Amniotic Membrane and Amniotic Fluid

Policy # 00458
Original Effective Date: 08/19/2015
Current Effective Date: 11/01/2020

Applies to all products administered or underwritten by Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and its subsidiary, HMO Louisiana, Inc.(collectively referred to as the "Company"), unless otherwise provided in the applicable contract. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Medical Policy periodically.

Note: Recombinant and Autologous Platelet Derived Growth Factors for Wound Healing and Other Non Orthopedic Conditions is addressed separately in medical policy 00262.

Note: Bioengineered Skin and Soft Tissue Substitutes is addressed separately in medical policy 00572.

Note: Orthopedic Applications of Stem Cell Therapy (Including Allograft and Bone Substitute Products Used With Autologous Bone Marrow) is addressed separately in medical policy 00258.

When Services Are Eligible for Coverage

Coverage for eligible medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products may be provided only if:

- *Benefits are available in the member's contract/certificate, and*
- *Medical necessity criteria and guidelines are met.*

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider treatment of nonhealing and not clinically infected diabetic foot ulcers using the following human amniotic membrane (HAM) products (AmnioBand® Membrane, Biovance®, EpiCord®, Epifix®, Grafix™)‡ to be **eligible for coverage**** when the following criteria are met:

- Initial treatment may be approved for up to 4 applications over 6 weeks period per nonhealing wound that is not infected and patient agrees to comply with adequate mechanical offloading (see Policy Guidelines); or
- Additional applications after initial 6 weeks may be eligible for coverage when following criteria are met:
    - Documented objective evidence of wound healing (e.g. development and presence of healthy granulation tissue with progressive wound contracture or decreasing depth); and

- Approved HAM product is applied no more frequently than in one-week intervals; and
- Patient remains compliant with adequate mechanical offloading; and
- Continued treatment may be approved for up to 4 additional applications over 6 more weeks, per wound treated.

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider HAM grafts with or without suture (Prokera®, AmbioDisk™)‡ for the treatment of any of the following ophthalmic indications to be **eligible for coverage:****

- Neurotrophic keratitis with ocular surface damage and inflammation that does not respond to conservative therapy (see Policy Guidelines); or
- Corneal ulcers and melts that do not respond to initial conservative therapy (see Policy Guidelines); or
- Corneal perforation when there is active inflammation after corneal transplant requiring adjunctive treatment; or
- Bullous keratopathy as a palliative measure in patients who are not candidates for curative treatment (eg, endothelial or penetrating keratoplasty); or
- Partial limbal stem cell deficiency with extensive diseased tissue where selective removal alone is not sufficient; or
- Moderate or severe Stevens-Johnson syndrome; or
- Persistent epithelial defects that do not respond to conservative therapy (See Policy Guidelines); or
- Severe dry eye (DEWS 3 or 4) with ocular surface damage and inflammation that remains symptomatic after Steps 1, 2, and 3 of the dry eye disease management algorithm (see Policy Guidelines); or
- Moderate or severe acute ocular chemical burn.

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider human amniotic membrane grafts with suture or glue for the treatment of the following ophthalmic indications to be **eligible for coverage:****

- Corneal perforation when corneal tissue is not immediately available; or
- Pterygium repair when there is insufficient healthy tissue to create a conjunctival autograft.

Amniotic Membrane and Amniotic Fluid

Policy # 00458
Original Effective Date: 08/19/2015
Current Effective Date: 11/01/2020

When Services Are Considered Investigational

Coverage is not available for investigational medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products.

Based on review of available data, the Company considers injection of micronized or particulated human amniotic membrane for all indications, including but not limited to treatment of osteoarthritis and plantar fasciitis.to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers human amniotic membrane grafts with or without suture for all ophthalmic indications not outlined above to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers injection of human amniotic fluid for all indications to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers all other human amniotic membrane (HAM) products, use for indications not listed above, including but not limited to treatment of lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency, and when criteria above are not met, including but not limited to using more than 8 applications beyond 12 weeks, to be **investigational.***

Policy Guidelines

Non-healing of diabetic wounds is defined as an ulcer that fails to demonstrate > 50% wound area reduction after a minimum of 4 weeks of standard wound therapy.

All ulcers subjected to sustained or frequent pressure and stress (ie, pressure-related heel ulcers or medial/lateral foot ulcers) or repetitive moderate pressure (plantar foot ulcers) benefit from pressure reduction, which is accomplished with mechanical offloading. Offloading devices include total contact casts, cast walkers, shoe modifications, and other devices to assist in ambulation.

Tables PG1 and PG2 list the medically necessary and investigational amniotic products that have an HCPCS code.

Table PG1 Amniotic Products Listed in the Policy Statements

Trade Name	Supplier	HCPCS Code
AmnioBand®‡ Membrane	MTF Wound Care	Q4151
Biovance®‡	Celularity	Q4154
Epifix®‡	MiMedx	Q4186
Epicord®‡	MiMedx	Q4187
Grafix®‡	Osiris	Q4132, Q4133

Table PG2 Other Amniotic Products with HCPCS Codes

Trade Name	Supplier	HCPCS Code
Affinity™‡	NuTech Medical	Q4159
Allogen	Vivex Biomedical	Q4212
AlloWrap™‡	AlloSource	Q4150
Amnioarmor™‡	Tissue Transplant Technology	Q4188
AmnioBand®‡Particulate	MTF Wound Care	Q4168
AmnioExcel®‡	Derma Sciences	Q4137
Amnion bio or Axomembrane	Axolotl Biologix	Q4211
AmnioMatrix®‡	Integra Life Sciences	Q4139

