MEDICAL POLICY – 7.01.85

Electrical Stimulation of the Spine as an Adjunct to Spinal Fusion Procedures
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Introduction

Spinal fusion is a surgery that causes the bones of the spine (the vertebrae) to grow together and become like one bone. A graft is used, and then the body’s own processes create the fusion over time. In some cases, the fusion processes can be helped along with electrical stimulation. Stimulators send electrical pulses or current through tissues, toward the bone. Electrical bone growth stimulators appear to make bone cells grow. Electrical bone growth stimulators are either noninvasive, invasive (implantable), or semi-invasive (semi-implantable).

- Noninvasive stimulators deliver current through small patches (electrodes) or coils placed on the skin.
- Invasive electrical stimulation use devices that are implanted in the body.
- Semi-invasive stimulators use needle-like electrodes placed through the skin.

This policy discusses when noninvasive and invasive electrical bone growth stimulators may be considered medically necessary for spinal fusions. Semi-invasive stimulators are considered investigational (unproven) for spinal fusions.
**Note:** The Introduction section is for your general knowledge and is not to be taken as policy coverage criteria. The rest of the policy uses specific words and concepts familiar to medical professionals. It is intended for providers. A provider can be a person, such as a doctor, nurse, psychologist, or dentist. A provider also can be a place where medical care is given, like a hospital, clinic, or lab. This policy informs them about when a service may be covered.

## Policy Coverage Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulation</th>
<th>Medical Necessity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Invasive or noninvasive electrical bone growth stimulation** | Either invasive or noninvasive methods of electrical bone growth stimulation may be considered medically necessary as an adjunct to lumbar spinal fusion surgery in patients at high risk for fusion failure, defined as having ANY one of the following criteria:  
  - Alcoholism  
  - Current tobacco use  
  - Diabetes  
  - Fusion to be performed at more than one level  
  - Grade III or worse spondylolisthesis  
  - One or more previous failed spinal fusion(s)  
  - Renal disease  
  - Steroid use  

Noninvasive electrical bone growth stimulation may be considered medically necessary as a treatment for patients with failed lumbar spinal fusion surgery.*  

*Note: Failed spinal fusion is defined as a spinal fusion that has not healed at a minimum of 6 months after the original surgery, as evidenced by serial radiographs over a course of 3 months.|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulation</th>
<th>Investigational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-invasive electrical bone growth stimulation</strong></td>
<td>Semi-invasive electrical bone growth stimulation is considered investigational as an adjunct to lumbar fusion surgery and for failed lumbar fusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invasive, semi-invasive,</strong></td>
<td>Invasive, semi-invasive, and noninvasive electrical bone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stimulation and noninvasive electrical bone growth stimulation are considered investigational:

- As an adjunct to cervical fusion surgery and for failed cervical spine fusion
- As an adjunct for healing of lumbar spondylolysis (pars interarticularis defect/fracture)

**Documentation Requirements**

The patient’s medical records submitted for review should document that medical necessity criteria are met. The record should include clinical documentation of:

- Diagnosis/condition
- History and physical examination documenting the severity of the condition
- Level(s) planned for fusion
- Risk factors that place member at high risk of fusion failure OR imaging that shows failure of fusion

**Coding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPT 20974</td>
<td>Electrical stimulation to aid bone healing; noninvasive (non-operative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT 20975</td>
<td>Electrical stimulation to aid bone healing; invasive (operative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPCS E0748</td>
<td>Osteogenesis stimulator, electrical, non-invasive, spinal applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPCS E0749</td>
<td>Osteogenesis stimulator, electrical, surgically implanted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** CPT codes, descriptions and materials are copyrighted by the American Medical Association (AMA). HCPCS codes, descriptions and materials are copyrighted by Centers for Medicare Services (CMS).
Definition of Terms

**Failed spinal fusion:** A spinal fusion that has not healed at a minimum of 6 months after the original surgery, as evidenced by serial x-rays over a course of 3 months.

**Spinal fusion:** A surgical procedure that joins (fuses) two or more bones in the spine (vertebrae) using bone grafts or metal rods.

**Spondylolysis/isthmic spondylolysis:** A stress fracture or defect in the bone connecting one facet joint to another (pars interarticularis). This condition may be seen in adolescents involved in sports.

Benefit Application

While invasive electrical stimulation will be billed as a component of the hospital charge, noninvasive devices may be adjudicated according to the member's benefits for durable medical equipment.

