

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL, REGULATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
55 FARMINGTON AVENUE  
HARTFORD, CT 06105-3730

[REDACTED] 2017  
Signature Confirmation

Client ID # [REDACTED]  
Request #807264

**NOTICE OF DECISION**  
**PARTY**

Re: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

On [REDACTED] 2016, Benecare Dental Plans ("Benecare") sent [REDACTED] (the "Appellant") a Notice of Action ("NOA") stating that it had denied a request for prior authorization of orthodontia for her minor child, [REDACTED], because orthodontia was not medically necessary.

On [REDACTED] 2017, the Appellant requested an administrative hearing to contest the Department's denial of prior authorization of orthodontia.

On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2017, the Office of Legal Counsel, Regulations, and Administrative Hearings ("OLCRAH") issued a notice scheduling the administrative hearing for [REDACTED] 2017.

On [REDACTED] 2017, in accordance with sections 17b-60, 17b-61 and 4-176e to 4-189, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes, OLCRAH held an administrative hearing.

The following individuals were present at the hearing:

[REDACTED], Appellant  
Magdalena Carter, Dental Plans, Department representative  
Dr. Stanley Wolf, Clinical Consultant for Benecare via telephone  
Miklos Mencseli, Hearing Officer

At the Appellant's and CTDHP's request the hearing officer held the record open for the submission of additional evidence and for the evidence to be reviewed. On [REDACTED] 2017 the hearing officer closed the hearing record.

## **STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE**

The issue is whether Benecare's denial of prior authorization through the Medicaid program for the Appellant's child's orthodontic services is correct because such services are not medically necessary.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. [REDACTED] is an 11 year old participant in the Medicaid program, as administered by the Department of Social Services through Benecare, its contractor.
2. [REDACTED] is the Appellant's treating orthodontist ("treating orthodontist"). (Dept. Ex. 1A)
3. On [REDACTED] 2016, the treating orthodontist completed diagnostic casts of [REDACTED] teeth. (Dept. Ex. 2A)
4. The treating orthodontist completed a *Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record*, scoring [REDACTED] teeth to be 28 points. (Dept. Ex. 2A)
5. The treating orthodontist commented on the assessment record; "Patient has 11mm over jet with deep bite, thank you." (Dept. Ex. 2A)
6. On [REDACTED] 2016, the treating orthodontist requested prior authorization to complete orthodontic services for [REDACTED] (Summary)
7. On [REDACTED] 2016, Dr. Geoffrey Drawbridge, Benecare's orthodontic dental consultant, independently reviewed [REDACTED] models and arrived at a score of 20 points on a completed *Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record*. (Dept. Ex. 3)
8. Dr. Drawbridge found no evidence of severe irregular placement of her teeth within the dental arches and no irregular growth or development of the jaw bones. There was no evidence presented of emotional issues related to [REDACTED] mouth. (Summary)
9. Dr. Drawbridge commented; "Overjet number eight, less than 9mm." (Dept. Ex. 3)
10. On [REDACTED] 2016, Benecare denied the treating orthodontist's request for prior authorization for orthodontic services for the reason that the scoring of [REDACTED] mouth was less than the 26 points needed for coverage and because the other requirements for medical necessity

were not met. (Dept. Ex. 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D)

11. On [REDACTED] 2017, the Appellant filed a request for an administrative hearing. (Dept. Ex. 5A, 5B)
12. On [REDACTED] 2017, Dr. Vincent Fazzino, the dental consultant for CTDHP, reviewed [REDACTED] models and arrived at a score of 22 points on a completed *Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record*. (Dept. Ex. 6)
13. Dr. Fazzino found no evidence of severe irregular placement of her teeth within the dental arches and no irregular growth or development of the jaw bones. There was no evidence presented of emotional issues directly related to [REDACTED] dental situation. (Summary)
14. Dr. Fazzino commented; "As per submitted models they do not show 11mm of over jet." (Dept. Ex. 6)
15. On [REDACTED] 2017, Benecare notified the Appellant that orthodontic treatment was denied as the score of 22 points was less than the 26 points needed to be covered. There was no presence found of any deviations affecting the mouth or underlying structures. There was no evidence presented of any treatment by a licensed psychiatrist or psychologist related to the condition of your teeth. (Dept. Ex. 7A, 7B)
16. At the hearing the Appellant provided a letter from [REDACTED]. The letter is from [REDACTED] therapists. The letter states; "[REDACTED] has been seen at [REDACTED] since [REDACTED] 2015 for weekly individual sessions with this clinician. [REDACTED] has a diagnosis with: Major Depressive Disorder, Recurrent Episode and Generalized Anxiety Disorder. Treatment has been focused on reducing depressive and anxiety symptoms, improving self esteem and peer interpersonal relationships and well as improving attendance. [REDACTED] performs well at school achieving Honor Roll, however, her anxiety and depression negative impact her self view and ability to interact at school. [REDACTED] self esteem and self confidence would be greatly boosted should she be approved for braces. [REDACTED] has been unable to participate in many recreational activity due to severe financial constraints permitting the family only necessities- therefore pay out of pocket for orthodontics would be impossible. She is eager to have her teeth cared for by dental profession committed to improving her self esteem as well." (Exhibit 9: letter dated [REDACTED]-17 from [REDACTED] LMSW)
17. Also provided at the hearing were photos of [REDACTED] teeth taken by the Appellant. (Exhibit 10)

