



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

64550, 59572, 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.

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 the use of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) devices for the treatment of musculoskeletal pain to be **eligible for coverage**.

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 the use of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) to be **investigational*** for the following indications:

- To relieve the pain of labor and vaginal delivery; or
- For the treatment of dementia.

Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of interferential current stimulation (IFS) to be **investigational*** for the following indications:

- For the relief of pain associated with soft tissue injury, musculoskeletal disorders; or
- Enhancing wound and fracture healing.

Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of H-wave stimulation for all applications to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of threshold electrical stimulation as a treatment of motor disorders, including but not limited to cerebral palsy, and all other applications to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of microcurrent stimulation for all applications to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of galvanic stimulation for all applications to be **investigational.***

Background/Overview

The application of electrical stimulation creates the transfer of electrical energy. This transfer is responsible for the physiological changes which occur as a result of the clinical application of electrical stimulation.

©2013 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.

Page 1 of 17



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

These changes occur at the cellular, tissue, segmental and systemic levels of the biological system and can be classified as electrothermal, electrochemical or electrophysical.

Electrothermal Reactions

The movement of charged particles in the conductive medium results in micro vibration of particles, causing minute frictional forces that eventually led to the production of heat.

Electrochemical Reactions

Direct current application is most commonly associated with electrochemical reactions. The unidirectional flow caused by direct current re-distributes sodium and chlorine resulting in the formation of new compounds in the tissues under the electrodes. The normal reaction of the body to non-extensive chemical changes is to increase blood flow in order to restore tissue pH.

Electrophysical Reactions

The movement of ions results in the excitation of peripheral nerves and the stimulation of the movement of sodium and potassium ions across the cell membrane.

Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS)

Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation describes the application of electrical stimulation to the surface of the skin at the site of pain. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation may be applied in a variety of settings (in the patient's home, a physician's office, or in an outpatient clinic).

Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation has been used to treat chronic intractable pain, postsurgical pain, and pain associated with active or post-trauma injury unresponsive to other standard pain therapies. It has been proposed that TENS may provide pain relief through release of endorphins in addition to potential blockade of local pain pathways.

Interferential Stimulation (IFS)

Interferential current stimulation is a type of electrical stimulation. It is believed that IFS permeates the tissues more effectively and thus is more comfortable than TENS. Interferential current stimulation has been investigated primarily as a technique to reduce pain but has also been proposed to increase function of patients with osteoarthritis and to treat other conditions such as dyspepsia, irritable bowel syndrome, and constipation.

Interferential current stimulation is a type of electrical stimulation that uses paired electrodes of 2 independent circuits carrying high-frequency (4,000 Hz) and medium-frequency (150 Hz) alternating currents. The superficial electrodes are aligned on the skin around the affected area. It is believed that IFS permeates the tissues more effectively and, with less unwanted stimulation of cutaneous nerves, is more comfortable than TENS. Interferential stimulation has been investigated as a technique to reduce pain, improve range of motion, and treat a variety of gastrointestinal disorders. There are no standardized protocols for the use of interferential therapy; the therapy may vary according to the frequency of stimulation, the pulse duration, treatment time, and electrode-placement technique.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142
Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005
Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

H-Wave Stimulation

H-wave stimulation is a distinct form of electrical stimulation, and an H-wave device is U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) -approved for medical purposes that involve repeated muscle contractions. H-wave electrical stimulation has been evaluated primarily as a pain treatment, but it has also been studied for other indications such as wound healing and improving post-surgical range of motion. Both office-based and home models of the H-wave device are available.

H-wave stimulation is a form of electrical stimulation that differs from other forms of electrical stimulation, such as TENS, in terms of its wave form. While H-wave stimulation may be performed by physicians, physiatrists, chiropractors, or podiatrists, H-wave devices are also available for home use. H-wave stimulation has been used for the treatment of pain related to a variety of etiologies, such as diabetic neuropathy, muscle sprains, temporomandibular joint dysfunctions, or reflex sympathetic dystrophy. H-wave stimulation has also been used to accelerate healing of wounds such as diabetic ulcers and to improve range of motion and function after orthopedic surgery.

H-wave electrical stimulation must be distinguished from the H-waves that are a component of electromyography.

Threshold Electrical Stimulation (TES)

Threshold electrical stimulation is provided by a small electrical generator, lead wires, and surface electrodes that are placed over the targeted muscles. The intensity of the stimulation is set at the sensory threshold and does not cause a muscle contraction.

Threshold electrical stimulation is described as the delivery of low-intensity electrical stimulation to target spastic muscles during sleep at home. The stimulation is not intended to cause muscle contraction. Although the mechanism of action is not understood, it is thought that low-intensity stimulation may increase muscle strength and joint mobility, leading to improved voluntary motor function. The technique has been used most extensively in children with spastic diplegia related to cerebral palsy but also in those with other motor disorders, such as spina bifida.

Microcurrent Stimulation

Microcurrent stimulation therapy involves the application of a very precise, low, tightly controlled electrical direct current to specific points on the body that correspond with classical acupuncture points. Unlike TENS, which blocks pain, microcurrent stimulation, usually at less than 600 μ A, acts on the naturally occurring electrical impulses to decrease pain by stimulating the healing process through an increased production of adenosine triphosphate (ATP) levels. Any form of stimulation at 1,000 microamps causes an initial plateau and then a reduction of ATP.

