



Connecticut Association of Optometrists

35 Cold Spring Road, Suite 211
Rocky Hill, CT 06067
860 529-1900
860 529-4411 (FAX)
www.cteyes.org

Connecticut Association of Optometrists
Senate Bill 192
Insurance and Real Estate Committee
February 27, 2014

Sen. Crisco, Rep. Megna, Sen. Kelly, Rep. Sampson and members of the committee:

My name is Dr. Joseph Pavano, and I am a managing partner and eye doctor practicing Optometry in New Britain, Bristol, and Newington. Appointed by the governor and serving at his pleasure, I am a member of the State Board of Examiners of Optometry for the past four years. Additionally, I am a member of the Connecticut Association of Optometrists and I speak to you today as a representative of our professional organization, and an independent practitioner. I would like to offer several comments about Senate Bill 192, *An Act Concerning the Qualifications of Clinical Peers for Adverse Determination Reviews*.

Under the current law, if a medical practitioner receives a denial of a treatment of service for their patient, the practitioner can have the decision reviewed.

The insurer then finds a practitioner in the same or similar specialty to review the decision. In our case, this would mean another Optometric Doctor.

The bill appears to change this and limit the reviews to a person with a doctoral or medical degree.

I believe that a licensed Optometric Doctor should have their treatment decisions reviewed by another licensed Optometric Doctor.

This, by the way, is exactly the way we as a Board of Optometry reviews Optometrists on a case by case basis.

The bill does appear to have some good changes, but we are worried specifically about the revisions in lines 8 and 9.

In closing, for issues involving an Optometrist and an insurance company, we believe that clinical peer review means review by an Optometrist.

Thank you.