

The \$1,750 Question: Why Massachusetts' New Adult Dental Cap Should Exempt Periodontal Care for MassHealth Members with Diabetes — A Health Management Analysis with a National Interest Perspective

Sara Renata Pereira Borges

Graduated in Dentistry, University São Francisco, Bragança Paulista, SP, Brazil.
ORCID: 0009-0000-8735-4474

Lucielle Guimarães Ferraz Santana

(PhD in Dentistry, Fluminense Federal University, Niterói, RJ, Brazil.
ORCID: 0000-0001-8587-269X

Ana Flávia Borges de Paula

Master's Degree in Orthodontics, São Leopoldo Mandic, Campinas, SP, Brazil
ORCID: 0009-0006-4231-3357

Taís Rocha

Master's Degree in Pediatric Dentistry, Faculdade São Leopoldo Mandic, Campinas, SP, Brazil.
ORCID: 0000-0003-1477-8633

Larissa Caroline Cayres Pereira

Specialist in Implant Dentistry, University Cruzeiro do Sul, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.
ORCID: 0009-0008-2406-8137

Kelly Barbosa Leal Castro

Specialist in Periodontology, Odontoclínica Central do Exército (OCEX), Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil;
ORCID: 0009-0005-0333-6794

Ingrid Ramos de Souza Silva

Graduated in Dentistry, University Nove de Julho, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.
ORCID: 0009-0007-2864-5213

Adrielen Henrique Picoli

Specialist in Orthodontics – FAIPE, Cuiabá, MT, Brazil
ORCID: 0009-0009-5864-171X

Paulo Vinicius de Oliveira Bastos (Supervisor)

Specialist in Public Health & Specialist in Health Family, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil)
ORCID: 0009-0008-2449-3010

Abstract:

Background: On August 1, 2026, MassHealth introduced a US\$1,750 yearly coverage limit on dental care for members aged 21 and older, exempting only clients of the Department of Developmental Services. About 9.2% of Massachusetts adults have diagnosed diabetes, a condition in which periodontal therapy is not cosmetic but part of metabolic control. The cap therefore creates a potential conflict between a short-term dental saving and a long-term medical cost.

Materials and Methods: Documentary analysis of MassHealth dental benefit rules, published MassHealth appeal decisions and Section 1115 demonstration documents, combined with a narrative review of clinical and economic evidence indexed in PubMed and an illustrative budget-impact model with explicit assumptions.

Results: Randomized evidence shows HbA1c reductions of 0.43 percentage points after periodontal treatment. Medicaid claims associate periodontal care with about US\$2,918 lower annual health care costs per patient with diabetes. A full course of scaling and root planing with maintenance can consume a large share of the US\$1,750 limit, forcing trade-offs with restorative or prosthetic needs. Under a 50% causal-attribution assumption, exempting periodontal therapy for 10,000 MassHealth members with diabetes would yield a net saving of about US\$7.6 million per year; the exemption breaks even at 24% attribution. MassHealth's accountable care organizations, covering more than 80% of eligible members, already provide the contractual vehicle for integration.

Conclusion: A targeted 'diabetes periodontal carve-out' from the adult cap, embedded in the ACO quality framework through a Chairside-to-Clinic pathway, would protect a cost-saving intervention at minimal fiscal risk and offers a replicable template for other states.

Key Word: MassHealth; Annual dental maximum; Periodontitis; Diabetes; Accountable care organizations; Medical–dental integration; Massachusetts; Health care costs.

Date of Submission: 06-10-2026

Date of Acceptance: 16-10-2026

I. Introduction

Massachusetts has long been regarded as a national reference in health coverage. Its Medicaid and CHIP program, MassHealth, enrolled 1,525,312 people in June 2026 ¹, and its accountable care organization (ACO) model, launched in 2018 and renewed under a Section 1115 demonstration approved through December 31, 2027, enrolls more than 80% of eligible members in provider-led entities paid for quality and total cost of care ^{2,3}. Adult dental coverage has followed a similar arc of relative generosity: MassHealth covers cleanings, fillings, crowns, root canal treatment, dentures, deep cleaning and some periodontal services for adults ⁴.

