellant "is a patient of record and is in need of orthodontic treatment. The patient's restorative care has been completed. The patient's level of cooperation and the patient's oral hygiene are acceptable. . . MEDICAL NECESSITY Family is concerned about severe L crowding." *Id.* at 8. The Appellant's provider did not include other evidence or supporting documentation of medical necessity. *Id.* at 11.

Prior to the hearing, DentaQuest calculated that the Appellant had an HLD score of 15 and no auto qualifying conditions. *Id.* at 5. At the hearing, the MassHealth representative examined the Appellant's teeth and testified that he calculated an HLD score of 15 points, based on 2 points for overjet, 5 points for overbite, 5 points for anterior crowding in the lower arch, and 3 points for labio-lingual spread. The MassHealth representative testified that he found no auto qualifying conditions and would deny payment for treatment.

The Appellant's father testified that the Appellant had problems with her baby teeth. The Appellant's father testified that he had also had problems with his own teeth and experienced pain and did not want his daughter to have that experience. The Appellant's father testified that his daughter's health is extremely important to him and that in his family they follow the recommendations of healthcare professionals and he would follow the doctor's recommendation that the Appellant needed comprehensive orthodontic treatment. The Appellant's father suggested that MassHealth partially pay for orthodontic treatment depending on the percentage of how much MassHealth found a handicapping malocclusion on the HLD scale—for example, a score of 15 out of 22 points, would mean that MassHealth would pay 68.18% of the cost of the

treatment.

Findings of Fact

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

1. The Appellant's orthodontic provider submitted a request for comprehensive orthodontic treatment on behalf of the Appellant (Testimony; Exhibit 5).
2. The Appellant's orthodontic provider completed an Orthodontic Prior Authorization form and an HLD form and submitted these to DentaQuest, along with photographs and x-rays of the Appellant's mouth (Exhibit 5).
3. The Appellant's orthodontic provider indicated that the Appellant had no auto qualifying conditions and an HLD score of 16 (Exhibit 5 at 10).
4. DentaQuest calculated an HLD score of 15 points and no auto qualifying conditions (Exhibit 5 at 7).
5. Based on his examination of the Appellant at hearing, the MassHealth representative calculated an HLD score of 15 points and no auto qualifying conditions (Testimony).
6. An HLD score of 22 is the minimum score indicative of a handicapping malocclusion (Testimony).
7. The Appellant's orthodontic provider checked that he was submitting a medical necessity narrative, but did not provide any explanation for why treatment was medically necessary beyond "Family is concerned about severe L crowding" (Exhibit 5 at 8, 11).

Analysis and Conclusions of Law

As a rule, MassHealth and its dental program pays only for medically necessary services to eligible MassHealth members and may require that such medical necessity be established through a prior authorization process. See 130 CMR 420.410; 130 CMR 450.204. The MassHealth regulations at 130 CMR 420.410(A)(3) state:

The provider must not start a service that requires prior authorization until the provider has requested and received written prior authorization from the MassHealth agency. The MassHealth agency may grant prior authorization after a procedure has begun if, in the judgment of the MassHealth agency

- (a) the treatment was medically necessary;
- (b) the provider discovers the need for additional services while the member is in the office and undergoing a procedure; and
- (c) it would not be clinically appropriate to delay the provision of the service.

130 CMR 420.410(A)(3).

In addition to complying with the prior authorization requirements at 130 CMR 420.410 et seq, covered services for certain dental treatments, including orthodontia, are subject to the relevant limitations of 130 CMR 420.421 through 130 CMR 420.456. The MassHealth regulations at 130 CMR 420.431 provide service descriptions and limitations for orthodontic services. As relevant to comprehensive orthodontic requests, the regulation provides:

420.431: Service Descriptions and Limitations: Orthodontic Services

(A) General Conditions. The MassHealth agency pays for orthodontic treatment, subject to prior authorization, service descriptions and limitations as described in 130 CMR 420.431. The provider must seek prior authorization for orthodontic treatment and begin initial placement and insertion of orthodontic appliances and partial banding or full banding and brackets prior to the member's 21st birthday.

(B) Definitions.

