

Medical Coverage Policy | Implantable Bone-Conduction and Bone-Anchored Hearing Aids



EFFECTIVE DATE: 01|01|2023

POLICY LAST UPDATED: 05|17|2023

OVERVIEW

Sensorineural, conductive, and mixed hearing loss may be treated with various devices, including conventional air-conduction (AC) or bone-conduction external hearing aids. AC hearing aids may not be suitable for patients with chronic middle ear and ear canal infections, atresia of the external canal, or an ear canal that cannot accommodate an ear mold. Bone-conduction hearing aids may be useful for individuals with conductive hearing loss, or (if used with contralateral routing of signal), for unilateral sensorineural hearing loss. Implantable, bone-anchored hearing aids (BAHAs) that use a percutaneous or transcutaneous connection to a sound processor have been investigated as alternatives to conventional bone-conduction hearing aids for patients with conductive or mixed hearing loss or for patients with unilateral single-sided sensorineural hearing loss.

MEDICAL CRITERIA

Not applicable

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

Not applicable

POLICY STATEMENT

Medicare Advantage Plans

Implantable bone-conduction and bone anchored hearing aids are covered.

Commercial Products

Unilateral or bilateral fully or partially implantable bone-conduction (bone-anchored) hearing aid(s) may be considered medically necessary as an alternative to an air-conduction hearing aid in patients 5 years of age and older with a conductive or mixed hearing loss with the following indications:

- Congenital or surgically induced malformations (eg, atresia) of the external ear canal or middle ear; or
- Chronic external otitis or otitis media; or
- Tumors of the external canal and/or tympanic cavity; or
- Dermatitis of the external canal

An implantable bone-conduction (bone-anchored) hearing aid may be considered medically necessary as an alternative to an air-conduction contralateral routing of signal (CROS) hearing aid in patients 5 years of age and older with single-sided sensorineural deafness and normal hearing in the other ear.

Other uses of implantable bone-conduction (bone-anchored) hearing aids, including use in patients with bilateral sensorineural hearing loss, are considered not medically necessary as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

In situations where the insertion of the device is not medically necessary, re-insertion of the device after removal is also considered not medically necessary.

COVERAGE

Benefits may vary between groups/contracts. Please refer to the appropriate Benefit Booklet, Evidence of Coverage or Subscriber Agreement for applicable surgery benefits/coverage and limitations of benefits/coverage when services are not medically necessary.

BACKGROUND HEARING LOSS

Hearing loss is described as conductive, sensorineural, or mixed and can be unilateral or bilateral. Normal hearing detects sound at or below 20 dB (decibel). The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association has defined the degree of hearing loss based on pure-tone average (PTA) detection thresholds as mild (20-40 dB), moderate (40-60 dB), severe (60-80 dB), and profound (≥ 80 dB). PTA is calculated by averaging the hearing sensitivities (ie, the minimum volume that the patient hears) at multiple frequencies (perceived as pitch), typically within the range of 0.25 to 8 kHz.

Sound amplification using an AC hearing aid can provide benefit to patients with sensorineural or mixed hearing loss. Contralateral routing of signal (CROS) is a system in which a microphone on the affected side transmits a signal to an AC hearing aid on the normal or less affected side.

Treatment

External bone-conduction hearing devices function by transmitting sound waves through the bone to the ossicles of the middle ear. The external devices must be applied close to the temporal bone, with either a steel spring over the top of the head or a spring-loaded arm on a pair of spectacles. These devices may be associated with either pressure headaches or soreness.

A bone-anchored implant system combines a vibrational transducer coupled directly to the skull via a percutaneous abutment that permanently protrudes through the skin from a small titanium implant anchored in the temporal bone. The system is based on the process of osseointegration through which living tissue integrates with titanium in the implant over a period of 3 to 6 months, conducting amplified and processed sound via the skull bone directly to the cochlea. The lack of intervening skin permits the transmission of vibrations at a lower energy level than required for external bone-conduction hearing aids. Implantable bone-conduction hearing systems are primarily indicated for people with conductive or mixed sensorineural or conductive hearing loss. They may also be used with CROS as an alternative to an AC hearing aid for individuals with unilateral sensorineural hearing loss.