18. On [REDACTED] 2017, Dr. Geoffrey Drawbridge, the dental consultant for CTDHP, reviewed the letter dated [REDACTED]-17 and the attached photos of [REDACTED] teeth. Dr. Drawbridge commented; "The Guidelines for Scoring of Orthodontic Cases specifically states score for scores under 26 points that approval may be appropriate if a letter from a licensed psychiatrist or psychologist is submitted stating that an ongoing emotional problem is caused by the patient's dental esthetics. The evaluation must clearly and substantially document how the dentofacial deformity is related to the child's mental, emotional and/or behavioral problems and that orthodontic treatment will significantly ameliorate the problems. Conclusion: The submitted narrative does not meet these criteria and therefore does not alter the assessment findings." "Attached Photos Do Not Alter the Assessment Recommendation [REDACTED]-16." (Exhibit 11: letter dated [REDACTED]-17)
19. All three reviewers scored teeth for [REDACTED] in the intra-arch deviation section of the *Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record* with scores of 17, 14 and 16 points. (Dept. Ex. 2A, 3, 6, Dr. Wolf Testimony)
20. All three reviewers agree [REDACTED] has an overjet. They all scored tooth #8 in the inter- arch deviation section. (Dept. Ex. 2A, 3, 6, Dr. Wolf's Testimony)
21. There is a variance in the scoring in the inter-arch section as the treating orthodontist also scored teeth #7, #9, #10 as overjet in addition scored tooth #24 as an overbite. The two reviewers did not score any of these teeth. The treating orthodontist scored a 10 and the two reviewers scored 2 and 2 points in the section of the *Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record*. (Dept. Ex. 2A, 3, 6, Dr. Wolf's Testimony)
22. In order to correctly score an overjet on the *Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record* the overjet must be greater than 9mm. The two reviewers do not agree that the overjet is 11 mm as noted by the treating orthodontist therefore they only scored tooth #8 as meeting the criteria of greater than 9mm. (Dr. Wolf's Testimony)
23. The treating orthodontists scored one tooth for [REDACTED] in the Posterior Segments of the *Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record*. He scored the left canine. The two reviewers both scored 4 teeth for [REDACTED] in the section. (Dept. Ex. 2, 3, 7, Dr. Gorman Testimony)
24. No current documentation was provided that [REDACTED] is being treated by a qualified psychiatrist or psychologist for related mental emotional or behavior problems, disturbances or dysfunctions.

25. No additional documentation was provided on behalf of [REDACTED] relating to medical issues.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. State statute provides that the Department may make such regulations as are necessary to administer the medical assistance program. [Conn. Gen. Stat. §17b-262]
2. "Medically necessary" and "medical necessity" defined. Notice of denial of services. Regulations. (a) For purposes of the administration of the medical assistance programs by the Department of Social Services, "medically necessary" and "medical necessity" mean those health services required to prevent, identify, diagnose, treat, rehabilitate or ameliorate an individual's medical condition, including mental illness, or its effects, in order to attain or maintain the individual's achievable health and independent functioning provided such services are: (1) Consistent with generally-accepted standards of medical practice that are defined as standards that are based on (A) credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature that is generally recognized by the relevant medical community, (B) recommendations of a physician-specialty society, (C) the views of physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas, and (D) any other relevant factors; (2) clinically appropriate in terms of type, frequency, timing, site, extent and duration and considered effective for the individual's illness, injury or disease; (3) not primarily for the convenience of the individual, the individual's health care provider or other health care providers; (4) not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of the individual's illness, injury or disease; and (5) based on an assessment of the individual and his or her medical condition.
- (b) Clinical policies, medical policies, clinical criteria or any other generally accepted clinical practice guidelines used to assist in evaluating the medical necessity of a requested health service shall be used solely as guidelines and shall not be the basis for a final determination of medical necessity.
- (c) Upon denial of a request for authorization of services based on medical necessity, the individual shall be notified that, upon request, the Department of Social Services shall provide a copy of the specific guideline or criteria, or portion thereof, other than the medical necessity definition provided in subsection (a) of this section, that was considered by the department or an entity acting on behalf of the department in making

the determination of medical necessity.