Galvanic Stimulation

Galvanic stimulation is characterized by high voltage, pulsed stimulation and is used primarily for local edema reduction through muscle pumping and polarity effect. Edema is comprised of negatively charged plasma proteins, which leak into the interstitial space. The theory of galvanic stimulation is that by placing a negative electrode over the edematous site and a positive electrode at a distant site, the monophasic high

©2013 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142
Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005
Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

voltage stimulus applies an electrical potential which disperses the negatively charged proteins away from the edematous site, thereby helping to reduce edema.

FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval

Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS)

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) currently have the following national coverage decisions on TENS:

- National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulators (TENS) (280.13)

Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation is a type of electrical nerve stimulator that is employed to treat chronic intractable pain. This stimulator is attached to the surface of the patient's skin over the peripheral nerve to be stimulated. It may be applied in a variety of settings (in the patient's home, a physician's office, or in an outpatient clinic). Payment for TENS may be made under the durable medical equipment benefit. Also see NCDs on Supplies Used in the Delivery of TENS and NMES (§160.13) and TENS for Acute Post-Operative Pain (§10.2).

- Decision Memo for Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation for Chronic Low Back Pain (CAG-00429N)

In June 2012, CMS determined that TENS is not reasonable and necessary for the treatment of chronic low back pain. However, to support further research on the use of TENS for chronic low back pain, CMS will provide coverage under evidence development for a period of 3 years after the publication of this decision.

- National Coverage Determination for Assessing Patient's Suitability for Electrical Nerve Stimulation Therapy (160.7.1)

Electrical nerve stimulation is an accepted modality for assessing a patient's suitability for ongoing treatment with a transcutaneous or an implanted nerve stimulator. Accordingly, program payment may be made for the following techniques when used to determine the potential therapeutic usefulness of an electrical nerve stimulator:

A. Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation

This technique involves attachment of a transcutaneous nerve stimulator to the surface of the skin over the peripheral nerve to be stimulated. It is used by the patient on a trial basis and its effectiveness in modulating pain is monitored by the physician, or physical therapist. Generally, the physician or physical therapist is able to determine whether the patient is likely to derive a significant therapeutic benefit from continuous use of a transcutaneous stimulator within a trial period of 1 month; in a few cases this determination may take longer to make. Document the medical necessity for such services which are furnished beyond the first month. (See §160.13 for an explanation of coverage of medically necessary supplies for the effective use of TENS.) If TENS significantly alleviates pain, it may be considered as primary treatment; if it produces no

©2013 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

relief or greater discomfort than the original pain electrical nerve stimulation therapy is ruled out. However, where TENS produces incomplete relief, further evaluation with percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation may be considered to determine whether an implanted peripheral nerve stimulator would provide significant relief from pain.

Usually, the physician or physical therapist providing the services will furnish the equipment necessary for assessment. Where the physician or physical therapist advises the patient to rent the TENS from a supplier during the trial period rather than supplying it himself/herself, program payment may be made for rental of the TENS as well as for the services of the physician or physical therapist who is evaluating its use. However, the combined program payment which is made for the physician's or physical therapist's services and the rental of the stimulator from a supplier should not exceed the amount which would be payable for the total service, including the stimulator, furnished by the physician or physical therapist alone.

- National Coverage Determination for Supplies Used in the Delivery of Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) and Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation (NMES) (160.13)

Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation and/or NMES can ordinarily be delivered to patients through the use of conventional electrodes, adhesive tapes and lead wires. There may be times, however, where it might be medically necessary for certain patients receiving TENS or NMES treatment to use, as an alternative to conventional electrodes, adhesive tapes and lead wires, a form-fitting conductive garment (i.e., a garment with conductive fibers which are separated from the patients' skin by layers of fabric).

A form-fitting conductive garment (and medically necessary related supplies) may be covered under the program only when:

1. It has received permission or approval for marketing by the Food and Drug Administration;
2. It has been prescribed by a physician for use in delivering covered TENS or NMES treatment; and
3. One of the medical indications outlined below is met:
 - o The patient cannot manage without the conductive garment because there is such a large area or so many sites to be stimulated and the stimulation would have to be delivered so frequently that it is not feasible to use conventional electrodes, adhesive tapes and lead wires;
 - o The patient cannot manage without the conductive garment for the treatment of chronic intractable pain because the areas or sites to be stimulated are inaccessible with the use of conventional electrodes, adhesive tapes and lead wires;
 - o The patient has a documented medical condition such as skin problems that preclude the application of conventional electrodes, adhesive tapes and lead wires;
 - o The patient requires electrical stimulation beneath a cast either to treat disuse atrophy, where the nerve supply to the muscle is intact, or to treat chronic intractable pain; or
 - o The patient has a medical need for rehabilitation strengthening (pursuant to a written plan of rehabilitation) following an injury where the nerve supply to the muscle is intact.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

A conductive garment is not covered for use with a TENS device during the trial period specified in §160.3 unless:

1. The patient has a documented skin problem prior to the start of the trial period; and
 2. The carrier's medical consultants are satisfied that use of such an item is medically necessary for the patient.
- National Coverage Determination for Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) for Acute Post-Operative Pain (10.2)

The use of TENS for the relief of acute post-operative pain is covered under Medicare. TENS may be covered whether used as an adjunct to the use of drugs, or as an alternative to drugs, in the treatment of acute pain resulting from surgery. TENS devices, whether durable or disposable, may be used in furnishing this service. When used for the purpose of treating acute post-operative pain, TENS devices are considered supplies. As such they may be hospital supplies furnished inpatients covered under Part A, or supplies incident to a physician's service when furnished in connection with surgery done on an outpatient basis, and covered under Part B. It is expected that TENS, when used for acute post-operative pain, will be necessary for relatively short periods of time, usually 30 days or less. In cases when TENS is used for longer periods, contractors should attempt to ascertain whether TENS is no longer being used for acute pain but rather for chronic pain, in which case the TENS device may be covered as durable medical equipment as described in §280.13.