That arc changed on August 1, 2026. From that date, dental coverage for MassHealth members aged 21 and older is subject to a yearly coverage limit of US\$1,750; the first benefit year runs to June 30, 2027, and later benefit years follow the state fiscal year. Once the limit is reached, most dental services are no longer paid until the next benefit year, although certain emergency services, extractions, denture repairs, anesthesia and first full dentures after extractions may still be covered. The same combined limit applies to adult dental services under the Health Safety Net, and the only adults exempted are clients of the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) ⁴.

Annual maximums are a familiar tool in commercial dental insurance, and their use in a public program is understandable at a time when states are preparing for the federal changes enacted in 2025, including Medicaid work requirements due by January 1, 2027 ⁵. The question this article poses is narrower: is a uniform cap appropriate for members whose dental condition is clinically linked to an expensive chronic medical disease? Diabetes is the clearest such case. Around 9.2% of Massachusetts adults reported diagnosed diabetes in 2022 ⁶, and nationally 40.1 million people have diagnosed or undiagnosed diabetes ⁷, at a cost of US\$412.9 billion per year ⁸. This article examines whether exempting periodontal care for MassHealth members with diabetes from the new cap would increase or reduce net public spending, and how such an exemption could be operationalized through the existing ACO architecture. It extends earlier work on management and economic sustainability in U.S. dental practice ⁹.

II. Material And Methods

The study combines three components. First, a documentary analysis of official Massachusetts sources: the MassHealth dental benefit pages updated on July 31, 2026 ⁴; published decisions of the Office of Medicaid Board of Hearings that cite the periodontal coverage rule at 130 CMR 420.427(B) ¹⁰; and Section 1115 demonstration summaries and monitoring reports describing the ACO program ^{2,3}. Second, a narrative review of PubMed-indexed clinical trials, systematic reviews and claims-based cost studies on periodontal treatment in people with diabetes, deliberately including studies with null results. Third, an illustrative budget-impact calculation of a targeted cap exemption.

The budget-impact calculation uses the Medicaid average treatment effect reported by Thakkar-Samtani et al. — US\$2,917.84 lower annual health care costs per treated patient with diabetes ¹¹ — as the gross saving. Because that figure derives from an observational design, it is multiplied by causal-attribution factors of 100%, 50% and 25%. The incremental cost of the exemption is set at US\$700 per patient per year, above the approximately US\$500 per person cited for periodontal therapy ¹², to include point-of-care screening, coordination and maintenance. Scenarios are reported for 5,000, 10,000 and 20,000 members treated per year. Data were accessed on October 3, 2026.

III. Why Periodontal Care Is Diabetes Care

In people with diabetes, periodontitis is more frequent, more severe and harder to control, while chronic periodontal inflammation raises insulin resistance. The practical question for a payer is whether treating the periodontal infection changes the course of diabetes. Randomized evidence indicates that it does. The 2022 Cochrane review, which pooled 30 trials and 2,443 analyzed participants for its main outcome, found an absolute HbA1c reduction of 0.43 percentage points three to four months after treatment, with moderate certainty ¹³. In the 12-month London trial of 264 patients with type 2 diabetes, intensive periodontal treatment left HbA1c 0.6 points lower than control treatment after full adjustment ¹⁴.

The economic literature is broadly consistent but must be read cautiously. In Medicaid and commercial claims analyzed with propensity-score matching, periodontal treatment in the prior two years was associated with 14% and 12% lower total health care costs, respectively ¹¹; an earlier commercial-claims study found US\$1,799 lower total costs among newly diagnosed patients who received a periodontal intervention ¹⁵; and a 2025 meta-analysis of economic evaluations concluded that periodontal treatment for people with type 2 diabetes is cost-effective ¹⁶. Against these findings, an integrated-system cohort in Minnesota observed fewer hospitalizations but no difference in total costs ¹⁷. These mixed results justify the use of attribution scenarios rather than a single point estimate.