AmnioWrap2™‡	Direct Biologics	Q4221
Articent ac (flowable)	Tides Medical	Q4189
Artacent ac (patch)	Tides Medical	Q4190
Artacent®‡ Wound	Tides Medical	Q4169
Artacent®‡ Cord	Tides Medical	Q4126
Ascent	StimLabs	Q4213
Axolotl ambien or Axolotl Cryo	Axolotl Biology	Q4215
BioDDryFlex®‡	BioD	Q4138
BioDfence™‡	Integra Life Science	Q4140
BioWound, BioWound Plus™‡, BioWound XPlus™	HRT[a]	Q4217
Cellesta/Cellesta duo	Ventris Medical	Q4184
Cellesta Cord	Ventris Medical	Q4214
Cellesta flowable	Ventris Medical	Q4185
Clarix®‡	Amniox Medical	Q4156
Clarix®‡Flo	Amniox Medical	Q4155
Cygnus	Vivex Biomedical	Q4170
Dermavest™‡ or Plurivest	AediCell[a]	Q4153
Epifix Injectable	MiMedx	Q4145
Fluid flow or Fluid GF	BioLab Sciences	Q4206
Genesis	Genesis Biologics	Q4198
Guardian/AmnioBand®‡	MTF Wound Care	Q4151

Matrion	LifeNet Health	Q4201
Neox®‡ Cord	Amniox Medical	Q4148
Neox®‡ Flo	Amniox Medical	Q4155
Neox®‡ Wound	Amniox Medical	Q4156
Novachor	Organogenisis	Q4191
Novafix®‡	Triad Life Sciences	Q4208
NuShield	Organogenesis	Q4160
PalinGen®‡ Membrane	Amnio ReGen Solutions	Q4173
PalinGen®‡ SportFlow	Amnio ReGen Solutions	Q4174
Plurivest™‡	AediCell	Q4153
Restorigin	UMTB Biomedical	Q4191
Restorigin Injectable	UMTB Biomedical	Q4192
Revitalon™‡	Medline Industries	Q4157
Surgicord	Synergy Biologics	Q4218
SurgiGRAFT™‡	Synergy Biologics	Q4183
WoundEx®‡	Skye Biologics[a]	Q4163
WoundEx®‡ Flow	Skye Biologics[a]	Q4162
Woundfix, Woundfix Plus, Wounfix XPlus (see BioWound above)	HRT	Q4217
Xwrap	Applied Biologics	Q4204

HRT: Human Regenerative Technologies; MTF: Musculoskeletal Transplant Foundation
[a,]Processed by HRT and marketed under different tradename
Tear Film and Ocular Surface Society staged management for dry eye disease (Jones et al, 2017)

Amniotic Membrane and Amniotic Fluid

Policy # 00458
Original Effective Date: 08/19/2015
Current Effective Date: 11/01/2020

Step 1:

- Education regarding the condition, its management, treatment and prognosis
- Modification of local environment
- Education regarding potential dietary modifications (including oral essential fatty acid supplementation)\
- Identification and potential modification/elimination of offending systemic and topical medications
- Ocular lubricants of various types (if meibomian gland dysfunction is present, then consider lipid containing supplements)\
- Lid hygiene and warm compresses of various types

Step 2:
If above options are inadequate consider:

- Non-preserved ocular lubricants to minimize preservative-induced toxicity
- Tea tree oil treatment for Demodex (if present)
- Tear conservation
- Punctal occlusion
- Moisture chamber spectacles/goggles
- Overnight treatments (such as ointment or moisture chamber devices)
- In-office, physical heating and expression of the meibomian glands
- In-office intense pulsed light therapy for meibomian gland dysfunction
- Prescription drugs to manage dry eye disease
- Topical antibiotic or antibiotic/steroid combination applied to the lid margins for anterior blepharitis (if present)
- Topical corticosteroid (limited-duration)
- Topical secretagogues
- Topical non-glucocorticoid immunomodulatory drugs (such as cyclosporine)
- Topical LFA-1 antagonist drugs (such as lifitegrast)
- Oral macrolide or tetracycline antibiotics

Step 3:
If above options are inadequate consider:

- Oral secretagogues
- Autologous/allogeneic serum eye drops

- Therapeutic contact lens options
- Soft bandage lenses
- Rigid scleral lenses

Step 4:
If above options are inadequate consider:

- Topical corticosteroid for longer duration
- Amniotic membrane grafts
- Surgical punctal occlusion
- Other surgical approaches (eg tarsorrhaphy, salivary gland transplantation)
- Dry eye severity level DEWS 3 to 4
- Discomfort, severity, and frequency - Severe frequent or constant
- Visual symptoms - chronic and/or constant, limiting to disabling
- Conjunctival Injection - +/- or +/+
- Conjunctive Staining - moderate to marked
- Corneal Staining - marked central or severe punctate erosions
- Corneal/tear signs - Filamentary keratitis, mucus clumping, increase in tear debris
- Lid/meibomian glands - Frequent
- Tear film breakup time - < 5
- Schirmer score (mm/5 min) - < 5

Background/Overview

Human Amniotic Membrane

Human amniotic membrane (HAM) consists of 2 conjoined layers, the amnion, and chorion, and forms the innermost lining of the amniotic sac or placenta. When prepared for use as an allograft, the membrane is harvested immediately after birth, cleaned, sterilized, and either cryopreserved or dehydrated. Many products available using amnion, chorion, amniotic fluid, and umbilical cord are being studied for the treatment of a variety of conditions, including chronic full-thickness diabetic lower-extremity ulcers, venous ulcers, knee osteoarthritis, plantar fasciitis, and ophthalmic conditions. The products are formulated either as patches, which can be applied as wound covers, or as suspensions or particulates, or connective tissue extractions, which can be injected or applied topically.

Amniotic Membrane and Amniotic Fluid

Policy # 00458
Original Effective Date: 08/19/2015
Current Effective Date: 11/01/2020

Fresh amniotic membrane contains collagen, fibronectin, and hyaluronic acid, along with a combination of growth factors, cytokines, and anti-inflammatory proteins such as interleukin-1 receptor antagonist. There is evidence that the tissue has anti-inflammatory, antifibroblastic, and antimicrobial properties. HAM is considered nonimmunogenic and has not been observed to cause a substantial immune response. It is believed that these properties are retained in cryopreserved HAM and dehydrated HAM products, resulting in a readily available tissue with regenerative potential. In support, 1 dehydrated HAM product has been shown to elute growth factors into saline and stimulate the migration of mesenchymal stem cells, both in vitro and in vivo.