Interferential Stimulation (IFS)

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

A number of interferential stimulator devices have received 510(k) marketing clearance from the FDA, including the Medstar^{TM‡} 100 (MedNet Services) and the RS-4i^{®‡} (RS Medical).

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)

There is no national coverage determination.

H-Wave Stimulation and Threshold Electrical Stimulation (TES)

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

In 1992, the H-Wave^{®‡} muscle stimulator (Electronic Waveform Lab, Huntington Beach, CA) was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) classified H-wave stimulation and TES devices as "powered muscle stimulators." As a class, the FDA describes these devices as being "intended for medical purposes that repeatedly contracts muscles by passing electrical currents through electrodes contacting the affected body area." According to the FDA, manufacturers may make the following claims regarding the effect of the device: "1) relaxation of muscle spasms; 2) prevention or retardation of disuse atrophy; 3) increasing local blood circulation; 4) muscle re-education; 5) immediate post-surgical stimulation of calf muscles to prevent venous thrombosis; and, 6) maintaining or increasing range of motion."



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142
Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005
Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

Uses of the device not cleared by the FDA include, but are not limited to, treatment of diabetic neuropathy and wound healing.

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)

There is no national coverage determination for H-wave stimulation or TES.

Rationale/Source

Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS)

This medical policy was developed through consideration of peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, U.S. FDA approval status, nationally accepted standards of medical practice and accepted standards of medical practice in this community, Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association technology assessment program (TEC) and other non-affiliated technology evaluation centers, reference to federal regulations, other plan medical policies and accredited national guidelines.

Interferential Stimulation (IFS)

As with any treatment focused on pain relief, randomized placebo-controlled trials are particularly important to determine if any treatment effect exceeds the expected treatment effect.

Musculoskeletal pain, range of motion, and function

In 2010, Fuentes and colleagues published a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) evaluating the effectiveness of IFS for treating pain. A total of 20 RCTs met the following inclusion criteria: included adults diagnosed with a painful musculoskeletal condition; compared IFS (alone or as a co-intervention) to placebo, no treatment, or an alternative intervention; and assessed pain on a numeric scale. Fourteen of the trials reported data that could be included in a pooled analysis. Interferential stimulation as a stand-alone intervention was not found to be more effective than placebo or an alternative intervention. For example, a pooled analysis of 2 studies comparing IFC alone and placebo did not find a statistically significant difference in pain intensity at discharge; the pooled mean difference (MD) was 1.17 (95% confidence interval [CI]:1.70 to 4.05). In addition, a pooled analysis of 2 studies comparing IFC alone and an alternative intervention (e.g., traction or massage) did not find a significant difference in pain intensity at discharge; the pooled MD was -0.16, 95% CI: -0.62 to 0.31. Moreover, in a pooled analysis of 5 studies comparing IFC as a co-intervention to a placebo group, there was a non-significant finding (MD = 1.60, 95% CI: -0.13 to 3.34). The meta-analysis found IFC plus another intervention to be superior to a control group (e.g., no-treatment). A pooled analysis of 3 studies found an MD of 2.45 (95% CI:1.69 to 3.22). The latter analysis is limited in that the specific effects of IFC versus the co-intervention cannot be determined, and it does not control for potential placebo effects.

The 2 trials identified that compared IFC alone to placebo had relatively small sample sizes in each treatment group. Defrin and colleagues included a total of 62 patients with osteoarthritic knee pain, randomly assigned to one of 6 groups (there were 4 active treatment groups and 2 control groups, sham and non-treated). Acute pre- versus post-treatment reductions in pain were found in all active groups but not in either control group. Stimulation resulted in a modest pre-treatment elevation of pain threshold over the 4 weeks of the study. Taylor and colleagues randomly assigned 40 patients with temporomandibular joint syndrome or myofascial pain syndrome to undergo either active or placebo interferential therapy. The

©2013 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142
Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005
Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

principal outcomes were pain assessed by a questionnaire and range of motion (ROM). There were no statistically significant differences in the outcomes between the 2 groups.

Representative recent trials on IFS for treating musculoskeletal pain are described below.

In 2012, Atamaz and colleagues conducted a double-blind RCT comparing the efficacy of IFS, TENS, and shortwave diathermy in 203 patients with knee osteoarthritis. Patients were randomized to one of 6 groups, 3 with active treatment and 3 with sham treatment. The primary outcome was a 0 to 100 visual analog scale (VAS) assessing knee pain. Other outcomes included range of motion, time to walk 15 meters, paracetamol intake, the Nottingham Health Profile (NHP) and the Western Ontario and McMaster University Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC). At the 1-, 3-, and 6-month follow-ups, there was not a statistically significant difference among the 6 groups in the VAS pain score, the WOMAC pain score or the NHP pain score. Moreover, the WOMAC function score, time to walk 15 meters, and the NHP physical mobility score did not differ significantly among groups at any of the follow-up assessments. At the 1-month follow-up, paracetamol intake was significantly lower in the IFS group than the TENS group.