Massachusetts dentists are also well positioned to find diabetes that has not yet been diagnosed. Nationally, 27.6% of adults with diabetes are unaware of it ⁷. Studies in dental offices and dental safety-net clinics have shown that simple chairside risk questions combined with point-of-care HbA1c testing identify a large proportion of people with unrecognized dysglycemia, and that most of them follow through with medical evaluation ¹⁸⁻²⁰.

IV. How The Cap Interacts With Periodontal Need

MassHealth pays for scaling and root planing only for members with active periodontal disease and not as a prophylactic procedure, requires prior authorization for adult deep cleaning, and expects the request to include periodontal charting, radiographs and a narrative of medical necessity ^{4,10}. Published appeal decisions show that requests are denied or delayed when documentation is incomplete or when frequency limits apply, illustrating that administrative friction already exists before any dollar cap is considered ¹⁰.

The cap adds a financial trade-off. An adult with diabetes and moderate periodontitis typically needs an examination, radiographs, scaling and root planing in several quadrants and periodontal maintenance at short intervals. The same adult frequently has caries and missing teeth as well. Under a single US\$1,750 envelope, the dentist and patient must choose between controlling the periodontal infection and restoring or replacing teeth. Because the exemptions listed by MassHealth cover extractions and first full dentures after extractions but not periodontal therapy ⁴, the structure of the cap may, at the margin, favor extraction over periodontal preservation — the opposite of what metabolic control requires.

Table no 1: Key features of the MassHealth adult dental environment relevant to members with diabetes.

Feature	Current rule	Implication for members with diabetes
Yearly coverage limit	US\$1,750 per benefit year from 1 Aug 2026 ⁴	Periodontal therapy competes with restorative care for the same budget
Exempted adults	DDS clients only ⁴	No clinical exemption for chronic systemic disease
Services still covered after limit	Certain emergency services, extractions, denture repairs, anesthesia, first full dentures ⁴	Tooth loss remains covered; tooth preservation does not
Adult deep cleaning	Covered with prior authorization; active disease only (130 CMR 420.427(B)) ^{4,10}	Documentation burden delays treatment
ACO enrollment	>80% of eligible members in ACOs ²³	Ready contractual vehicle for medical–dental accountability

Sources as cited; MassHealth pages accessed October 3, 2026.

V. Budget Impact of a Diabetes Periodontal Carve-Out

Table 2 estimates the net effect of exempting periodontal therapy from the cap for MassHealth members with a documented diagnosis of diabetes and periodontitis. At 50% attribution, each member treated generates a net saving of about US\$759 per year, and 10,000 members would produce about US\$7.6 million in net annual savings. The exemption remains marginally positive at 25% attribution and breaks even at 24%.

Table no 2: Illustrative net annual change in MassHealth spending from exempting periodontal therapy for members with diabetes (cost US\$700 per patient; gross saving US\$2,917.84 before attribution ¹¹).

Members treated per year	100% attribution	50% attribution	25% attribution
5,000	US\$11.1 million	US\$3.8 million	US\$0.15 million
10,000	US\$22.2 million	US\$7.6 million	US\$0.29 million
20,000	US\$44.4 million	US\$15.2 million	US\$0.59 million

Note: net = (attribution × US\$2,917.84 – US\$700) × members. Gross saving from 2019 national Medicaid claims, not adjusted for Massachusetts price levels or inflation; Massachusetts' higher health care prices would likely increase absolute savings. Author's calculation.

The fiscal risk of the carve-out is limited and capped by design: it applies only to a clinically defined subgroup and only to periodontal procedures. By contrast, the downside of keeping the uniform cap is open-ended, because the costs it may generate — poorer glycemic control, hospitalizations and complications — fall on the medical side of the MassHealth budget, where diabetes care for a single patient averages tens of thousands of dollars over a few years ⁸.

VI. Operationalizing The Carve-Out Through MassHealth ACOs

Massachusetts has an advantage few states share: most members are already attributed to ACOs that are accountable for quality and total cost of care ^{2,3}. A Chairside-to-Clinic Integrated Periodontal–Diabetes Pathway can therefore be built on existing contracts rather than new legislation.