Use of a HAM graft, which is fixated by sutures, is an established treatment for disorders of the corneal surface, including neurotrophic keratitis, corneal ulcers and melts, following pterygium repair, Stevens-Johnson syndrome, and persistent epithelial defects. Amniotic membrane products that are inserted like a contact lens have more recently been investigated for the treatment of corneal and ocular surface disorders. Amniotic membrane patches are also being evaluated for the treatment of various other conditions, including skin wounds, burns, leg ulcers, and prevention of tissue adhesion in surgical procedures.[1,] Additional indications studied in preclinical models include tendonitis, tendon repair, and nerve repair. The availability of HAM opens the possibility of regenerative medicine for an array of conditions.

Amniotic Fluid
Amniotic fluid surrounds the fetus during pregnancy and provides protection and nourishment. In the second half of gestation, most of the fluid is a result of micturition and secretion from the respiratory tract and gastrointestinal tract of the fetus, along with urea. The fluid contains proteins, carbohydrates, peptides, fats, amino acids, enzymes, hormones, pigments, and fetal cells. Use of human and bovine amniotic fluid for orthopedic conditions was first reported in 1927. Amniotic fluid has been compared with synovial fluid, containing hyaluronan, lubricant, cholesterol, and cytokines. Injection of amniotic fluid or amniotic fluid-derived cells is currently being evaluated for the treatment of osteoarthritis and plantar fasciitis.

Amniotic membrane and amniotic fluid are also being investigated as sources of pluripotent stem cells. Pluripotent stem cells can be cultured and are capable of differentiation toward any cell type.

FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
The U.S. FDA regulates human cells and tissues intended for implantation, transplantation, or infusion through the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, under Code of Federal Regulation, Title 21, parts 1270 and 1271. In 2017, the FDA published clarification of what is considered minimal manipulation and homologous use for human cells, tissues, and cellular and tissue-based products (HCT/Ps).

HCT/Ps are defined as human cells or tissues that are intended for implantation, transplantation, infusion, or transfer into a human recipient. If an HCT/P does not meet the criteria below and does not qualify for any of the stated exceptions, the HCT/P will be regulated as a drug, device, and/or biological product and applicable regulations and premarket review will be required.

An HCT/P is regulated solely under section 361 of the PHS Act and 21 CFR Part 1271 if it meets all of the following criteria:

1. "The HCT/P is minimally manipulated;
2. The HCT/P is intended for homologous use only, as reflected by the labeling, advertising, or other indications of the manufacturer's objective intent;
3. The manufacture of the HCT/P does not involve the combination of the cells or tissues with another article, except for water, crystalloids, or a sterilizing, preserving, or storage agent, provided that the addition of water, crystalloids, or the sterilizing, preserving, or storage agent does not raise new clinical safety concerns with respect to the HCT/P; and
4. Either:
    i. The HCT/P does not have a systemic effect and is not dependent upon the metabolic activity of living cells for its primary function; or
    ii. The HCT/P has a systemic effect or is dependent upon the metabolic activity of living cells for its primary function, and:
        a. Is for autologous use;
        b. Is for allogeneic use in a first-degree or second-degree blood relative; or
        c. Is for reproductive use."

The guidance provides the following specific examples of homologous and non-homologous use for amniotic membrane:

a. "Amniotic membrane is used for bone tissue replacement to support bone regeneration following surgery to repair or replace bone defects. This is not a homologous use because bone regeneration is not a basic function of amniotic membrane.
b. An amniotic membrane product is used for wound healing and/or to reduce scarring and inflammation. This is not homologous use because wound healing and reduction of scarring and inflammation are not basic functions of amniotic membrane.
c. An amniotic membrane product is applied to the surface of the eye to cover or offer protection from the surrounding environment in ocular repair and reconstruction procedures. This is homologous use because serving as a covering and offering protection from the surrounding environment are basic functions of amniotic membrane."

The FDA noted the intention to exercise enforcement discretion for the next 36 months after publication of the guidance.

In 2003, Prokera™‡ was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process for the ophthalmic conformer that incorporates amniotic membrane (K032104). The FDA determined that this device was substantially equivalent to the Symblepharon Ring. The Prokera device is intended "for use in eyes in which the ocular surface cells have been damaged, or underlying stroma is inflamed and scarred." The development of Prokera, a commercially available product, was supported in part by the National Institute of Health and the National Eye Institute.

AmnioClip (FORTECH GmbH) is a ring designed to hold the amniotic membrane in the eye without sutures or glue fixation. A mounting device is used to secure the amniotic membrane within the AmnioClip. The AmnioClip currently has CE approval in Europe.

Rationale/Source

Several commercially available forms of human amniotic membrane (HAM) and amniotic fluid can be administered by patches, topical application, or injection. Amniotic membrane and amniotic fluid are being evaluated for the treatment of a variety of conditions, including chronic full-thickness diabetic lower-extremity ulcers, venous ulcers, knee osteoarthritis, plantar fasciitis, and ophthalmic conditions.

Diabetic Lower-Extremity Ulcers

For individuals who have non-healing diabetic lower-extremity ulcers who receive a patch or flowable formulation of HAM or placental membrane (ie, AmnioBand Membrane, AmnioExcel, Biovance, EpiCord, EpiFix, Grafix), the evidence includes randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The RCTs evaluating amniotic and placental membrane products for the treatment of non-healing diabetic lower-extremity ulcers have compared HAM with standard care or with an established advanced wound care product. These trials used wound closure as the primary outcome measure, and some used power analysis, blinded assessment of wound healing, and intention-to-treat analysis. For the HAM products that have been sufficiently evaluated (ie, AmnioBand Membrane, Biovance, EpiCord, EpiFix, Grafix), results have shown improved outcomes compared with standard care, and outcomes that are at least as good as an established advanced wound care product. Improved health outcomes in the RCTs are supported by multicenter registries. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Lower-Extremity Ulcers due to Venous Insufficiency
For individuals who have lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency who receive a patch or flowable formulation of HAM, the evidence includes 2 RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The published evidence on HAM for the treatment of venous leg ulcers includes 2 multicenter RCTs with EpiFix. One RCT reported a larger percent wound closure at 4 weeks, but the percentage of patients with complete wound closure at 4 weeks did not differ between EpiFix and the standard of care. A second RCT evaluated complete wound closure at 12 weeks after weekly application of EpiFix or standard dressings with compression, but interpretation is limited by methodologic concerns. Two additional studies with other HAM products have been completed but not published, raising further questions about the efficacy of HAM for venous insufficiency ulcers. Therefore, corroboration with well-designed and well-conducted RCTs evaluating wound healing is needed to demonstrate efficacy for this indication. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Osteoarthritis
For individuals who have knee osteoarthritis who receive an injection of suspension or particulate formulation of HAM or amniotic fluid, the evidence includes a feasibility study. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The pilot study assessed the feasibility of a larger RCT evaluating HAM injection. Additional trials, which will have