In 2011, Facci and colleagues in Brazil published an RCT that compared IFS ($n = 50$) and TENS ($n = 50$) to a no-treatment control group ($n = 40$) in patients with chronic low-back pain. Patients were assessed by a blinded evaluator before and after completing ten 30-minute treatment sessions over 2 weeks. Patients in the control group were reassessed after 2 weeks. A total of 137 of 150 (91%) patients completed the intervention; analysis was intention to treat. The mean pain intensity, as measured by a 10-point VAS, decreased 4.48 cm in the IFS group, 3.91 cm in the TENS group, and 0.85 cm in the control group. There was not a statistically significant difference in pain reduction in the active treatment groups. Both groups experienced significantly greater pain reduction than the control group. Since a sham treatment was not used, a placebo effect cannot be ruled out when comparing active to control treatments. Moreover, findings from this trial do not demonstrate equivalence between IFS and TENS; studies with larger numbers of patients that are designed as equivalence or non-inferiority trials would be needed before drawing this conclusion.

In a 2011 study, Gundog and colleagues in Turkey randomly assigned 60 patients with knee osteoarthritis to 1 of 4 groups; 3 IFS groups at frequencies of 40 Hz, 100 Hz, and 180 Hz, or sham IFS. Interferential stimulation or sham IFS treatments were performed 5 times a week for 3 weeks. During the sham treatment, placement of the pads was the same and duration was the same, but no electrical stimulation was applied. The primary outcome was pain intensity assessed by the WOMAC. Mean WOMAC scores one month after treatment were 7.2 in the 40 Hz group, 6.7 in the 100 Hz group, 7.8 in the 180 Hz group, and 16.1 in the sham IFS group ($p < 0.05$ compared to the active treatment groups). Secondary outcomes also showed significantly higher benefit in the active treatment groups compared to the sham IFS group. For example, one outcome was pain on movement according to a 100-point visual analogue scale (VAS) score. One month after treatment, the mean VAS score was 16.0 in the 40 Hz group, 17.0 in the 100 Hz group, 22.5 in the 180 Hz group, and 58.5 in the sham group. There were no significant differences in outcomes among the 3 active treatment groups. The number of patients assigned to each group and patient follow-up rates were not reported.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

Conclusions: A large number of RCTs have been performed using IFS for musculoskeletal conditions. These have varied in the adjunct treatments that are used, comparison groups, types of controls, and outcome measures. Many of these trials have methodologic limitations such as an inadequate placebo control and/or the use of multiple treatment modalities. While some of these studies have reported benefit, the majority do not. A meta-analysis of RCTs did not find a significant benefit of IFS over control for treating pain. The body of evidence suggests, although is not definitive, that IFS is not efficacious for improving pain, function and/or range of motion for patients with musculoskeletal conditions.

Gastrointestinal disorders

Constipation

Several RCTs evaluating IFS for treating children with constipation and/or other lower gastrointestinal symptoms were identified. The RCTs had small sample sizes and did not consistently find a benefit of interferential stimulation. For example, in 2012, Kajbafzadeh and colleagues in Iran randomized 30 children with intractable constipation to receive IFS or sham stimulation. Children ranged in age from 3 to 12 years-old, and all had failed 6 months of conventional therapy e.g., dietary changes and laxatives. Patients received fifteen 20-minute sessions, 3 times a week over 5 weeks. Over 6 months, the mean frequency of defecation increased from 2.5 times per week to 4.7 times per week in the treatment group and from 2.8 times per week to 2.9 times per week in the control group. The mean pain during defecation score decreased from 0.35 to 0.20 in the treatment group and from 0.29 to 0.22 in the control group. The authors reported that there was a statistically significant difference between groups in constipation symptoms.

Another RCT was published by Clarke and colleagues in 2009; the study was conducted in Australia. Thirty-three children with slow transit constipation (mean age, 12 years) were randomized to receive IFS or sham treatment. They received twelve 20-minute sessions over 4 weeks. The primary outcome was health-related quality of life and the main instrument used was the Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory (PedsQL). The authors only reported within-group changes; they did not compare the treatment and control groups. There was not a statistically significant change in QOL, as perceived by the parent in either the active or sham treatment group. The mean parentally perceived QOL scores changed from 70.3 to 70.1 in the active treatment group and from 69.8 to 70.2 in the control group. There was also no significant difference in QOL, as perceived by the child after sham treatment. The score on the PedQL group as perceived by the child, did increase significantly in the active treatment group (mean of 72.9 pre-treatment and 81.1 post-treatment, $p = 0.005$).