- **Regulatory change.** Amend the yearly-limit policy so that, for members with a diabetes diagnosis code on medical claims, periodontal evaluation, scaling and root planing and periodontal maintenance do not count toward the US\$1,750 limit, mirroring the existing DDS exemption ⁴.
- **Simplified authorization.** Replace narrative prior authorization with an automated check that links the dental request to an ACO-verified diabetes diagnosis, reducing the documentation failures seen in published appeals ¹⁰.
- **Chairside detection.** Fund point-of-care HbA1c testing in community health center dental clinics serving MassHealth members, with electronic referral to the member's ACO primary care team ^{19,20}.
- **ACO quality measure.** Add 'annual periodontal evaluation for members with diabetes' to the ACO quality slate, creating a shared incentive for medical and dental providers who today work in separate payment systems ^{21,22}.
- **Linked evaluation.** Use the MassHealth data warehouse to compare HbA1c, admissions and total cost of care by periodontal-treatment status, producing Massachusetts-specific causal evidence before the demonstration's 2027 renewal ².

For dental practices and dental service organizations operating in Massachusetts, the pathway also defines a sustainable business line: a predictable, protected periodontal-maintenance population linked to value-based payments, rather than an uncertain share of a capped benefit ⁹.

VII. Implementation Roadmap And Performance Indicators

Translating the pathway into practice in Massachusetts requires a phased plan with explicit responsibilities and measurable targets. Table 3 sets out a 36-month roadmap and Table 4 the indicators against which MassHealth, its accountable care organizations and the MassHealth Dental Program administrator can judge whether the pathway is delivering clinical and financial value. The structure is also designed to be used directly in a business or operational plan by a dental organization that intends to serve this population.

Table no 3: Phased implementation roadmap for the Chairside-to-Clinic pathway in Massachusetts.

Phase	Main actions	Responsible parties	Deliverable
1. Preparation (months 0–6)	Amend the adult yearly-limit policy to exempt periodontal care for members with diabetes; define diabetes-identification rule from medical claims; train dental teams in risk screening and point-of-care HbA1c	MassHealth, its accountable care organizations and the MassHealth Dental Program administrator; dental schools and hygiene programs	Policy text, data-linkage protocol, trained pilot teams
2. Pilot (months 6–18)	Launch in community health center dental clinics affiliated with two or three ACOs; closed-loop referral to primary care; periodontal therapy and 3- to 4-month maintenance	Pilot clinics, primary care teams, plan care managers	First-year cohort with baseline and follow-up HbA1c
3. Evaluation and scale-up (months 18–36)	Compare treated and comparable untreated members on HbA1c, admissions and total cost of care; extend to all regions if net cost is neutral or	State Medicaid agency, independent evaluator	Public evaluation report and scale-up decision

	negative		
--	----------	--	--

Note: timelines are indicative and assume no new federal waiver is required.

Table no 4: Core performance indicators for the pathway in Massachusetts.

Domain	Indicator	Indicative target (year 2)
Detection	Share of at-risk adult dental patients receiving chairside HbA1c	≥ 60%
Linkage	Dental-detected dysglycemia cases confirmed in primary care within 90 days	≥ 75%
Treatment	Adults with diabetes and periodontitis completing scaling and root planing	≥ 50%
Continuity	Treated members attending at least two maintenance visits in 12 months	≥ 60%
Clinical	Mean HbA1c change in treated members at 6 months	≤ -0.3 percentage points
Financial	Total cost of care per treated member versus matched ACO members	Net cost ≤ US\$0 per member per year

Note: targets are proposed by the author as starting benchmarks, informed by published pilot results and the Cochrane estimate; they should be recalibrated after the pilot.

VIII. Discussion And Limitations

The new cap reflects a legitimate need to manage dental spending. The analysis suggests, however, that applying it uniformly to members with diabetes may be penny-wise and pound-foolish: the dental saving is certain but small, while the medical cost risk is uncertain but large. A narrow clinical exemption, of the same kind Massachusetts already grants to DDS clients, resolves the tension without abandoning the cap's purpose. Massachusetts' ACO infrastructure makes it unusually well placed to implement and evaluate such an exemption quickly.