3. State regulations provide that orthodontic services for services provided for individuals under 21 years of age will be paid for when provided by a qualified dentist and deemed medically necessary as described in these regulations. [Conn. Agencies Regs. §17-134d-35(a)]
4. The Department of Social Services shall cover orthodontic services for a Medicaid recipient under twenty-one years of age when the Salzmänn Handicapping Malocclusion Index indicates a correctly scored assessment for the recipient of twenty-six points or greater, subject to prior authorization requirements. If a recipient's score on the Salzmänn Handicapping Malocclusion Index is less than twenty-six points, the Department of Social Services shall consider additional substantive information when determining the need for orthodontic services, including (1) documentation of the presence of other severe deviations affecting the oral facial structures; and (2) the presence of severe mental, emotional or behavioral problems or disturbances, as defined in the most current edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, published by the American Psychiatric Association, that affects the individual's daily functioning. [Sec. 17b-282e of the Supplement to the General Statutes]
5. State regulations provides, in relevant part as follows; the Department shall consider additional information of a substantial nature about the presence of severe mental, emotional, and/or behavior problems, disturbances or dysfunctions, as defined in the most current edition of the Diagnostic Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association, and which may be caused by the recipient's daily functioning. The Department will only consider cases where a diagnostic evaluation has been performed by a licensed psychiatrist or licensed psychologist who has accordingly limited his practice to child psychiatry or child psychology. The evaluation must clearly and substantially document how the dentofacial deformity is related to the child's mental, emotional, and/or behavior problems, and the orthodontic treatment is necessary, and, in this case, will significantly ameliorate the problems. [Conn. Agencies Regs. §17-134d-35(e)(2)]
6. State regulations provide that the study models submitted for prior authorization must clearly show the occlusal deviations and support the total point score of the preliminary assessment. [Conn. Agencies Regs. §17-134d-35(f)]
7. In [REDACTED] case, the study models submitted for prior authorization do not clearly support the total point score of the preliminary assessment.

8. In [REDACTED] case, a licensed psychiatrist or licensed psychologist who has limited his or her practice to child psychiatry or child psychology has not recommended that the child receive orthodontic treatment to significantly ameliorate her child's mental, emotional, and or behavior problems, disturbances or dysfunctions.
9. The Department was correct to find that [REDACTED] malocclusion did not meet the medical necessity criteria for orthodontia, as established in state regulations.

### **DISCUSSION**

The treating orthodontist did not provide documentation to establish medical necessity for [REDACTED] to warrant braces. The letter from [REDACTED] does not meet the statutory requirements. The requirement is; "The evaluation must clearly and substantially document how the dentofacial deformity is related to the child's mental, emotional, and/or behavior problems, and the orthodontic treatment is necessary, and, in this case, will significantly ameliorate the problems." In addition, the evaluation has been performed by a licensed psychiatrist or licensed psychologist who has accordingly limited his practice to child psychiatry or child psychology. The letter submitted is signed by a Licensed Master of Social Work. [REDACTED] is seen by an APRN regarding medications she takes regarding her depression. The Appellant stated that [REDACTED] is covered under the American Disabilities Act since [REDACTED] 2017. [REDACTED] has a written out 504 disability plan at her school. She also has counseling with the school therapist. The Appellant also indicated [REDACTED] had been involved with Domestic Violence. The hearing record was left open for the submission of additional documentation. None were received per CTDHP prior to the closing of the hearing record.

All the reviewers agree [REDACTED] does not have a perfect malocclusion. The issue is the degree of severity. [REDACTED] does not meet the point score required on the Preliminary Handicapping Assessment Record and the additional documentation does not demonstrate medically necessary and medical necessity.

### **DECISION**

The Appellant's appeal is **DENIED**.



Miklos Mencseli  
Hearing Officer

C: CarolSue Shannon, Operations Manager, DSS R.O. # 31 Danbury  
Diane D'Ambrosio, Connecticut Dental Health Partnership, P.O. Box 486,  
Farmington, CT 06034



### **RIGHT TO REQUEST RECONSIDERATION**

The appellant has the right to file a written reconsideration request within **15** days of the mailing date of the decision on the grounds there was an error of fact or law, new evidence has been discovered or other good cause exists. If the request for reconsideration is granted, the appellant will be notified within 25 days of the request date. No response within 25 days means that the request for reconsideration has been denied. The right to request a reconsideration is based on §4-181a (a) of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Reconsideration requests should include specific grounds for the request: for example, indicate what error of fact or law, what new evidence, or what other good cause exists.

Reconsideration requests should be sent to: Department of Social Services, Director, Office of Administrative Hearings and Appeals, 55 Farmington Avenue Hartford, CT 06105.

### **RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The appellant has the right to appeal this decision to Superior Court within 45 days of the mailing of this decision, or 45 days after the agency denies a petition for reconsideration of this decision, provided that the petition for reconsideration was filed timely with the Department. The right to appeal is based on §4-183 of the Connecticut General Statutes. To appeal, a petition must be filed at Superior Court. A copy of the petition must be served upon the Office of the Attorney General, 55 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106 or the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services, 55 Farmington Avenue Hartford, CT 06105. A copy of the petition must also be served on all parties to the hearing.

The 45 day appeal period may be extended in certain instances if there is good cause. The extension request must be filed with the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services in writing no later than 90 days from the mailing of the decision. Good cause circumstances are evaluated by the Commissioner or the Commissioner's designee in accordance with §17b-61 of the Connecticut General Statutes. The Agency's decision to grant an extension is final and is not subject to review or appeal.

The appeal should be filed with the clerk of the Superior Court in the Judicial District of New Britain or the Judicial District in which the appellant resides.