a larger sample size and longer follow-up, are needed to permit conclusions on the effect of this treatment. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Plantar Fasciitis
The evidence on injection of amniotic membrane for the treatment of plantar fasciitis includes preliminary studies and a larger (n=145) patient-blinded comparison of micronized injectable-HAM and placebo control. Injection of micronized amniotic membrane resulted in greater improvements in the visual analog score for pain and the Foot Functional Index compared to placebo controls. The primary limitation of the study is that this is an interim report with 12-month results pending. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Ophthalmic Conditions

Neurotrophic Keratitis with Ocular Surface Damage and Inflammation That Does Not Respond to Conservative Therapy
For individuals who have neurotrophic keratitis with ocular surface damage and inflammation that does not respond to conservative therapy who receive HAM, the evidence includes an RCT. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. An RCT of 30 patients showed no benefit of sutured HAM graft compared to tarsorrhaphy or bandage contact lens. Based on clinical input, HAM might be considered for patients who did not respond to conservative therapy. Clinical input indicated that non-sutured HAM in an office setting would be preferred to avoid a delay in treatment associated with scheduling a surgical treatment. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Corneal Ulcers and Melts That Does Not Respond to Initial Medical Therapy
For individuals who have corneal ulcers and melts that does not respond to initial medical therapy who receive HAM, the evidence is limited. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. Corneal ulcers and melts are uncommon and variable and RCTs are not expected. Based on clinical input, HAM might be considered for patients who did not respond to conservative therapy. Clinical input indicated that non-sutured HAM in an office setting would be preferred to avoid a delay in treatment associated with scheduling a surgical treatment. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Corneal Perforation When There is Active Inflammation After Corneal Transplant Requiring Adjunctive Treatment

For individuals who have corneal perforation when there is active inflammation after corneal transplant requiring adjunctive treatment who receive HAM, the evidence is limited. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. No comparative evidence was identified for this indication. Clinical input supported the use of HAM to reduce inflammation and promote epithelial healing with active inflammation following corneal transplantation. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Bullous Keratopathy as a Palliative Measure in Patients Who are Not Candidates for a Curative Treatment (eg, Endothelial or Penetrating Keratoplasty)

For individuals who have bullous keratopathy and who are not candidates for curative treatment (eg, endothelial or penetrating keratoplasty) who receive HAM, the evidence includes an RCT. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. An RCT found no advantage of sutured HAM over the simpler stromal puncture procedure for the treatment of pain from bullous keratopathy. Based on clinical input, non-sutured HAM could be used as an alternative to stromal puncture. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Partial Limbal Stem Cell Deficiency with Extensive Diseased Tissue Where Selective Removal Alone is Not Sufficient

For individuals who have partial limbal stem cell deficiency with extensive diseased tissue where selective removal alone is not sufficient who receive HAM, the evidence is limited. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. No RCTs were identified on HAM for limbal stem cell deficiency. Improvement in visual acuity has been reported for some patients who have received HAM in conjunction with removal of the diseased limbus. Clinical input noted the limitations of performing an RCT and supported the use of HAM for this indication. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Moderate or Severe Stevens-Johnson Syndrome

For individuals who have moderate or severe Stevens-Johnson syndrome (SJS) who receive HAM, the evidence includes an RCT. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional

outcomes, and quality of life. The evidence on HAM for the treatment of SJS includes 1 RCT with 25 patients (50 eyes) that found improved symptoms and function with HAM compared to medical therapy alone. Clinical input indicated that large RCTs are unlikely due to the severity and rarity of the disease, supported the use of HAM for moderate or severe SJS. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Persistent Epithelial Defects and Ulceration That Do Not Respond to Conservative Therapy
For individuals who have persistent epithelial defects that do not respond to conservative therapy who receive HAM, the evidence is limited. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. No RCTs were identified on persistent epithelial defects and ulceration. Clinical input noted the difficulty in conducting RCTs for this indication and supported the use of amniotic membrane for persistent epithelial defects and ulcerations that do not respond to conservative therapy. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Severe Dry Eye with Ocular Surface Damage and Inflammation That Does Not Respond to Conservative Therapy
For individuals who have severe dry eye with ocular surface damage and inflammation that does not respond to conservative therapy, who receive HAM, the evidence includes an RCT and a large case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The evidence on HAM for severe dry eye with ocular surface damage and inflammation includes an RCT with 20 patients and a retrospective series of 84 patients (97 eyes). Placement of self-retained HAM for 2 to 11 days reduced symptoms and restored a smooth corneal surface and corneal nerve density for as long as 3 months. Clinical input supported HAM in cases of severe dry eye with ocular surface damage and inflammation that does not respond to conservative therapy. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Moderate or Severe Acute Ocular Chemical Burns
For individuals who have moderate or severe acute ocular chemical burn who receive HAM, the evidence includes 3 RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. Evidence includes a total of 197 patients with acute ocular chemical burns who were treated with HAM transplantation plus medical therapy or medical therapy alone. Two of the 3 RCTs did not show a faster rate of epithelial healing, and there was no significant benefit for other

outcomes. Clinical input was in support of HAM for acute ocular chemical burn. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Corneal Perforation When Corneal Tissue is Not Immediately Available
For individuals who have corneal perforation when corneal tissue is not immediately available who receive sutured HAM, the evidence is limited. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The standard treatment for corneal perforation is corneal transplantation. Based on clinical input, sutured HAM may be used as a temporary measure when corneal tissue is not immediately available. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Pterygium Repair When There is Insufficient Healthy Tissue to Create a Conjunctival Autograft
For individuals who have pterygium repair when there is insufficient healthy tissue to create a conjunctival autograft who receive HAM, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. Systematic reviews of RCTs have been published that found that conjunctival or limbal autograft is more effective than HAM graft in reducing the rate of pterygium recurrence. Based on clinical input, sutured or glued HAM may be considered when there is insufficient healthy tissue to create a conjunctival autograft (eg, extensive, double, or recurrent pterygium). The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Supplemental Information