The study has limitations. It relies on national, observational cost estimates rather than Massachusetts claims; it cannot yet observe the real effect of the cap, which began only in August 2026; and its budget model is static and illustrative. The share of MassHealth members with diabetes who would reach the cap in a given year is unknown and should be measured. Finally, the policy description is based on published state pages and may not capture every administrative detail.

IX. National Interest And Significance

Although the analysis is set in Massachusetts, its significance is national. Every state Medicaid program faces the same choice on optional adult dental benefits under the fiscal changes enacted in 2025 ⁵, and annual dollar maximums are among the most common tools states use to contain dental costs. Massachusetts is an early adopter of a public-program cap in a state with a mature value-based system; whether it protects or neglects periodontal care for people with diabetes will be watched by other states. A carve-out that is clinically targeted, fiscally neutral or positive, and measurable through linked claims is a model that can be transferred directly to other Medicaid programs and to Medicare Advantage dental benefits.

The endeavor serves the United States in three concrete ways: it reduces public spending on a disease that consumes one in four health care dollars ⁸; it improves outcomes for a vulnerable, low-income population; and it builds the evidence base on medical–dental integration that the country still lacks ¹⁷. Its implementation depends on professionals who combine periodontal expertise, public primary-care experience and health-management skills.

X. Conclusion

Massachusetts' US\$1,750 adult dental cap answers a budget question but raises a clinical one. For MassHealth members with diabetes, periodontal therapy is part of diabetes management, supported by randomized evidence on glycemic control and associated with lower total health care costs. Exempting periodontal care for these members, as MassHealth already does for DDS clients, and integrating it into ACO accountability through a Chairside-to-Clinic pathway would protect a cost-saving intervention at low fiscal risk. The Commonwealth has the data systems and contracts to do so before its demonstration renewal in 2027.

References

- [1]. Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF). Total monthly Medicaid and CHIP enrollment, June 2026 (CMS Performance Indicator data) [Internet]. State Health Facts; updated Sep 2026 [cited 2026 Oct 3]. Available from: <https://www.kff.org/affordable-care-act/state-indicator/total-monthly-medicaid-and-chip-enrollment/>
- [2]. MassHealth, Executive Office of Health and Human Services. MassHealth 1115 demonstration extension, 2022-2027: summary [Internet]. Boston (MA): Commonwealth of Massachusetts; 2022 [cited 2026 Oct 3]. Available from: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/1115-masshealth-demonstration-extension-summary/download>