- (1) Pre-orthodontic Treatment Examination. Includes the periodic observation of the member's dentition at intervals established by the orthodontist to determine when orthodontic treatment should begin.
- (2) Interceptive Orthodontic Treatment. Includes treatment of the primary and transitional dentition to prevent or minimize the development of a handicapping malocclusion and therefore, minimize or preclude the need for comprehensive orthodontic treatment.
- (3) Comprehensive Orthodontic Treatment. Includes a coordinated diagnosis and treatment leading to the improvement of a member's craniofacial dysfunction and/or dentofacial deformity which may include anatomical and/or functional relationship. Treatment may utilize fixed and/or removable orthodontic appliances and may also include functional and/or orthopedic appliances. Comprehensive orthodontics may incorporate treatment phases, including adjunctive procedures to facilitate care focusing on specific objectives at various stages of dentofacial development.
- (4) Orthodontic Treatment Visits. Periodic visits which may include, but are not limited to, updating wiring, tightening ligatures or otherwise evaluating and updating care while undergoing comprehensive orthodontic treatment.

(C) Service Limitations and Requirements.

...

(3) Comprehensive Orthodontics. 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. Upon the completion of orthodontic treatment, the provider must take post treatment photographic prints and maintain them in the member's dental record. The MassHealth agency pays for the office visit, radiographs and a record fee of the pre-orthodontic treatment examination (alternative billing to a contract fee) when the MassHealth agency denies a request for prior authorization for comprehensive orthodontic treatment or when the member terminates the planned treatment. The payment for a pre-orthodontic treatment consultation as a separate procedure does not include models or photographic prints. The MassHealth agency may request additional consultation for any orthodontic procedure. Payment for comprehensive orthodontic treatment is inclusive of initial placement, and insertion of the orthodontic fixed and removable appliances (for example: rapid palatal expansion (RPE) or head gear), and records. Comprehensive orthodontic treatment may occur in phases, with the anticipation that full banding must occur during the treatment period. The payment for comprehensive orthodontic treatment covers a maximum period of three calendar years. The MassHealth agency pays for orthodontic treatment as long as the member remains eligible for MassHealth, if initial placement and insertion of fixed or removable orthodontic appliances begins before the member reaches 21 years of age. Comprehensive orthodontic care should commence when the first premolars and first permanent molars have erupted. It should only include the transitional dentition in cases with craniofacial anomalies such as cleft lip or cleft palate. Comprehensive treatment may commence with second deciduous molars present. Subject to prior authorization, the MassHealth agency will pay for more than one comprehensive orthodontic treatment for members with cleft lip, cleft palate, cleft lip and palate, and other craniofacial anomalies to the extent treatment cannot be completed within three years.

130 CMR 420.431(A); (B); (C)(3).

Appendix D of the Dental Manual contains the authorization form for comprehensive orthodontic treatment.¹ As indicated by the paper record, MassHealth testimony, and the relevant regulations, appendices and manuals (including the HLD Authorization form), MassHealth approves comprehensive orthodontic treatment only when the member meets one of the three following requirements:

¹ Appendix D of the Dental Manual is available at <https://www.mass.gov/doc/appendix-d-authorization-form-for-comprehensive-orthodontic-treatment-0/download>.

1. the member has an auto qualifying condition as described by MassHealth in the HLD index;²
2. the member meets or exceeds the threshold score (currently 22 points) listed by MassHealth on the HLD index;³ or
3. comprehensive orthodontic treatment is medically necessary for the member, as demonstrated by a medical necessity narrative letter and supporting documentation submitted by the requesting provider.⁴ Usually this involves a severe medical condition that can include atypical or underlying health concerns, which may be either dental or non-dental.

The instructions for the medical necessity narrative state

Instructions for Medical Necessity Narrative and Supporting Documentation (if applicable)

Providers may establish that comprehensive orthodontic treatment is medically necessary by submitting a medical necessity narrative and supporting documentation, where applicable. The narrative must establish that comprehensive orthodontic treatment is medically necessary to treat a handicapping malocclusion, including to correct or significantly ameliorate

- i. a severe skeletal deviation affecting the patient's mouth and/or underlying dentofacial structures;
- ii. a diagnosed mental, emotional, or behavioral condition caused by the patient's malocclusion;
- iii. a diagnosed nutritional deficiency and/or a substantiated inability to eat or chew caused by the patient's malocclusion;
- iv. a diagnosed speech or language pathology caused by the patient's malocclusion; or
- v. a diagnosed condition caused by the overall severity of the patient's malocclusion.

