

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL, REGULATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
55 FARMINGTON AVENUE
HARTFORD, CT 06105-3725

[REDACTED], 2021
SIGNATURE CONFIRMATION

Case ID # [REDACTED]
Client ID # [REDACTED]
Request # 170106

NOTICE OF DECISION

PARTY

[REDACTED]

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On [REDACTED] 2020, Connecticut Dental Health Partnership (“CTDHP”), the Dental Administrator for the Department of Social Services (the “Department”) sent [REDACTED] (the “Appellant”) a Notice of Action (“NOA”) denying a request for prior authorization for her minor child, [REDACTED] (the “child”) indicating it was not medically necessary.

On [REDACTED], 2020, the Appellant requested an administrative hearing to contest the Department’s denial of the prior authorization request for orthodontia for the child.

On [REDACTED], 2021, the Office of Legal Counsel, Regulations, and Administrative Hearings (“OLCRAH”) issued a notice scheduling the administrative hearing for [REDACTED] 2021.

On [REDACTED], 2021, in accordance with sections 17b-60, 17-61, and 4-176e to 4-189, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes, OLCRAH held an administrative hearing. The following individuals participated in the hearing:

[REDACTED] Appellant
Rosario Monteza, Grievance and Appeals Representative, CTDHP
Dr. Brett Zanger, Dental Consultant, CTDHP
Shelley Starr, Hearing Officer

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, the hearing was held as a telephonic hearing.

The hearing record was held open for the Appellant's submission of photos and the Department's review and comment of the evidence. On [REDACTED] 2021, the hearing record closed. On [REDACTED], 2021, the hearing record was re-opened to allow for the submission of the Department's review and comment. On [REDACTED] 2021, the hearing record closed.

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The issue to be decided is whether CTDHP's denial of a prior authorization request for the child's orthodontia as not medically necessary was correct and in accordance with state statutes and regulations.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Appellant is the child's mother. (Hearing Record; Appellant's testimony)
2. The child is [REDACTED] years old [REDACTED] (Exhibit 1: Prior Authorization Claim Form; Appellant's Testimony)
3. CTDHP is the Department's contractor for reviewing dental provider's requests for prior authorization of orthodontic treatment. (Hearing Record)
4. [REDACTED] (the "treating orthodontist") is the child's treating orthodontist. (Exhibit 1: Prior Authorization Claim Form; Hearing Summary)
5. On [REDACTED] 2020, CTDHP received a prior authorization request for braces for the child. (Exhibit 1: Prior Authorization Claim Form; Hearing Summary)
6. The prior authorization request included a Malocclusion Severity Assessment. The treating orthodontist assigned the child a score of twenty-seven (27) points. Also included were models and x-rays of the child's teeth. The treating orthodontist did not indicate that the child presented with other severe deviations affecting her mouth and underlying structures. The Doctor commented, "Client has no missing teeth." (Exhibit 1; Dental Claim Form; Exhibit 2: The Treating Orthodontist's Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record received [REDACTED] 2020; Hearing Summary)
7. On [REDACTED] 2020, Dr. Benson Monastersky, DMD, an Orthodontic Consultant for CTDHP reviewed the dental records and evidence provided by the child's treating orthodontist and assigned her a score of twenty (20) points on the Malocclusion Severity Assessment. He noted that there is no presence of other severe deviations affecting the child's mouth and underlying structures. Dr. Monastersky's decision was that the orthodontic treatment is not medically necessary and he did not approve the request for braces. (Exhibit 3: Dr. Monastersky's Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record dated [REDACTED] 2020; Hearing Summary)