Partially implantable magnetic bone-conduction hearing systems, also referred to as transcutaneous bone-anchored systems, are an alternative to bone-conduction hearing systems that connect to bone percutaneously via an abutment. With this technique, acoustic transmission occurs transcutaneously via magnetic coupling of the external sound processor and the internally implanted device components. The bone-conduction hearing processor contains magnets that adhere externally to magnets implanted in shallow bone beds with the bone-conduction hearing implant. Because the processor adheres magnetically to the implant, there is no need for a percutaneous abutment to physically connect the external and internal components. To facilitate greater transmission of acoustics between magnets, skin thickness may be reduced to 4 to 5 mm over the implant when it is surgically placed.

Several implantable bone-conduction hearing systems have been approved by the US Food and Drug Administration for marketing through the 510(k) process:

- Baha® Auditory Osseointegrated Implant System, manufactured by Cochlear Americas
 - Baha 6 System
 - BA310 Abutment, BIA310 Implant/Abutment
 - Baha 5 Power Sound Processor
 - Baha 5 Super Power Sound Processor
 - Baha® 5 Sound Processor

- Baha® Attract System
- Baha® Cordelle II
- Baha Divino®
- Baha Intenso® (digital signal processing)
- Baha® BP100
- Baha® 4 (upgraded from the BP100)
- Cochlear™ Osia™2 System
- OBC Bone-Anchored Hearing Aid System, manufactured by Oticon Medical
- Ponto Bone-Anchored Hearing System, manufactured by Oticon Medical
 - Ponto 4
 - Ponto 3, Ponto 3 Power and Ponto 3 SuperPower

The FDA cleared these systems for use in children ages 5 years and older and adults for the following indications:

- Patients who have conductive or mixed hearing loss and can still benefit from sound amplification;
- Patients with bilaterally symmetric conductive or mixed hearing loss may be implanted bilaterally;
- Patients with sensorineural deafness in 1 ear and normal hearing in the other (ie, single-sided deafness);
- Patients who are candidates for an AC CROS hearing aid but who cannot or will not wear an AC CROS device
- The Osia™2 system may be used by adults and children 12 years of age and older with conductive hearing loss, mixed hearing loss, and single-sided sensorineural deafness.

The FDA also cleared three partially implantable magnetic bone-conduction devices for marketing through the 510(k) process:

- Bonebridge, MED-EL,
- Otomag® Bone-Conduction Hearing System, Medtronic (formerly Sophono),
- Cochlear Baha® 4 Sound Processor, Cochlear Americas

The SoundBite™ Hearing System (Sonitus Medical, San Mateo, CA) is an intraoral bone-conducting hearing prosthesis that consists of a behind-the-ear microphone and an in-the-mouth hearing device. In 2011, it was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process for indications similar to the Baha. Sonitus Medical closed in 2015.