Irritable bowel disease

An RCT with adults was published in 2012 by Coban and colleagues in Turkey. The authors randomized 67 individuals with irritable bowel syndrome to active or placebo IFS. Patients with functional dyspepsia were excluded. Patients received a total of four 15-minute sessions over 4 weeks. Fifty-eight of 67 (87%) patients completed the study. One month after treatment, primary outcomes measures did not differ significantly between the treatment and control groups. Treatment response was defined as more than a 50% improvement in symptoms. For the symptom of abdominal discomfort, for example, the response rate was 68% in the treatment group and 44% in the control group. For bloating and discomfort, the response rate was 48% in the treatment group and 46% in the placebo group. Using a VAS measure, 72% of the treatment group and 69% of the control group reported improvement in abdominal discomfort.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

Dyspepsia

One RCT, by Koklu and colleagues in Turkey, was identified that evaluated interferential current stimulation for treating dyspepsia. The study randomized patients to active IFS (n = 25) or sham treatment (n = 25); patients were unaware of treatment allocation. There were 12 treatment sessions over 4 weeks; each session lasted 15 minutes. A total of 44 of 50 (88%) randomized patients completed the therapy session and follow-up questionnaires at 2 and 4 weeks. The authors did not specify primary outcome variables; they measured the frequency of 10 gastrointestinal symptoms. In an intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis at 4 weeks, IFS was superior to placebo for the symptoms of early satiation and heartburn, but not for the other 8 symptoms. For example, before treatment, 16 of 25 (64%) patients in each group reported experiencing heartburn. At 4 weeks, 9 patients (36%) in the treatment group and 13 patients (52%) in the sham group reported heartburn; p = 0.02. Among symptoms that did not differ at follow-up between groups, 24 of 25 patients (96%) in each group reported epigastric discomfort before treatment. In the ITT analysis at 4 weeks, 5 of 25 patients (20%) in the treatment group and 6 of 25 (24%) patients in the placebo group reported epigastric discomfort.

Conclusions: Interferential stimulation has been tested for a variety of gastrointestinal (GI) conditions, with a small number of trials completed for each condition. The results of these trials are mixed, with some reporting benefit and others reporting no benefit. This body of evidence is inconclusive to determine whether IFS is an efficacious treatment for GI conditions.

Summary

There is insufficient evidence from well-designed trials that IFS, a type of electrical stimulation, improves health outcomes (e.g., pain, range of motion) for patients diagnosed with painful musculoskeletal conditions. The limited amount of evidence from a few small trials comparing IFS alone to a placebo or sham intervention for treating does not consistently show benefit. Some trials do not control for potential placebo effects, others do not adequately evaluate the incremental effects of IFS beyond that of a co-intervention and/or do not adequately evaluate the equivalence of IFS and an alternative intervention. There is also insufficient evidence that IFS improves health outcomes for patients with other conditions, such as dyspepsia, irritable bowel syndrome, and constipation. Therefore, interferential stimulation is considered investigational.

H-Wave Stimulation

Most of the studies identified in searches evaluated H-wave stimulation for treating pain. As with other technologies intended to relieve pain, measurement of placebo effects is important and therefore the searches focused on placebo (sham)-controlled studies. Studies were also identified on H-wave stimulation for wound healing and post-surgical rehabilitation but not for other clinical applications of the technology. Following is a summary of the key literature to date:

Pain treatment

In 2008, Blum and colleagues published a meta-analysis of studies evaluating the H-Wave device for treatment of chronic soft tissue inflammation and neuropathic pain. Five studies, 2 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and 3 observational studies, met inclusion criteria. Four of the studies used a measure of pain reduction. In a pooled analysis of data from these 4 studies (treatment groups only), the mean weighted

©2013 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

effect size was 0.59. Two studies reported the effect of the H-Wave device on pain mediation use; the mean weighted effect size was 0.56. (An effect size of 0.5 is considered a moderate effect and of 0.80 is considered a large effect.) A limitation of this analysis was that the authors did not use data from patients in the control or comparison groups; thus, the incremental effect of the H-Wave device beyond that of a comparison intervention cannot be determined.

The five studies identified by the systematic review for the meta-analysis were published by two research groups; Kumar and colleagues published three studies and the other two were published by Blum and colleagues. Blum and several co-investigators are consultants to the device manufacturer. Descriptions of the individual published studies are included below.

In 1997, Kumar and Marshall published an RCT comparing active H-wave electrical stimulation with sham stimulation for treatment of diabetic peripheral neuropathy. The authors selected 31 patients with type 2 diabetes and painful peripheral neuropathy in both lower extremities lasting at least 2 months. Patients were excluded if they had vascular insufficiency of the legs or feet or specified cardiac conditions. Patients were randomly assigned to the active group ($n = 18$) or the sham group ($n = 13$). Both groups were instructed to use their devices 30 minutes daily for 4 weeks. The device used in the sham group had inactive electrodes. Outcomes were assessed using a pain-grading scale (ranging from 0 to 5). Both groups experienced significant declines in pain, and the post-treatment mean grade for the active group was significantly lower than the mean grade for the sham group. This study did not state whether patients and/or investigators were blinded and did not state whether any patients withdrew from the study.