8. On [REDACTED], 2020, CTDHP sent a Notice of Action to the Appellant and her child advising that the prior authorization request received from the provider for braces (orthodontics) was denied as not medically necessary. The child's teeth scored less than the 26 points needed for coverage, her teeth were not crooked enough to qualify for braces and they currently pose no threat to the jawbone or the attached soft tissue. (Exhibit 4: Notice of Action for Denied Services or Goods dated [REDACTED] 2020; Hearing record)
9. On [REDACTED] 2020, the Department received the Appellant's request for an appeal/hearing. (Exhibit 5: Request for appeal and administrative hearing received [REDACTED] 2020; Hearing Summary)
10. On [REDACTED], 2020, pursuant to the Appellant's appeal filed on [REDACTED] 2020, Dr. Robert Gange, DDS, a Dental Consultant for CTDHP conducted an appeal review of the child's dental records. He assigned the child's malocclusion a score of twenty-one (21) points. He did not find the presence of other severe deviations affecting the child's mouth and underlying structures. Dr. Gange did not approve the request for braces as it is not medically necessary. (Exhibit 6: Dr. Gange's Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record dated [REDACTED] 2020; Hearing Summary)
11. On [REDACTED] 2021, CTDHP notified the Appellant that the child's score of twenty-one (21) points was less than the twenty-six (26) points needed to receive coverage for braces. They did not find the presence of any deviations affecting the child's mouth or underlying structures. Nor did they find evidence of any treatment by a licensed psychiatrist or psychologist related to the condition of the child's teeth. CTDHP upheld the denial for braces. (Exhibit 7: Determination Letter dated [REDACTED] 2021; Hearing record)
12. On [REDACTED], 2021, Dr. Benson Monastersky, DMD, an Orthodontic Consultant for CTDHP reviewed the photos submitted by the Appellant and determined that the photos reflect what was seen by the submitted models and do not alter the denial of orthodontic treatment. (Exhibit 10: submitted photos; Letter dated [REDACTED] 2021, from Dr. Monastersky; Hearing record)
13. The child bites on her gums when chewing. She has no problem swallowing her food. (Appellant's testimony; Hearing record)
14. The child has no pain or infection of the mouth. (Appellant's testimony; Hearing record)
15. The child speaks clearly and is in generally good health. (Appellant's testimony; Hearing record)
16. The child is not receiving psychiatric or psychological treatment related to the condition of his mouth. (Appellant's testimony; Hearing record)
17. The issuance of this decision is timely under Connecticut General Statutes 17b-61(a), which requires that a decision be issued within 90 days of the request for an administrative hearing. The Appellant requested an administrative hearing on [REDACTED] 2020. This

decision is due not later than [REDACTED] 2021. However, the hearing record was held open an additional 15 days for the submission of evidence and for the review and comment of the evidence. Due to the 15 day delay, the hearing decision is due [REDACTED] 2021, and is therefore timely. (Hearing record)

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Connecticut General Statutes §17b-262 provides that the Department may make such regulations as are necessary to administer the medical assistance program.
2. 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. [Conn. Gen. Stat. § 17b-259b(a)]
3. Orthodontic services will be paid for when provided by a qualified dentist and deemed medically necessary as described in these regulations. [Regs., Conn. State Agencies § 17-134d-35(a)]
4. Orthodontic services are limited to recipients under twenty-one (21) years of age. [Regs., Conn. State Agencies § 17-134d-35(d)]
5. "The Department of Social Services shall cover orthodontic services for a Medicaid recipient under twenty-one years of age when the Salzmann 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 Salzmann 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 individuals daily functioning. . . ." [Conn. Gen. Stat § 17b-282e]

6. Prior authorization is required for the comprehensive diagnostic assessment. The qualified dentist shall submit:
 - (A) the authorization request form;
 - (B) the completed Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record;
 - (C) Preliminary assessment study models of the patient's dentition; and
 - (D) Additional supportive information about the presence of other severe deviations described in Section (e) (if necessary).[Regs., Conn. State Agencies § 17-134d-35(f)(1)]
7. The study models must clearly show the occlusal deviations and support the total point score of the preliminary assessment. [Regs., Conn. State Agencies § 17-134d-35(f)(1)(D)]
8. In the child's case, the two CTDHP Malocclusion Severity Assessments were less than 26 points and there was no substantial evidence presented about the presence of severe deviations affecting her mouth and underlying structures, orthodontic services are not determined medically necessary.
9. In the child's case, a licensed child psychologist or psychiatrist has not recommended that the child receive orthodontic treatment to significantly ameliorate her mental, emotional, or behavioral problems, disturbances, or dysfunctions caused by her dental deformity, orthodontic services are not determined medically necessary.
10. The child's malocclusion severity does not meet the criteria for medical necessity for the approval of the prior authorization request for orthodontic treatment.
11. CTDHP correctly denied the request for orthodontic treatment for the child as it is not medically necessary.

DECISION

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


Shelley Starr
Hearing Officer

Pc: Magdalena Carter, Connecticut Dental Health Partnership
Rita LaRosa, Connecticut Dental Health Partnership

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 06105-3725.

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, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106 or the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services, 55 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, CT 06105-3725. 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.