Providers may submit a medical necessity narrative (along with the required completed HLD) in any case where, in the professional judgment of the requesting provider and any other involved clinician(s), comprehensive orthodontic treatment is medically necessary to treat a handicapping malocclusion. Providers must submit this narrative in cases where the patient does not have an autoqualifying condition or meet the threshold score on the HLD, but where, in the professional judgment of the requesting provider and any other involved clinician(s), comprehensive orthodontic treatment is medically necessary to treat a handicapping malocclusion.

² Found on page D-5 of Appendix D of the Dental Manual.

³ Found on page D-6 of Appendix D of the Dental Manual.

⁴ Found on page D-3 of Appendix D of the Dental Manual.

The medical necessity narrative must clearly demonstrate why comprehensive orthodontic treatment is medically necessary for the patient. If any part of the requesting provider's justification of medical necessity involves a mental, emotional, or behavioral condition; a nutritional deficiency; a speech or language pathology; or the presence of any other condition that would typically require the diagnosis, opinion, or expertise of a licensed clinician other than the requesting provider, then the narrative and any attached documentation must

- i. clearly identify the appropriately qualified and licensed clinician(s) who furnished the diagnosis or opinion substantiating the condition or pathology (e.g., general dentist, oral surgeon, physician, clinical psychologist, clinical dietitian, speech therapist);
- ii. describe the nature and extent of the identified clinician(s) involvement and interaction with the patient, including dates of treatment;
- iii. state the specific diagnosis or other opinion of the patient's condition furnished by the identified clinician(s);
- iv. document the recommendation by the clinician(s) to seek orthodontic evaluation or treatment (if such a recommendation was made);
- v. discuss any treatments for the patient's condition (other than comprehensive orthodontic treatment) considered or attempted by the clinician(s); and
- vi. provide any other relevant information from the clinician(s) that supports the requesting provider's justification of the medical necessity of comprehensive orthodontic treatment.

Dental Manual, D-3.

None of the three reviewing dentists, including the Appellant's own orthodontist, found that the Appellant had an auto qualifying condition. None of the three reviewing dentists, including the Appellant's own orthodontist, found that the Appellant had a score of 22 or more points that is needed for approval on the HLD scale. The Appellant's orthodontic provider checked that he was submitting a medical necessity narrative, but did not provide any explanation for why treatment was medically necessary beyond "Family is concerned about severe L crowding." Exhibit 5 at 8. This does not follow the Dental Manual's instructions to establish medical necessity. Dental Manual at D-3. Accordingly, the Appellant has not demonstrated that she has a handicapping malocclusion, such that orthodontic treatment is medically necessary. Therefore, MassHealth was correct in denying the request, pursuant to 130 CMR 420.431. This appeal is denied.⁵

I credit and respect the Appellant's father's concern for the well-being of his child. To the extent that his testimony and arguments are a challenge to the legality of the MassHealth regulations, in accordance with 130 CMR 610.082(C)(2), as the hearing officer, I

⁵ This denial does not preclude the Appellant or the Appellant's orthodontist from submitting a new prior authorization request to MassHealth every six months upon re-examination, until the Appellant reaches the age of 21.

must not render a decision regarding the legality of federal or state law including, but not limited to, the MassHealth regulations. If the legality of such law or regulations is raised by the appellant, the hearing officer must render a decision based on the applicable law or regulation as interpreted by the MassHealth agency. Such decision must include a statement that the hearing officer cannot rule on the legality of such law or regulation and must be subject to judicial review in accordance with 130 CMR 610.092.

130 CMR 610.082(C)(2).

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.

Emily Sabo
Hearing Officer
Board of Hearings

MassHealth Representative: DentaQuest 1, MA