2019
In response to requests while this policy was under review in 2018-2019, clinical input on the use of human amniotic membrane graft either without or with suture fixation for several ophthalmic conditions was received from 2 respondents, including 1 specialty society-level response and 1 physician-level response identified through specialty societies including physicians with academic medical center affiliations.

Evidence from clinical input is integrated within the Rationale section summaries and the Summary of Evidence.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Tear Film and Ocular Surface Society
In 2017, the Tear Film and Ocular Surface Society published the Dry Eye Workshop II (DEWS) management and therapy report. The report evaluated the evidence on treatments for dry eye and provided the following treatment algorithm for dry eye disease management:

Step 1:

- Education regarding the condition, its management, treatment, and prognosis
- Modification of local environment
- Education regarding potential dietary modifications (including oral essential fatty acid supplementation)
- Identification and potential modification/elimination of offending systemic and topical medications
- Ocular lubricants of various types (if meibomian gland dysfunction is present, then consider lipid containing supplements)
- Lid hygiene and warm compresses of various types

Step 2:
If above options are inadequate consider:

- Non-preserved ocular lubricants to minimize preservative-induced toxicity
- Tea tree oil treatment for Demodex (if present)
- Tear conservation
- Punctal occlusion
- Moisture chamber spectacles/goggles
- Overnight treatments (such as ointment or moisture chamber devices)
- In-office, physical heating and expression of the meibomian glands
- In-office intense pulsed light therapy for meibomian gland dysfunction
- Prescription drugs to manage dry eye disease
- Topical antibiotic or antibiotic/steroid combination applied to the lid margins for anterior blepharitis (if present)
- Topical corticosteroid (limited-duration)
- Topical secretagogues
- Topical non-glucocorticoid immunomodulatory drugs (such as cyclosporine)

- Topical LFA-1 antagonist drugs (such as lifitegrast)
- Oral macrolide or tetracycline antibiotics

Step 3:
If above options are inadequate consider:

- Oral secretagogues
- Autologous/allogeneic serum eye drops
- Therapeutic contact lens options
- Soft bandage lenses
- Rigid scleral lenses

Step 4:
If above options are inadequate consider:

- Topical corticosteroid for longer duration
- Amniotic membrane grafts
- Surgical punctal occlusion
- Other surgical approaches (eg tarsorrhaphy, salivary gland transplantation)

Society for Vascular Surgery et al.
In 2016, the Society for Vascular Surgery in collaboration with the American Podiatric Medical Association and the Society for Vascular Medicine made the following recommendation: "For DFUs [diabetic foot ulcers] that fail to demonstrate improvement (>50% wound area reduction) after a minimum of 4 weeks of standard wound therapy, we recommend adjunctive wound therapy options. These include negative pressure therapy, biologics (platelet-derived growth factor [PDGF], living cellular therapy, extracellular matrix products, amnionic membrane products), and hyperbaric oxygen therapy. Choice of adjuvant therapy is based on clinical findings, availability of therapy, and cost-effectiveness; there is no recommendation on ordering of therapy choice."

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations
Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage
There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
NCT03414268a	A Phase 3, Prospective, Double-Blinded, Randomized Controlled Trial of the Micronized dHACM Injection As Compared To Saline Placebo Injection In The Treatment Of Plantar Fasciitis	276	Nov 2020
NCT02322554	The Registry of Cellular and Tissue Based Therapies for Chronic Wounds and Ulcers	50,000	Jan 2020
NCT03390920[a]	Evaluation of Outcomes With Amniotic Fluid for Musculoskeletal Conditions	200	Jun 2022
Unpublished			
NCT02609594[a]	A Multi-center Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial Evaluating Two Application Regimens of Amnioband Dehydrated Human Amniotic Membrane and Standard of Care vs. Standard of Care Alone in the Treatment of Venous Leg Ulcers	240	Dec 2018
NCT02838784[a]	The Efficacy and Safety of Artacent™‡ for Treatment Resistant Lower Extremity Venous and Diabetic Ulcers: A Prospective Randomized Study	134	Dec 2018

NCT02880592[a]	A Multi-center, Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial Evaluating the Effect of Fresh Amniotic Membrane in the Treatment of Diabetic Foot Ulcers	100	Jan 2019
NCT03441607[a]	Safety & Efficacy of Micronized Human Amnion Chorion Membrane Biologic (mHACMb) FloGraft (Micronized Human Amnion Chorion Membrane)® in Adults With Pain Due to Osteoarthritis of the Knee	320	Mar 2019
NCT02318511[a]	An Investigation of ReNu™ Knee Injection: Monitoring the Response of Knee Function and Pain in Patients With Osteoarthritis	200	Feb 2019
NCT03414255[a]	A Phase 3, Prospective, Double-Blinded, Randomized Controlled Trial Of The Micronized dHACM Injection As Compared To Saline Placebo Injection In The Treatment Of Achilles Tendonitis	158	Dec 2019
NCT03379324[a]	A Prospective, Randomized Study Comparing Outcomes Following Arthroscopic Double-row Rotator Cuff Repair With and Without the Addition of a Cryopreserved, Liquid, Injectable Amnion Allograft	260	Sep 2019 (status unknown)
NCT02765737[a]	Dehydrated Human Amnion Chorion Membrane (dHACM) vs. Control in the Treatment of Partial Thickness Burns	60	Dec 2018