Evidence Review

**Background**

Both invasive and noninvasive electrical bone growth stimulators have been investigated as an adjunct to spinal fusion surgery, with or without associated instrumentation, to enhance the probability of obtaining a solid spinal fusion. Noninvasive devices have also been investigated to treat a failed fusion.

**Electrical Bone Growth Stimulators**

Electrical and electromagnetic fields can be generated and applied to bones through the following methods:
Invasive Stimulators

Invasive devices require surgical implantation of a current generator in an intramuscular or subcutaneous space, with an accompanying electrode implanted within the fragments of bone graft at the fusion site. The implantable device typically remains functional for 6 to 9 months after implantation and, although the current generator is removed in a second surgical procedure when stimulation is completed, the electrode may or may not be removed. Implantable electrodes provide constant stimulation at the nonunion or fracture site but carry increased risks associated with implantable leads.

Noninvasive Stimulators

Noninvasive electrical bone growth stimulators generate a weak electrical current within the target site by using either pulsed electromagnetic fields, capacitive coupling, or combined magnetic fields. In capacitive coupling, small skin pads/electrodes are placed on either side of the fusion site and worn for 24 hours per day until healing occurs, or up to 9 months. In contrast, pulsed electromagnetic fields are delivered via treatment coils that are placed into a back brace or directly onto the skin and are worn for 6–8 hours per day for 3 to 6 months. Combined magnetic fields deliver a time-varying magnetic field by superimposing the time-varying magnetic field onto an additional static magnetic field. This device involves 30 minutes of treatment daily for 9 months. Patient compliance may be an issue with externally worn devices.

Semi-Invasive Stimulators

Semi-invasive (semi-implantable) stimulators use percutaneous electrodes and an external power supply, obviating the need for a surgical procedure to remove the generator when treatment is finished.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who are at high risk of lumbar spinal fusion surgery failure who receive invasive or noninvasive electrical bone growth stimulation, the evidence includes systematic reviews, a TEC Assessment, and randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, and functional outcomes. Results from these trials have indicated that in patients with risk factors for failed fusion surgery, either invasive or noninvasive electrical
bone stimulation increases the fusion rate. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have failed lumbar spinal fusion surgery who receive noninvasive electrical bone growth stimulation, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment and studies with patients serving as their own controls. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, and functional outcomes. Data have shown that noninvasive electrical stimulation improves the fusion rate in this population. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are undergoing cervical spinal fusion surgery or have failed cervical spine fusion who receive invasive or noninvasive electrical bone growth stimulation, the evidence includes an RCT. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, and functional outcomes. The only controlled trial published to date had methodologic limitations, and the efficacy of electrical stimulation in the cervical spine has not been established. An open-label multicenter cohort study provided evidence to demonstrate that patients at high risk for arthrodesis following anterior cervical discectomy and fusion procedures reported statistically significant improvements in fusion rates with pulsed electromagnetic field stimulation. However, limitations in the study design, including use of a historical control group, lack of blinding, and no restrictions on surgical methods used by surgeons, preclude definitive assessments of treatment efficacy. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

A search of ClinicalTrials.gov in March 2018 did not identify any ongoing or unpublished trials that would likely influence this policy.

Clinical Input Received from Physician Specialty Societies and Academic Medical Centers

While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process, through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted.
In response to requests, input was received from 2 physician specialty societies and 3 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2011. Input agreed with the criteria for high risk of fusion failure of the lumbar spine. Input on electrical stimulation for the cervical spine was mixed; specifically, some reviewers’ input agreed that data do not demonstrate improved outcomes with use of electrical stimulation in cervical spine fusion surgery. Most reviewers agreed that the large number of dropouts, nonsignificant difference in fusion rates by intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis, and lack of data on functional outcomes (eg, pain, return to usual activity) limited interpretation of the published study results.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

*North American Spine Society*

The North American Spine Society (2016) issued a coverage recommendation for electrical bone growth stimulators, which stated the following:

