MASSACHUSETTS

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts is an Independent Licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

Medical Policy

Patient-Specific Instrumentation (eg, Cutting Guides) for Joint Arthroplasty

Table of Contents

Policy Number: 706

BCBSA Reference Number: 7.01.144
NCD/LCD: NA

Related Policies

Computer-Assisted Musculoskeletal Surgical Navigational Orthopedic Procedures, #594

Policy

Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, and Indemnity Medicare HMO Blue℠ and Medicare PPO Blue℠ Members

Use of patient-specific instrumentation (eg, cutting guides) for joint arthroplasty, including but not limited to use in unicompartmental or total knee arthroplasty, is considered **INVESTIGATIONAL**.

Prior Authorization Information

Inpatient

- For services described in this policy, precertification/preauthorization **IS REQUIRED** for all products if the procedure is performed **inpatient**.

Outpatient

- For services described in this policy, see below for products where prior authorization **might be required** if the procedure is performed **outpatient**.

	Outpatient
Commercial Managed Care (HMO and POS)	This is **not** a covered service.
Commercial PPO and Indemnity	This is **not** a covered service.
Medicare HMO Blue℠	This is **not** a covered service.
Medicare PPO Blue℠	This is **not** a covered service.

CPT Codes / HCPCS Codes / ICD Codes

Inclusion or exclusion of a code does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage as it applies to an individual member.

Providers should report all services using the most up-to-date industry-standard procedure, revenue, and diagnosis codes, including modifiers where applicable.

No specific CPT code

Description

TOTAL KNEE ARTHROPLASTY

Total knee arthroplasty (TKA; also called knee replacement) is an established treatment for relief from significant, disabling pain caused by advanced arthritis. TKA is considered among the most successful medical procedures in the United States regarding the degree of improvement in functional status and quality of life. As a result of the success of TKA, the increase in the aging population, and the desire of older adults to remain physically active, the incidence of TKA is increasing rapidly. It is projected that by 2030, the demand for knee replacement will approach 3.5 million procedures annually.[1]

TKA is performed by removing the damaged cartilage surface and a portion of underlying bone using a saw guided by templates and jigs. The cartilage and bone removed from the distal femur and proximal tibia are replaced with implants that recreate the surface of the joint. Patellar resurfacing may also be performed. Three-dimensional implant alignment (coronal, sagittal, axial) is considered to be critical for joint articulation and implant longevity. Less than 3° deviation from the rotational or mechanical axis, as determined by a straight line through the center of the hip, knee, and ankle on the coronal plane, is believed to minimize the risk of implant wear, loosening, instability, and pain.

Cutting Guides

The placement of conventional cutting guides (templates and jigs) is based on anatomic landmarks or computer navigation (see policy #594). Use of conventional instrumentation has been shown to result in malalignment of approximately one-third of implants in the coronal plane.[2] Computer-assisted navigation can significantly reduce the proportion of malaligned implants compared with conventional instrumentation, but has a number of limitations including a lack of rotational alignment, increased surgical time, and a long learning curve. Also, no studies have demonstrated an improvement in clinical outcomes with computer-assisted navigation compared with conventional instrumentation.

Patient-specific instrumentation has been developed as an alternative to conventional cutting guides, with the goal of improving both alignment and surgical efficiency. Patient-specific guides are constructed with the use of preoperative 3-dimensional computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging scans, which are taken 4 to 6 weeks before the surgery. The images are sent to the planner/manufacturer to create a 3-dimensional model of the knee and proposed implant. After the surgeon reviews the model of the bone, makes adjustments, and approves the surgical plan, the manufacturer fabricates the disposable cutting guides.

The proposed benefits of using patient-specific instrumentation during TKA include improved alignment, decreased operative time, increased patient throughput, fewer instrument trays, reduced risk of fat embolism and intraoperative bleeding (no intramedullary canal reaming), shorter recovery, reduced postoperative pain, reduced revision rate, and reduced costs. However, the nonsurgical costs of the procedure may be increased due to the requirement for preoperative computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging, preoperative review of the template, and fabrication of the patient-specific instrumentation. Also, the patient-specific template relies on the same anatomic landmarks as conventional TKA and does not take soft tissue balancing into account. Thus, evaluation of this technology should also address the reliability of the cutting guides and the need for intraoperative changes such as conversion to conventional instrumentation.

Outcome Measures

The surrogate outcome measure of a reduction in malalignment may be informative to support improvement with the new technology. However, a reduction in the percentage of malaligned implants has not been definitively shown to result in improved clinical outcomes and is, therefore, not sufficient to demonstrate an improvement in clinical outcomes. Also, because this is a relatively new technology, no long-term studies are currently available that could provide data on revision rates. It should also be noted

that the design of these devices is evolving, and results from older studies may be less relevant for contemporary designs.