NCT: national clinical trial.
[a] Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

References

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, Medical Policy Reference Manual, "Amniotic Membrane and Amniotic Fluid", 7.01.149, March 2020.
2. Parolini O, Soncini M, Evangelista M, et al. Amniotic membrane and amniotic fluid-derived cells: potential tools for regenerative medicine? Regen Med. Mar 2009;4(2):275-291. PMID 19317646
3. Koob TJ, Rennert R, Zabek N, et al. Biological properties of dehydrated human amnion/chorion composite graft: implications for chronic wound healing. Int Wound J. Oct 2013;10(5):493-500. PMID 23902526
4. Shimberg M, Wadsworth K. The use of amniotic-fluid concentrate in orthopaedic conditions. J Bone Joint Surg. 1938;20(I):167-177.
5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Regulatory Considerations for Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products: Minimal Manipulation and Homologous Use Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff. 2017 https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=FDA-2017-D-6146-0003
6. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Summary: ProKeraTM Bio-Tissue Inc. (K032104). 2003; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf3/K032104.pdf. Accessed January 26, 2018.
7. Ananian, CC, Dhillon, YY, Van Gils, CC, Lindsey, DD, Otto, RR, Dove, CC, Pierce, JJ, Saunders, MM. A multicenter, randomized, single-blind trial comparing the efficacy of viable cryopreserved placental membrane to human fibroblast-derived dermal substitute for the treatment of chronic diabetic foot ulcers. Wound Repair Regen, 2018 Aug 12;26(3). PMID 30098272
8. Tettelbach, WW, Cazzell, SS, Sigal, FF, Caporusso, JJ, Agnew, PP, Hanft, JJ, Dove, CC. A multicentre prospective randomised controlled comparative parallel study of dehydrated human umbilical cord (EpiCord) allograft for the treatment of diabetic foot ulcers. 2019 Feb; 16(1): 122 -130. PMID 30246926
9. DiDomenico LA, Orgill DP, Galiano RD, et al. Use of an aseptically processed, dehydrated human amnion and chorion membrane improves likelihood and rate of healing in chronic diabetic foot ulcers: A prospective, randomised, multi-centre clinical trial in 80 patients. Int Wound J, 2018 Jul 19;15(6). PMID 30019528
10. Snyder RJ, Shimozaki K, Tallis A, et al. A prospective, randomized, multicenter, controlled evaluation of the use of dehydrated amniotic membrane allograft compared to standard of care for the closure of chronic diabetic foot ulcer. Wounds. Mar 2016;28(3):70-77. PMID 26978860

11. Zelen CM, Gould L, Serena TE, et al. A prospective, randomised, controlled, multi-centre comparative effectiveness study of healing using dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane allograft, bioengineered skin substitute or standard of care for treatment of chronic lower extremity diabetic ulcers. Int Wound J. Dec 2015;12(6):724-732. PMID 25424146
12. Zelen CM, Serena TE, Gould L, et al. Treatment of chronic diabetic lower extremity ulcers with advanced therapies: a prospective, randomised, controlled, multi-centre comparative study examining clinical efficacy and cost. Int Wound J. Apr 2016;13(2):272-282. PMID 26695998
13. Tettelbach W, Cazzell S, Reyzelman AM et al. A confirmatory study on the efficacy of dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane dHACM allograft in the management of diabetic foot ulcers: A prospective, multicentre, randomised, controlled study of 110 patients from 14 wound clinics.. Int Wound J, 2018 Aug 24;16(1). PMID 30136445
14. Lavery LA, Fulmer J, Shebetka KA, et al. The efficacy and safety of Grafix((R)) for the treatment of chronic diabetic foot ulcers: results of a multi-centre, controlled, randomised, blinded, clinical trial. Int Wound J. Oct 2014;11(5):554-560. PMID 25048468
15. Smiell JM, Treadwell T, Hahn HD, et al. Real-world experience with a decellularized dehydrated human amniotic membrane allograft. Wounds. Jun 2015;27(6):158-169. PMID 26061491
16. Frykberg, RR, Gibbons, GG, Walters, JJ, Wukich, DD, Milstein, FF. A prospective, multicentre, open-label, single-arm clinical trial for treatment of chronic complex diabetic foot wounds with exposed tendon and/or bone: positive clinical outcomes of viable cryopreserved human placental membrane.. Int Wound J, 2016 Aug 5;14(3). PMID 27489115
17. Serena TE, Carter MJ, Le LT, et al. A multicenter, randomized, controlled clinical trial evaluating the use of dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane allografts and multilayer compression therapy vs. multilayer compression therapy alone in the treatment of venous leg ulcers. Wound Repair and Regeneration. Nov-Dec 2014;22(6):688-693. PMID 25224019
18. Bianchi C, Cazzell S, Vayser D, et al. A multicentre randomised controlled trial evaluating the efficacy of dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane (EpiFix(R)) allograft for the treatment of venous leg ulcers. Int Wound J. Oct 11 2017. PMID 29024419
19. Bianchi C, Tettelbach W, Istwan N, et al. Variations in study outcomes relative to intention-to-treat and per-protocol data analysis techniques in the evaluation of efficacy for treatment of venous leg ulcers with dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane allograft. Int Wound J, 2019 Mar 14;16(3). PMID 30864259
20. Vines JB, Aliprantis AO, Gomoll AH, et al. Cryopreserved amniotic suspension for the treatment of knee osteoarthritis. J Knee Surg. Aug 2016;29(6):443-450. PMID 26683979