- “For augmentation of spinal fusion in any and all regions of the spine including occipital-cervical, cervical, cervicothoracic, thoracic, thoracolumbar, lumbar and lumbosacral spinal regions in patients at high-risk for the development of pseudarthrosis (ie, nonunion) who exhibit one or more of the following:
  - Are undergoing spinal fusion of two or more motion segments (3 vertebrae)
  - Are undergoing a revision spinal fusion (eg, repeat surgery for a previously unhealed fusion attempt)
  - Are smokers who cannot stop smoking in preparation for fusion due to the nature of the underlying condition (eg, acute traumatic fracture)
  - Exhibit one or more of the following comorbidities when undergoing primary lumbar fusion:
    - Diabetes
    - Inflammatory arthritis (eg, rheumatoid arthritis) that has required long-term corticosteroid therapy
    - Immunocompromised (eg, undergoing chemotherapy and radiation therapy to the spine, hypogammaglobulinemia, granulocytopenia, acquired immune deficiency syndrome, chronic granulomatous disease)
- Systemic vascular disease
- Osteopenia or osteoporosis

- In the lumbar spine, the following forms of electrical stimulation are indicated in high-risk patients with the specific techniques outlined. In all other regions of the spine, coverage for the same indications is recommended although there is less supporting evidence.
  - DCS [direct current stimulation: electrodes implanted within or very close to the location of the desired fusion] and CCS [capacitance coupling stimulation; 2 electrodes placed on the skin over the fusion site] for posterolateral fusion using autograft and extender
  - PEMFS [pulsed electromagnetic field stimulation: coils that produce a time-varying magnetic field around the area of the desired fusion] for lumbar interbody fusion.”

**American Association of Neurological Surgeons and the Congress of Neurological Surgeons**

Updated 2014 guidelines from the American Association of Neurological Surgeons and the Congress of Neurological Surgeons indicated that there was no evidence published after their 2005 guideline that conflicts with the previous recommendations regarding bone growth stimulation. Based on a single-level II study (2009), the routine use of direct current stimulation in patients older than age 60 years was not recommended. Use of direct current stimulation was recommended as an option for patients younger than 60 years of age, based on Level III and IV studies showing a positive impact on fusion rate. However, concerns about the level III study were that it was a poorly designed and poorly conducted cohort study consisting of an exceedingly small heterogeneous population of patients, and the overall recommendation was level C. There was insufficient evidence to recommend for or against the use of pulsed electromagnetic field stimulation (PEMFS) as a treatment alternative to revision surgery in patients presenting with pseudoarthrosis following posterolateral lumbar fusion (PLF, single level IV study). No additional studies investigating the efficacy of capacitive coupled electrical stimulation were identified.

The 2 medical associations also issued guidelines in 2005 that stated there was class II and III evidence (nonrandomized comparative trials and case series):
... to support the use of direct current stimulation or [capacitative coupled stimulation] for enhancing fusion rates in high-risk patients undergoing lumbar PLF. A beneficial effect on fusion rates in patients not at "high risk" has not been convincingly demonstrated, nor has an effect been shown for these modalities in patients treated with interbody fusion. There is limited evidence both for and against the use of PEMFS for enhancing fusion rates following PLF. Class II and III medical evidence supports the use of PEMFS for promoting arthrodesis following interbody fusion. Although some studies have purported to demonstrate functional improvement in some patient subgroups, other studies have not detected differences. All of the reviewed studies are significantly flawed by the use of a four-point patient satisfaction scale as the primary outcome measure. This outcome measure is not validated. Because of the use of this flawed outcome measure and because of the conflicting results reported in the better-designed studies that assess functional outcome, there is no consistent medical evidence to support or refute use of these devices for improving patient outcomes.”

**Medicare National Coverage**

Medicare covers noninvasive electrical stimulators for the following:

- “Failed fusion, where a minimum of 9 months has elapsed since the last surgery” and
- “... as an adjunct to spinal fusion surgery for patients at high risk of pseudoarthrosis due to previously failed spinal fusion at the same site or for those undergoing multiple level fusion. A multiple level fusion involves three or more vertebrae (e.g., L3-L5, L4-S1, etc.).”

Medicare covers invasive electrical stimulators:

- “... as an adjunct to spinal fusion surgery for patients at high risk of pseudoarthrosis due to previously failed spinal fusion at the same site or for those undergoing multiple level fusion. A multiple level fusion involves three or more vertebrae (e.g., L3-L5, L4-S1, etc.).”

**Regulatory Status**

*Implantable Devices*

The following implantable device was approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the premarket approval process:
• In 1986, the OsteoStim® (Electro-Biology), which may also be marketed under the trade name SPF (Biomet).

**Noninvasive Devices**

The following noninvasive bone growth stimulators have been approved by FDA through the premarket approval process:

• In 1999, the SpinalPak® bone growth stimulator system (Biolectron, a subsidiary of Electro-Biology), a capacitive coupling system, was approved for use as an adjunct to primary lumbar spinal fusion at 1 or 2 levels.