For individuals who have conductive or mixed hearing loss who receive an implantable bone-anchored hearing aid (BAHA) with a percutaneous abutment or a partially implantable BAHA with transcutaneous coupling to the sound processor, the evidence includes observational studies that have reported pre-post differences in hearing parameters after treatment with BAHAs. Relevant outcomes are functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. No prospective trials were identified. Observational studies reporting on within-subjects changes in hearing have generally reported hearing improvements with the devices. Given the objectively measured outcomes and the largely invariable natural history of hearing loss in individuals who would be eligible for an implantable bone-conduction device, the demonstrated improvements in hearing after device placement can be attributed to the device. Studies of partially implantable BAHAs have similarly demonstrated within-subjects improvements in hearing. The single-arm studies have shown improvements in hearing in the device-aided state. No direct comparisons other than within-individual comparisons with external hearing aids were identified, but, for individuals unable to wear an external hearing aid, there may be few alternative treatments. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have unilateral sensorineural hearing loss who receive a fully or partially implantable BAHA with the contralateral routing of signal, the evidence includes a randomized controlled trial, multiple prospective and retrospective case series, and a systematic review. Relevant outcomes are functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. Single-arm case series, with sample sizes ranging from 9 to 180 patients, have generally reported improvements in patient-reported speech quality, speech perception in noise, and satisfaction with bone-conduction devices with contralateral routing of the signal. However, a well-conducted systematic review of studies comparing bone-anchored devices with hearing aids using contralateral routing of signal found no evidence of improvement in speech recognition or hearing localization. The single randomized controlled trial included in the systematic review was a pilot study enrolling only 10 patients and, therefore, does not provide definitive evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

CODING

The following CPT and HCPCS code(s) are covered with no diagnosis edits for Medicare Advantage plans. For Commercial Products, the following CPT and HCPCS code(s) are medically necessary when filed with the ICD-10 diagnosis codes listed below any other diagnosis codes are not medically necessary.

- 69710** Implantation or replacement of electromagnetic bone-conduction hearing device in temporal bone
- 69711** Removal or repair of electromagnetic bone conduction hearing device in temporal bone
- 69714** Implantation, osseointegrated implant, skull with percutaneous attachment to external speech processor
- 69716** Implantation, osseointegrated implant, skull; with magnetic transcutaneous attachment to external speech processor, within the mastoid and/or resulting in removal of less than 100 sq mm surface area of bone deep to the outer cranial cortex (Text Revised Effective 1/1/2023)
- 69717** Replacement (including removal of existing device), osseointegrated implant, skull; with percutaneous attachment to external speech processor (Revised text 1/01/2023)
- 69719** Replacement (including removal of existing device), osseointegrated implant, skull; with magnetic transcutaneous attachment to external speech processor, within the mastoid and/or involving a bony defect less than 100 sq mm surface area of bone deep to the outer cranial cortex (Revised Text 1/01/2023)
- 69729** Implantation, osseointegrated implant, skull; with attachment to external speech processor, outside of the mastoid (New Code Effective 1/01/2023)
- 69730** Replacement osseointegrated implant, skull; with attachment to external speech processor, outside the mastoid (New Code Effective 1/01/2023)
- L8625** External recharging system for battery for use with cochlear implant or auditory osseointegrated device, replacement only, each
- L8690** Auditory osseointegrated device, includes all internal and external components
- L8691** Auditory osseointegrated device, external sound processor, excludes transducer/actuator, replacement only, each
- L8693** Auditory osseointegrated device abutment, any length, replacement only
- L8694** Auditory osseointegrated device, transducer/actuator, replacement only, each

ICD-10 covered diagnosis code(s) for Commercial Products only

H60.60 – H60.93
H61.301 - H61.399
H65.20 - H65.499
H66.10 - H66.3X9
H90.0 - H90.8
Q16.0 - Q16.9

The following code(s) are covered for Medicare Advantage Plans and Commercial Products:

- L8618 Transmitter cable for use with cochlear implant device or auditory osseointegrated device, replacement
- L8624 Lithium ion battery for use with cochlear implant or auditory osseointegrated device speech processor, ear level, replacement, each

RELATED POLICIES

Cochlear Implants
Hearing Aid Mandate
Semi and Fully Implantable Middle Ear Hearing Aids

PUBLISHED

Provider Update, July 2023
Provider Update, October 2022, December 2022
Provider Update, May 2021
Provider Update, January 2021
Provider Update, December 2019