Another randomized study published by Kumar and colleagues in 1998 compared active H-wave electrical stimulation with sham stimulation among patients treated initially with a tricyclic antidepressant. The authors enrolled 26 patients with type 2 diabetes and painful peripheral neuropathy persisting for 2 months or more. Exclusion criteria were similar to those used in the earlier study. Amitriptyline was administered for 4 weeks initially, and those who had a partial response or no response were later randomly assigned to the 2 groups. After excluding 3 amitriptyline responders, the active stimulation group included 14 patients, and the sham stimulation included 9 patients. Sham devices had inactive output terminals. Stimulation therapy lasted 12 weeks, and final outcome assessment was conducted by an investigator blinded to group assignment 4 weeks after the end of treatment. As in the earlier study, mean pain grade in both groups improved significantly, but the difference between groups after treatment significantly favored active H-wave stimulation. Results on an analogue scale were similar. It is unclear whether patients were blinded to the type of device, and the report does not note whether withdrawals from the study occurred. A later report from this research group described a case series of 34 patients who continued H-Wave electrical stimulation for more than 1 year and achieved a 44% reduction in symptoms.

Two observational studies on the H-Wave device were published by Blum and colleagues and consisted of patients' responses to 3 of 10 questions on a manufacturer's customer service questionnaire (i.e., warranty registration card). In the larger of the two reports, 80% of 8,498 patients with chronic soft tissue injury and neuropathic pain who were given the H-Wave device completed the questionnaire. The answers were compared with an expected placebo response of 37% improvement. Following an average 87 days of use,



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142
Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005
Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

65% of respondents reported a decrease in the amount of medication needed, 79% reported an increase in function and activity, and 78% of respondents reported an improvement in pain of 25% or greater.

Wound healing

The only published study identified in literature searches was a case report from 2010 describing outcomes in 3 patients with chronic diabetic leg ulcers who used the H-Wave device.

Post-operative rehabilitation

In 2009, Blum and colleagues published a small double-blind placebo-controlled randomized trial evaluating home use of the H-Wave device for improving range of motion and muscle strength after rotator cuff reconstruction surgery. Electrode placement for the H-Wave device was done during the surgical procedure. After surgery, patients were provided with an active H-wave device ($n = 12$) or sham device ($n = 10$) and were instructed to use the device for 1 hour twice daily for 90 days. Individuals in the sham group were told not to expect any sensation from the device. Both groups also received standard physical therapy. At follow-up, range of motion of the involved extremity was compared to that of the uninvolved extremity. At the 90-day postoperative examination, patients in the H-wave group had significantly less loss of external rotation of the involved extremity (mean loss of 11.7 degrees) compared to the placebo group (mean loss of 21.7 degrees), $p = 0.007$. Moreover, there was a statistically significant difference in internal rotation, a mean loss of 13.3 degrees in the H-wave group and a mean loss of 23.3 degrees in the placebo group, $p = 0.006$. There were no statistically significant differences between groups in postoperative strength. The authors also stated that there was no statistically significant difference on any of the other 4 range-of-motion variables. The study did not assess change in functional status or capacity.

Summary

Two small controlled trials are insufficient to permit conclusions about the effectiveness of H-wave electrical stimulation as a pain treatment. Additional sham-controlled studies are needed from other investigators, preferably studies that are clearly blinded, specify the handling of any withdrawals, and provide long-term, comparative follow-up data. One small RCT represents insufficient evidence on the effectiveness of H-wave simulation for improving strength and function after rotator cuff surgery. No comparative studies have been published evaluating H-wave stimulation to accelerate wound healing. In addition, no studies were identified that evaluated H-wave stimulation for any clinical application other than those described above. Thus, H-wave electrical stimulation is considered investigational.

Threshold Electrical Stimulation (TES)

Validation of therapeutic electrical stimulation requires randomized, controlled studies that can isolate the contribution of the electrical stimulation from other components of therapy. Physical therapy is an important component of the treatment of cerebral palsy and other motor disorders. Therefore, trials of threshold electrical stimulation ideally should include standardized regimens of physical therapy. Randomized studies using sham devices are preferred to control for any possible placebo effect.

A randomized study published in 1997 included 44 patients with spastic cerebral palsy who had undergone a selective posterior lumbosacral rhizotomy at least 1 year previously. All patients had impaired motor function, but some form of upright ambulation. Patients were randomly assigned to receive either a 12-



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

month period of 8 to 12 hours of nightly electrical stimulation or no therapy. The principal outcome measure was the change from baseline to 12 months in the Gross Motor Function Measure (GMFM), as assessed by therapists blinded to the treatment. The patients and their parents were not blinded; the authors stated that the active device produced a tingling sensation that precluded a double-blind design. Patients were encouraged to maintain whatever ongoing therapy they were participating in. The type of physical therapy in either the control or treatment group was not described.

After 1 year, the mean change in the GMFM was 5.5% in the treated group, compared to 1.9% in the control group, a statistically significant difference. The authors state that this 3.6% absolute difference is clinically significant. For example, a child who was previously only able to rise and stand while pushing on the floor, could now do so without using hands. While these results point to a modest benefit, the lack of control for associated physical therapy limits the interpretation.

Five additional studies were identified in the literature over the next 10 years, none of them demonstrating effectiveness. Dali and colleagues published the results of a trial that randomly assigned 57 children with cerebral palsy to receive either threshold electrical stimulation or a dummy device for a 12-month period. Visual and subjective assessments showed a trend in favor of the treatment group, while there was no significant effect of therapeutic electrical stimulation in terms of motor function, range of motion, or muscle size. The authors concluded that therapeutic electrical stimulation was not shown to be effective in this study.