- [3]. MassHealth. Massachusetts Section 1115 demonstration monitoring report, DY27 (October 1 - December 31, 2022) [Internet]. Boston (MA): EOHHS; 2023 [cited 2026 Oct 3]. Available from: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/section-1115-demonstration-waiver-annual-report-dy27-1/download>
- [4]. MassHealth, Executive Office of Health and Human Services. Learn about MassHealth dental benefits (including the adult dental yearly coverage limit effective August 1, 2026) [Internet]. Boston (MA): Commonwealth of Massachusetts; updated 31 Jul 2026 [cited 2026 Oct 3]. Available from: <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/learn-about-masshealth-dental-benefits>
- [5]. Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF). An early look at policy decisions as states get ready to implement work requirements [Internet]. San Francisco (CA): KFF; 2026 [cited 2026 Oct 3]. Available from: <https://www.kff.org/medicaid/an-early-look-at-policy-decisions-as-states-get-ready-to-implement-work-requirements/>
- [6]. Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF). Percentage of adults with diagnosed diabetes by age group, 2022 (CDC Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System data) [Internet]. State Health Facts; [cited 2026 Oct 3]. Available from: <https://www.kff.org/state-health-policy-data/state-indicator/adults-with-diabetes-by-age/>
- [7]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Diabetes Statistics Report [Internet]. Atlanta (GA): CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion; updated 16 Sep 2026 [cited 2026 Oct 3]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/php/data-research/index.html>
- [8]. Parker ED, Lin J, Mahoney T, Ume N, Yang G, Gabbay RA, ElSayed NA, Bannuru RR. Economic costs of diabetes in the U.S. in 2022. *Diabetes Care*. 2024;47(1):26-43. doi:10.2337/dci23-0085
- [9]. Oliveira JAP, Apolinário VC, Loiola SF, Souza PM, Abadessa SN, Dalbone AF, et al. Advancing dental practice management in the United States: strategic leadership, economic sustainability, and healthcare innovation. *Revista DCS*. 2026;23(90):1-6. doi:10.54899/dcs.v23i90.5554
- [10]. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Office of Medicaid Board of Hearings. Appeal decision 2310461: prior authorization for periodontal scaling and root planing (D4341) under 130 CMR 420.427(B) [Internet]. Boston (MA); [cited 2026 Oct 3]. Available from: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/appeal-2310461/download>
- [11]. Thakkar-Samtani M, Heaton LJ, Kelly AL, Taylor SD, Vidone L, Tranby EP. Periodontal treatment associated with decreased diabetes mellitus-related treatment costs: an analysis of dental and medical claims data. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2023;154(4):283-292.e1. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2022.12.011
- [12]. CareQuest Institute for Oral Health. The connections between periodontal disease and overall health [Internet]. Boston (MA): CareQuest Institute; [cited 2026 Oct 3]. Available from: <https://www.carequest.org/about/blog-post/connections-between-periodontal-disease-and-overall-health>
- [13]. Simpson TC, Clarkson JE, Worthington HV, MacDonald L, Weldon JC, Needleman I, et al. Treatment of periodontitis for glycaemic control in people with diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2022;4(4):CD004714. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD004714.pub4
- [14]. D'Aiuto F, Gkraniats N, Bhowruth D, Khan T, Orlandi M, Suvar J, et al. Systemic effects of periodontitis treatment in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 12 month, single-centre, investigator-masked, randomised trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2018;6(12):954-965. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(18)30038-X
- [15]. Nasseh K, Vujicic M, Glick M. The relationship between periodontal interventions and healthcare costs and utilization. Evidence from an integrated dental, medical, and pharmacy commercial claims database. *Health Econ*. 2017;26(4):519-527. doi:10.1002/hec.3316
- [16]. Sáenz-Ravello G, Castillo-Riquelme M, Cuadrado C, Gamonal J, Baeza M. Efficiency of periodontal treatment to improve type 2 diabetes mellitus outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of economic evaluations. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 2025;53(2):135-151. doi:10.1111/cdoe.12999
- [17]. Michalowicz BS, Anderson JP, Kottke TE, Dehmer SP, Worley DC, Kane S, et al. Periodontal treatment and subsequent clinical outcomes and medical care costs: a retrospective cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2023;18(8):e0290028. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0290028
- [18]. Herman WH, Taylor GW, Jacobson JJ, Burke R, Brown MB. Screening for prediabetes and type 2 diabetes in dental offices. *J Public Health Dent*. 2015;75(3):175-182. doi:10.1111/jphd.12082
- [19]. Lalla E, Kunzel C, Burkett S, Cheng B, Lamster IB. Identification of unrecognized diabetes and pre-diabetes in a dental setting. *J Dent Res*. 2011;90(7):855-860. doi:10.1177/0022034511407069
- [20]. Glurich I, Berg R, Panny A, Shimpi N, Steinmetz A, Nycz G, Acharya A. Longitudinal observation of outcomes and patient access to integrated care following point-of-care glycemic screening in community health center dental safety net clinics. *Front Oral Health*. 2021;2:670355. doi:10.3389/froh.2021.670355
- [21]. Shimpi N, Glurich I, Panny A, Acharya A. Knowledgeability, attitude, and practice behaviors of primary care providers toward managing patients' oral health care in medical practice: Wisconsin statewide survey. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2019;150(10):863-872. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2019.05.020
- [22]. Glurich I, Nycz G, Acharya A. Status update on translation of integrated primary dental-medical care delivery for management of diabetic patients. *Clin Med Res*. 2017;15(1-2):21-32. doi:10.3121/cmr.2017.1348