Summary

Patient-specific instrumentation (PSI) has been developed as an alternative to conventional cutting guides for joint arthroplasty. Patient-specific cutting guides are constructed with the aid of preoperative 3-dimensional computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging scans and proprietary planning software. The goals of patient-specific instrumentation is to increase surgical efficiency and to improve implant alignment and clinical outcomes.

For individuals who are undergoing partial or total knee arthroplasty who receive patient-specific cutting guides, the evidence includes a number of randomized controlled trials, comparative cohort studies, and systematic reviews of these studies. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, and quality of life. Results from the systematic reviews are mixed, finding significant improvements in some measures of implant alignment but either no improvement or worse alignment for other measures. The available systematic reviews are limited by the small size of some of the selected studies, publication bias, and differences in both planning and manufacturing of the PSI systems. Also, the designs of the devices are evolving, and some of the studies might have assessed now obsolete PSI systems. Available results from randomized controlled trials have not shown a benefit of PSI systems in improving clinical outcome measures with follow-up currently extending out to 2 years. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Policy History

Date	Action
7/2018	BCBSA National medical policy review. Title changed to Patient-Specific Instrumentation (eg, Cutting Guides) for Joint Arthroplasty.7/1/2018
5/2018	Prior Authorization Information reformatted.
11/2017	Policy clarified to remove custom knee implants from the policy. 11/14/2017
9/2017	New references added from BCBSA National medical policy.
11/2015	New references added from BCBSA National medical policy.
2/2015	New medical policy describing investigational indications. Effective 2/1/2015.

Information Pertaining to All Blue Cross Blue Shield Medical Policies

Click on any of the following terms to access the relevant information:
Medical Policy Terms of Use
Managed Care Guidelines
Indemnity/PPO Guidelines
Clinical Exception Process
Medical Technology Assessment Guidelines

References

1. Kurtz S, Ong K, Lau E, et al. Projections of primary and revision hip and knee arthroplasty in the United States from 2005 to 2030. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Apr 2007;89(4):780-785. PMID 17403800
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center. Computer-assisted navigation for total knee arthroplasty. *Technology Assessment* Feb 2007;Volume 22:Tab 10. PMID 18411501
3. Thienpont E, Schwab PE, Fennema P. Efficacy of patient-specific instruments in total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Mar 15 2017;99(6):521-530. PMID 28291186
4. Mannan A, Smith TO. Favourable rotational alignment outcomes in PSI knee arthroplasty: A Level 1 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Knee.* Mar 2016;23(2):186-190. PMID 26782300
5. Alcelik I, Blomfield M, Ozturk C, et al. A comparison of short term radiological alignment outcomes of the patient specific and standard instrumentation for primary total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc.* May 2017;51(3):215-222. PMID 28502570

6. Mannan A, Akinyooye D, Hossain F. A meta-analysis of functional outcomes in patient-specific instrumented knee arthroplasty. *J Knee Surg.* Sep 2017;30(7):668-674. PMID 27907935
7. Alvand A, Khan T, Jenkins C, et al. The impact of patient-specific instrumentation on unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a prospective randomised controlled study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* Aug 22 2017. PMID 28831554
8. Kosse NM, Heesterbeek PJC, Schimmel JJP, et al. Stability and alignment do not improve by using patient-specific instrumentation in total knee arthroplasty: a randomized controlled trial. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* Nov 28 2017. PMID 29181560
9. Maus U, Marques CJ, Scheunemann D, et al. No improvement in reducing outliers in coronal axis alignment with patient-specific instrumentation. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* Oct 25 2017. PMID 29071356
10. Van Leeuwen J, Snorrason F, Rohrl SM. No radiological and clinical advantages with patient-specific positioning guides in total knee replacement. *Acta Orthop.* Feb 2018;89(1):89-94. PMID 29161930
11. Calliess T, Bauer K, Stukenborg-Colsman C, et al. PSI kinematic versus non-PSI mechanical alignment in total knee arthroplasty: a prospective, randomized study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* Jun 2017;25(6):1743- 1748. PMID 27120192
12. Boonen B, Schotanus MG, Kerens B, et al. No difference in clinical outcome between patient-matched positioning guides and conventional instrumented total knee arthroplasty two years post-operatively: a multicentre, double-blind, randomised controlled trial. *Bone Joint J.* Jul 2016;98-B(7):939-944. PMID 27365472