21. Tsikopoulos K, Vasiliadis HS, Mavridis D. Injection therapies for plantar fasciopathy ('plantar fasciitis'): a systematic review and network meta-analysis of 22 randomised controlled trials. Br J Sports Med. Nov 2016;50(22):1367-1375. PMID 27143138
22. Zelen CM, Poka A, Andrews J. Prospective, randomized, blinded, comparative study of injectable micronized dehydrated amniotic/chorionic membrane allograft for plantar fasciitis--a feasibility study. Foot Ankle Int. Oct 2013;34(10):1332-1339. PMID 23945520
23. Cazzell, SS, Stewart, JJ, Agnew, PP, Senatore, JJ, Walters, JJ, Murdoch, DD, Reyzelman, AA, Miller, SS. Randomized Controlled Trial of Micronized Dehydrated Human Amnion/Chorion Membrane (dHACM) Injection Compared to Placebo for the Treatment of Plantar Fasciitis.. NA. PMID 30058377
24. Khokhar, SS, Natung, TT, Sony, PP, Sharma, NN, Agarwal, NN, Vajpayee, RR. Amniotic membrane transplantation in refractory neurotrophic corneal ulcers: a randomized, controlled clinical trial. Cornea, 2005 Jul 15;24(6). PMID 16015082
25. Suri, KK, Kosker, MM, Raber, II, Hammersmith, KK, Nagra, PP, Ayres, BB, Halfpenny, CC, Rapuano, CC. Sutureless amniotic membrane ProKera for ocular surface disorders: short-term results. Eye Contact Lens, 2013 Aug 16;39(5). PMID 23945524
26. Liu J, Li L, Li X. Effectiveness of Cryopreserved Amniotic Membrane Transplantation in Corneal Ulceration: A Meta-Analysis. Cornea. 2019 Apr;38(4). PMID 30702468
27. Paris Fdos S, Goncalves ED, Campos MS, et al. Amniotic membrane transplantation versus anterior stromal puncture in bullous keratopathy: a comparative study. Br J Ophthalmol. Aug 2013;97(8):980-984. PMID 23723410
28. Kheirkhah, AA, Casas, VV, Raju, VV, Tseng, SS. Sutureless amniotic membrane transplantation for partial limbal stem cell deficiency.. Am. J. Ophthalmol., 2008 Mar 11;145(5). PMID 18329626
29. Pachigolla, GG, Prasher, PP, Di Pascuale, MM, McCulley, JJ, McHenry, JJ, Mootha, VV. Evaluation of the role of ProKera in the management of ocular surface and orbital disorders.. Eye Contact Lens, 2009 May 29;35(4). PMID 19474753
30. Sharma N, Thenarasun SA, Kaur M, et al. Adjuvant role of amniotic membrane transplantation in acute ocular stevens-johnson syndrome: a randomized control trial. Ophthalmology. Mar 2016;123(3):484-491. PMID 26686968
31. Bouchard, CC, John, TT. Amniotic membrane transplantation in the management of severe ocular surface disease: indications and outcomes.. Ocul Surf, 2007 Jan 12;2(3). PMID 17216092

32. John, TT, Tighe, SS, Sheha, HH, Hamrah, PP, Salem, ZZ, Cheng, AA, Wang, MM, Rock, NN. Corneal Nerve Regeneration after Self-Retained Cryopreserved Amniotic Membrane in Dry Eye Disease.. J Ophthalmol, 2017 Sep 13;2017:6404918. PMID 28894606
33. McDonald, MM, Sheha, HH, Tighe, SS, Janik, SS, Bowden, FF, Chokshi, AA, Singer, MM, Nanda, SS, Qazi, MM, Dierker, DD, Shupe, AA, McMurren, BB. Treatment outcomes in the DRy Eye Amniotic Membrane (DREAM) study.. Clin Ophthalmol, 2018 Apr 20;12:677-681. PMID 29670328
34. Tandon, RR, Gupta, NN, Kalaivani, MM, Sharma, NN, Titiyal, JJ, Vajpayee, RR. Amniotic membrane transplantation as an adjunct to medical therapy in acute ocular burns.. Br J Ophthalmol, 2010 Aug 3;95(2). PMID 20675729
35. Eslani M, Baradaran-Rafii A, Cheung AY et al. Amniotic Membrane Transplantation in Acute Severe Ocular Chemical Injury: A Randomized Clinical Trial. Am. J. Ophthalmol. 2019 Mar;199:209-215. PMID 30419194
36. Tamhane A, Vajpayee RB, Biswas NR, et al. Evaluation of amniotic membrane transplantation as an adjunct to medical therapy as compared with medical therapy alone in acute ocular burns. Ophthalmology. 2005 Nov;112(11). PMID 16198422
37. Kheirkhah, AA, Johnson, DD, Paranjpe, DD, Raju, VV, Casas, VV, Tseng, SS. Temporary sutureless amniotic membrane patch for acute alkaline burns.. Arch. Ophthalmol., 2008 Aug 13;126(8). PMID 18695099
38. Kaufman SC, Jacobs DS, Lee WB, et al. Options and adjuvants in surgery for pterygium: a report by the American Academy of Ophthalmology. Ophthalmology. Jan 2013;120(1):201-208. PMID 23062647
39. Clearfield, EE, Muthappan, VV, Wang, XX, Kuo, II. Conjunctival autograft for pterygium. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016 Feb 13;2:CD011349. PMID 26867004
40. Hingorani, AA, LaMuraglia, GG, Henke, PP, Meissner, MM, Loretz, LL, Zinszer, KK, Driver, VV, Frykberg, RR, Carman, TT, Marston, WW, Mills, JJ, Murad, MM. The management of diabetic foot: A clinical practice guideline by the Society for Vascular Surgery in collaboration with the American Podiatric Medical Association and the Society for Vascular Medicine.. NA. PMID 26804367
41. Elraiyah T, et al. Management of diabetic foot ulcers. Medline Abstract. J Vasc Surg. 2016;63(2Suppl):59S.