Two smaller randomized controlled studies found no improvement in muscle strength with electrical stimulation. In the van der Linden et al. study, 22 children with cerebral palsy were randomly assigned to receive 1 hour of electrical stimulation to the gluteus maximus daily over a period of 8 weeks to improve gait. No clinical or statistically significant between group differences were found in measurements of hip extensor strength, gait analysis, passive limits of hip rotation, and section E of the GMFM. Fehlings and colleagues also found no evidence of improved strength in 13 children with types II/III spinal muscular atrophy who were randomly assigned to either receive electrical stimulation or a placebo stimulator during a 12-month period. A study of 24 patients with cerebral palsy demonstrated positive results for the subset that received stimulation combined with dynamic bracing; however, the effect did not last after discontinuing treatment.

Kerr and colleagues randomly assigned 60 children with cerebral palsy to 1 hour daily of neuromuscular stimulation ($n = 18$), overnight threshold electrical stimulation ($n = 20$), or overnight sham stimulation ($n = 22$). Blinded assessment following 16 weeks of treatment showed no difference among the groups as measured by peak torque or by a therapist-scored gross motor function. A parental questionnaire on the impact of disability on the child and family showed improvement for the 2 active groups but not the sham control. Compliance in the threshold electrical stimulation group was 38%; compliance in the placebo group was not reported. Retrospective analysis indicated that the study would require 110 to 190 subjects to achieve 80% power for measures of strength and function.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142
Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005
Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

A 2006 systematic review of electrical stimulation or other therapies given after botulinum toxin injection, conducted by the American Academy for Cerebral Palsy and Developmental Medicine, concluded that the available evidence is poor.

Summary

The studies published to date demonstrate that threshold electrical stimulation is not effective for treatment of spasticity, muscle weakness, reduced joint mobility, or motor function; therefore the treatment is considered investigational.

References

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, Medical Policy Reference Manual, "Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS)", 1.01.09, 8:2012.
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, Medical Policy Reference Manual, "Interferential Stimulation", 1.01.24, 12:2012.
3. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, Medical Policy Reference Manual, "H-wave Electrical Stimulation", 1.01.13, 11:2012.
4. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, Medical Policy Reference Manual, "Threshold Electrical Stimulation as a Treatment of Motor Disorders", 1.01.19, 11:2012.
5. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. National Coverage Determination for Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulators (TENS) (280.13). 1995. Available online at: <http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/search/document-id-search-results.aspx?DocID=280.13&bc=gAAAAAAAAAA&>
6. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. National Coverage Determination for Assessing Patient's Suitability for Electrical Nerve Stimulation Therapy (160.7.1) 2006. Available online at: <http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=63&ncdver=2&DocID=160.7.1&bc=gAAAAAAGAAAA&>
7. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. National Coverage Determination for Supplies Used in the Delivery of Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) and Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation (NMES) (160.13) 1988. Available online at: <http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/search/document-id-search-results.aspx?DocID=160.13&bc=gAAAAAAAAAA&>
8. Medicare CfMa. National Coverage Determination for Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) for Acute Post-Operative Pain (10.2) 1995. Available online at: <http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/search/document-id-search-results.aspx?DocID=10.2&bc=gAAAAAAAAAA&>
9. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. Decision Memo for Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation for Chronic Low Back Pain (CAG-00429N) 2012. Available online at: <http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-decision-memo.aspx?NCALId=256>.
10. Fuentes JP, Armijo Olivo S, Magee DJ et al. Effectiveness of interferential current therapy in the management of musculoskeletal pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Phys Ther* 2010; 90(9):1219-38.
11. Defrin R, Ariel E, Peretz C. Segmental noxious versus innocuous electrical stimulation for chronic pain relief and the effect of fading sensation during treatment. *Pain* 2005; 115(1-2):152-60.
12. Taylor K, Newton RA, Personius WJ et al. Effects of interferential current stimulation for treatment of subjects with recurrent jaw pain. *Phys Ther* 1987; 67:346-50.
13. Atamaz FC, Durmaz B, Baydar M et al. Comparison of the efficacy of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation, interferential currents, and shortwave diathermy in knee osteoarthritis: a double-blind, randomized, controlled, multicenter study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2012; 93(5):748-56.
14. Facci LM, Nowotny JP, Tormem F et al. Effects of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) an interferential currents (IFC) in patients with nonspecific chronic low back pain: randomized controlled trial. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2011; 129(4):206-16.
15. Gundog M, Atamaz F, Kanyilmaz S et al. Interferential current therapy in patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2011; Epub before print.
16. Kajbafzadeh AM, Sharifi-Rad L, Nejat F et al. Transcutaneous interferential electrical stimulation for management of neurogenic bowel dysfunction in children with myelomeningocele. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2012; 27(4):453-8.
17. Clarke MC, Chase JW, Gibb S et al. Improvement of quality of life in children with slow transit constipation after treatment with transcutaneous electrical stimulation. *J Pediatr Surg* 2009; 44(6):1268-72; discussion 72.
18. Coban S, Akbal E, Koklu S et al. Clinical trial: transcutaneous interferential electrical stimulation in individuals with irritable bowel syndrome - a prospective double-blind randomized study. *Digestion* 2012; 86(2):86-93.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