• In 1979, the EBI Bone Healing System® (Biolectron, a subsidiary of Electro-Biology), a pulsed electromagnetic field system, was approved for nonunions, failed fusions, and congenital pseudoarthroses. The device is secured with a belt around the waist.

• In 1994, the SpinaLogic Bone Growth Stimulator® (Regentek, a division of dj Orthopedics [formerly OrthoLogic]) was approved as a combined magnetic field portable device. This device is secured with a belt around the waist.

• In 1996, the Spinal-Stim Lite® (Orthofix) was approved as a spinal adjunct to the PhysioStim®. The Spinal-Stim Lite® device was approved to increase the probability of fusion success and as a nonoperative treatment for the salvage of failed spinal fusion, where a minimum of 9 months has elapsed since the last surgery.

• In 2004, the Stim® (Orthofix), a pulsed electromagnetic field system, was approved as an adjunct to cervical fusion surgery in patients at high risk for nonfusion.

**Semi-Invasive Devices**

No semi-invasive electrical bone growth stimulator devices were identified with FDA approval or clearance.

FDA product codes: LOE (invasive bone growth stimulator), LOF (noninvasive bone growth stimulator)
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**Disclaimer:** This medical policy is a guide in evaluating the medical necessity of a particular service or treatment. The Company adopts policies after careful review of published peer-reviewed scientific literature, national guidelines and local standards of practice. Since medical technology is constantly changing, the Company reserves the right to review and update policies as appropriate. Member contracts differ in their benefits. Always consult the member benefit booklet or contact a member service representative to determine coverage for a specific medical service or supply. CPT codes, descriptions and materials are copyrighted by the American Medical Association (AMA). ©2019 Premera All Rights Reserved.
**Scope:** Medical policies are systematically developed guidelines that serve as a resource for Company staff when determining coverage for specific medical procedures, drugs or devices. Coverage for medical services is subject to the limits and conditions of the member benefit plan. Members and their providers should consult the member benefit booklet or contact a customer service representative to determine whether there are any benefit limitations applicable to this service or supply. This medical policy does not apply to Medicare Advantage.
Discrimination is Against the Law

LifeWise Health Plan of Oregon complies with applicable Federal civil rights laws and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, or sex. LifeWise does not exclude people or treat them differently because of race, color, national origin, age, disability or sex.

LifeWise:
• Provides free aids and services to people with disabilities to communicate effectively with us, such as:
  • Qualified sign language interpreters
  • Written information in other formats (large print, audio, accessible electronic formats, other formats)
• Provides free language services to people whose primary language is not English, such as:
  • Qualified interpreters
  • Information written in other languages

If you need these services, contact the Civil Rights Coordinator.

If you believe that LifeWise has failed to provide these services or discriminated in another way on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, or sex, you can file a grievance with:
Civil Rights Coordinator - Complaints and Appeals
PO Box 91102, Seattle, WA 98111
Toll free 855-332-6396, Fax 425-918-5592. TTY 800-842-5357
Email AppealsDepartmentInquiries@LifeWiseHealth.com

You can file a grievance in person or by mail, fax, or email. If you need help filing a grievance, the Civil Rights Coordinator is available to help you.

You can also file a civil rights complaint with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Civil Rights, electronically through the Office for Civil Rights Complaint Portal, available at https://ocrportal.hhs.gov/ocr/portal/lobby.jsf, or by mail or phone at:
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue SW, Room 509F, HHH Building
Washington, D.C. 20020, 1-800-368-1019, 800-537-7697 (TDD)

Getting Help in Other Languages

This Notice has Important Information. This notice may have important information about your application or coverage through LifeWise Health Plan of Oregon. There may be key dates in this notice. You may need to take action by certain deadlines to keep your health coverage or help with costs. You have the right to get this information and help in your language at no cost. Call 800-596-3440 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Français (French):

Deutsche (German):

Italiano (Italian):

中文 (Chinese):
本通知有重要的訊息。本通知可能有關於您透過 LifeWise Health Plan of Oregon 提交的申請或保險的重要訊息。本通知內可能有重要日期。您可能需要在截止日期之前採取行動。以保留您的健康保險或者費用補貼。您有權利免費以您的母語得到本訊息和幫助。請撥電話 800-596-3440 (TTY: 800-842-5357).