Policy History

Original Effective Date: 08/19/2015
Current Effective Date: 11/01/2020

08/06/2015	Medical Policy Committee review
08/19/2015	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. New policy.
08/04/2016	Medical Policy Committee review
08/17/2016	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
01/01/2017	Coding update: Removing ICD-9 Diagnosis Codes
08/03/2017	Medical Policy Committee review
08/23/2017	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. AmnioBand Membrane, Biovance, Epifix, Grafix considered medically necessary for diabetic foot ulcers; all other products and indications are investigational. Sutured amniotic membrane grafts considered medically necessary for neurotrophic keratitis, corneal ulcers and melts, following pterygium repair, Stevens-Johnson syndrome, and persistent epithelial defects. Ophthalmic products added and discontinued product names removed from Table 1.
05/03/2018	Medical Policy Committee review
05/16/2018	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Investigational indications clarified.
04/04/2019	Medical Policy Committee review
04/24/2019	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. EpiCord add to medically necessary statement for diabetic lower extremity ulcers. Sutured and non-sutured amniotic membrane may be considered medically necessary for specified ophthalmic conditions.
08/01/2019	Medical Policy Committee review
08/14/2019	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Added criteria for non healing diabetic ulcers.
08/06/2020	Medical Policy Committee review
08/12/2020	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. 60-day provider notification required as proposed changes will result in more restrictive coverage criteria. Effective date is 11/01/2020. Replaced “diabetic lower extremity ulcers” with “diabetic foot ulcers” in the eligible for coverage statement for treatment of nonhealing and not clinically infected diabetic foot ulcers. This change is proposed to make distinction/clarification between other lower extremity ulcers in diabetics and true non-healing diabetic foot ulcers.

Added the requirement that "patient agrees to comply with adequate mechanical offloading" for initial placement and similarly for continued treatment eligible for coverage criteria for additional applications, adding that "patient remains compliant with adequate mechanical offloading".
Revised the Policy Guidelines definition of non-healing diabetic wounds was revised to "an ulcer that fails to demonstrate > 50% wound area reduction after a minimum of 4 weeks of standard wound therapy." It replaces the previous definition that was worded as "fails to demonstrate 20% decrease in wound area with standard wound care for at least 2 weeks."

Coding

The five character codes included in the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines are obtained from Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®)‡, copyright 2019 by the American Medical Association (AMA). CPT is developed by the AMA as a listing of descriptive terms and five character identifying codes and modifiers for reporting medical services and procedures performed by physician.

The responsibility for the content of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines is with Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and no endorsement by the AMA is intended or should be implied. The AMA disclaims responsibility for any consequences or liability attributable or related to any use, nonuse or interpretation of information contained in Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines. Fee schedules, relative value units, conversion factors and/or related components are not assigned by the AMA, are not part of CPT, and the AMA is not recommending their use. The AMA does not directly or indirectly practice medicine or dispense medical services. The AMA assumes no liability for data contained or not contained herein. Any use of CPT outside of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines should refer to the most current Current Procedural Terminology which contains the complete and most current listing of CPT codes and descriptive terms. Applicable FARS/DFARS apply.

CPT is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association.

Amniotic Membrane and Amniotic Fluid

Policy # 00458
Original Effective Date: 08/19/2015
Current Effective Date: 11/01/2020

Codes used to identify services associated with this policy may include (but may not be limited to) the following:

Code Type	Code
CPT	15271, 15275, 17999, 65778, 65779
HCPCS	Q4100, Q4132, Q4133, Q4137, Q4138, Q4139, Q4140, Q4145, Q4148, Q4150. Q4151, Q4153, Q4154, Q4155, Q4156, Q4157, Q4159, Q4160, Q4162, Q4163, Q4168, Q4169, Q4170, Q4171, Q4173, Q4174, Q4177, Q4178, Q4179, Q4181, Q4183, Q4184, Q4185, Q4186, Q4187, Q4188, Q4189, Q4190, Q4191, Q4192, Q4194, Q4198, Q4201, Q4204, Q4205, Q4206, Q4208, Q4209, Q4210, Q4211, Q4212, Q4213, Q4214, Q4215, Q4216, Q4217, Q4218, Q4219, Q4221, V2790 Added codes eff 7/1/2020: Q4176, Q4227, Q4228, Q4229, Q4230, Q4231, Q4232, Q4233, Q4234, Q4235, Q4236, Q4237, Q4239, Q4240, Q4241, Q4242, Q4244, Q4245, Q4246, Q4247, Q4248 Added codes eff 10/1/2020: Q4249, Q4250, Q4254
ICD-10 Diagnosis	All related diagnoses

*Investigational – A medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational if the effectiveness has not been clearly tested and it has not been incorporated into standard medical practice. Any determination we make that a medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational will be based on a consideration of the following:

A. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product can be lawfully marketed without approval of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and whether such approval has been granted at the time the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is sought to be furnished; or
B. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product requires further studies or clinical trials to determine its maximum tolerated dose, toxicity, safety, effectiveness, or effectiveness as compared with the standard means of treatment or diagnosis, must improve health outcomes, according to the consensus of opinion among experts as shown by reliable evidence, including:
    1. Consultation with the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association technology assessment program (TEC) or other nonaffiliated technology evaluation center(s);

2. Credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community; or
3. Reference to federal regulations.

**Medically Necessary (or "Medical Necessity") - Health care services, treatment, procedures, equipment, drugs, devices, items or supplies that a Provider, exercising prudent clinical judgment, would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury, disease or its symptoms, and that are:

A. In accordance with nationally accepted standards of medical practice;
B. Clinically appropriate, in terms of type, frequency, extent, level of care, site and duration, and considered effective for the patient's illness, injury or disease; and
C. Not primarily for the personal comfort or convenience of the patient, physician or other health care provider, and 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 that patient's illness, injury or disease.

For these purposes, "nationally accepted standards of medical practice" means standards that are based on credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, Physician Specialty Society recommendations and the views of Physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas and any other relevant factors.

‡ Indicated trademarks are the registered trademarks of their respective owners.

NOTICE: If the Patient's health insurance contract contains language that differs from the BCBSLA Medical Policy definition noted above, the definition in the health insurance contract will be relied upon for specific coverage determinations.

NOTICE: Medical Policies are scientific based opinions, provided solely for coverage and informational purposes. Medical Policies should not be construed to suggest that the Company recommends, advocates, requires, encourages, or discourages any particular treatment, procedure, or service, or any particular course of treatment, procedure, or service.