19. Koklu S, Koklu G, Ozguclu E et al. Clinical trial: interferential electric stimulation in functional dyspepsia patients - a prospective randomized study. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2010; 31(9):961-8.
20. Food and Drug Administration. Warning letter. September 17, 1997. Available online at: <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/ICECI/EnforcementActions/WarningLetters/1997/UCM065904.pdf>
21. Blum K, Chen AL, Chen TJ et al. The H-Wave device is an effective and safe non-pharmacological analgesic for chronic pain: a meta-analysis. *Adv Ther* 2008; 25(7):644-57.
22. Kumar D, Marshall HJ. Diabetic peripheral neuropathy: amelioration of pain with transcutaneous electrostimulation. *Diabetes Care* 1997; 20(11):1702-5.
23. Kumar D, Alvaro MS, Julka IS et al. Diabetic peripheral neuropathy. Effectiveness of electrotherapy and amitriptyline for symptomatic relief. *Diabetes Care* 1998; 21(8):1322-5.
24. Julka IS, Alvaro M, Kumar D. Beneficial effects of electrical stimulation on neuropathic symptoms in diabetes patients. *J Foot Ankle Surg* 1998; 37(3):191-4.
25. Blum K, DiNubile NA, Tekten T et al. H-Wave, a nonpharmacologic alternative for the treatment of patients with chronic soft tissue inflammation and neuropathic pain: a preliminary statistical outcome study. *Adv Ther* 2006; 23(3):446-55.
26. Blum K, Chen TJ, Martinez-Pons M et al. The H-Wave small muscle fiber stimulator, a nonpharmacologic alternative for the treatment of chronic soft-tissue injury and neuropathic pain: an extended population observational study. *Adv Ther* 2006; 23(5):739-49.
27. Blum K, Chen AL, Chen TJ et al. Healing enhancement of chronic venous stasis ulcers utilizing H-WAVE® device therapy: a case series. *Cases J* 2010; 3:54.
28. Blum K, Chen AL, Chen TJ et al. Repetitive H-wave device stimulation and program induces significant increases in the range of motion of post operative rotator cuff reconstruction in a double-blinded randomized placebo controlled human study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2009; 10:132.
29. Steinbok P, Reiner A, Kestle JR. Therapeutic electrical stimulation (ThresholdES) following selective posterior rhizotomy in children with spastic diplegic cerebral palsy: a randomized clinical trial. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 1997; 39(8):515-20.
30. Dali C, Hansen FJ, Pedersen SA et al. Threshold electrical stimulation (TES) in ambulant children with CP: a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2002; 44(6):364-9.
31. van der Linden ML, Hazlewood ME, Aitchison AM et al. Electrical stimulation of gluteus maximus in children with cerebral palsy: effects on gait characteristics and muscle strength. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2003; 45(6):385-90.
32. Fehlings DL, Kirsch S, McComas A et al. Evaluation of therapeutic electrical stimulation to improve muscle strength and function in children with types II/III spinal muscular atrophy. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2002; 44(11):741-4.
33. Ozer K, Chesher SP, Scheker LR. Neuromuscular electrical stimulation and dynamic bracing for the management of upper-extremity spasticity in children with cerebral palsy. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2006; 48(7):559-63.
34. Kerr C, McDowell B, Cosgrove A et al. Electrical stimulation in cerebral palsy: a randomized controlled trial. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2006; 48(11):870-6.
35. Lannin N, Scheinberg A, Clark K. AACPDM systematic review of the effectiveness of therapy for children with cerebral palsy after botulinum toxin A injections. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2006; 48(6):533-9.

Coding

The five character codes included in the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines (BCBSLAMP CG) are obtained from Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®)‡, copyright 2012 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



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142
Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005
Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

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.

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

Code Type	Code
CPT	64550, 95972
HCPCS	C1883, E0720, E0730, E0731, E0744
ICD-9 Diagnosis	All diagnoses
ICD-9 Procedure	93.39

Policy History

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005
Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

10/05/2004 Medical Director review
10/19/2004 Medical Policy Committee review. Policy replaces TENS policy. Additional modalities addressed: Interferential Stimulation, H-Wave Stimulation, Threshold Stimulation Microcurrent Stimulation, Galvanic Stimulation.
11/29/2004 Managed Care Advisory Council approval. Policy to be effective for claims processing 02/01/2005.
04/14/2005 Policy History revised to reflect claims processing effective date.
10/05/2005 Medical Director review
10/18/2005 Medical Policy Committee review. Format revision. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
10/27/2005 Quality Care Advisory Council approval
10/04/2006 Medical Director review
10/18/2006 Medical Policy Committee approval. Format revision; updated with additional references. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
11/07/2007 Medical Director review
11/15/2007 Medical Policy Committee approval. No change to coverage eligibility.
12/03/2008 Medical Director review
12/17/2008 Medical Policy Committee approval. No change to coverage eligibility.
12/04/2009 Medical Policy Committee approval
12/16/2009 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage eligibility.
12/01/2010 Medical Policy Committee review
12/15/2010 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
03/01/2012 Medical Policy Committee review
03/21/2012 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Management of postoperative pain bullet was removed from investigational indications.
03/07/2013 Medical Policy Committee review
03/20/2013 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
12/12/2013 Medical Policy Committee review
12/18/2013 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged. Processing changes only.

Next Scheduled Review Date: 12/2014

©2013 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



BlueCross BlueShield of Louisiana

An independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Electrical Nerve Stimulation Devices

Policy # 00142

Original Effective Date: 02/01/2005

Current Effective Date: 12/18/2013

*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: 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.