REFERENCES

1. Heath E, Dawoud MM, Stavarakas M, et al. The outcomes of bilateral bone conduction hearing devices (BCHD) implantation in the treatment of hearing loss: A systematic review. *Cochlear Implants Int.* Mar2022; 23(2): 95-108. PMID 34852723
2. Janssen RM, Hong P, Chadha NK. Bilateral bone-anchored hearing aids for bilateral permanent conductive hearing loss: a systematic review. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Sep 2012; 147(3): 412-22. PMID 22714424
3. Bosman AJ, Snik AF, van der Pouw CT, et al. Audiometric evaluation of bilaterally fitted bone-anchored hearing aids. *Audiology.* May-Jun 2001; 40(3): 158-67. PMID 11465298
4. Priwin C, Stenfelt S, Granstrom G, et al. Bilateral bone-anchored hearing aids (BAHAs): an audiometric evaluation. *Laryngoscope.* Jan 2004; 114(1): 77-84. PMID 14709999
5. Snik AF, Mylanus EA, Proops DW, et al. Consensus statements on the BAHA system: where do we stand at present?. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol Suppl.* Dec 2005; 195: 2-12. PMID 16619473
6. Dun CA, de Wolf MJ, Mylanus EA, et al. Bilateral bone-anchored hearing aid application in children: the Nijmegen experience from 1996 to 2008. *Otol Neurotol.* Jun 2010; 31(4): 615-23. PMID 20393374
7. Ho EC, Monksfield P, Egan E, et al. Bilateral Bone-anchored Hearing Aid: impact on quality of life measured with the Glasgow Benefit Inventory. *Otol Neurotol.* Oct 2009; 30(7): 891-6. PMID 19692937
8. Briggs R, Van Hasselt A, Luntz M, et al. Clinical performance of a new magnetic bone conduction hearing implant system: results from a prospective, multicenter, clinical investigation. *Otol Neurotol.* Jun 2015; 36(5): 834-41. PMID25634465
9. Denoyelle F, Coudert C, Thierry B, et al. Hearing rehabilitation with the closed skin bone-anchored implant Sophono Alpha1: results of a prospective study in 15 children with ear atresia. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol.* Mar2015; 79(3): 382-7. PMID 25617189
10. Gawęcki W, Gibasiewicz R, Marszał J, et al. The evaluation of a surgery and the short-term benefits of a new active bone conduction hearing implant - the Osia®. *Braz J Otorhinolaryngol.* 2022; 88(3): 289-295. PMID 32713797
11. Hol MK, Nelissen RC, Agterberg MJ, et al. Comparison between a new implantable transcutaneous boneconductor and percutaneous bone-conduction hearing implant. *Otol Neurotol.* Aug 2013; 34(6): 1071-5. PMID23598702
12. Nelissen RC, Agterberg MJ, Hol MK, et al. Three-year experience with the Sophono in children with congenital conductive unilateral hearing loss: tolerability, audiometry, and sound localization compared to a bone-anchored hearing aid. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* Oct 2016; 273(10): 3149-56. PMID 26924741
13. Iseri M, Orhan KS, Tuncer U, et al. Transcutaneous Bone-anchored Hearing Aids Versus Percutaneous Ones: Multicenter Comparative Clinical Study. *Otol Neurotol.* Jun 2015; 36(5): 849-53. PMID 25730451

14. Gerdes T, Salcher RB, Schwab B, et al. Comparison of Audiological Results Between a Transcutaneous and a Percutaneous Bone Conduction Instrument in Conductive Hearing Loss. *Otol Neurotol*. Jul 2016; 37(6): 685-91. PMID 27093021
15. Kim Y, Choe G, Oh H, et al. A comparative study of audiological outcomes and compliance between the Osia system and other bone conduction hearing implants. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. Nov 01 2022. PMID 36318324
16. Dimitriadis PA, Farr MR, Allam A, et al. Three year experience with the cochlear BAHHA attract implant: a systematic review of the literature. *BMC Ear Nose Throat Disord*. 2016; 16: 12. PMID 27733813
17. Reddy-Kolanu R, Gan R, Marshall AH. A case series of a magnetic bone conduction hearing implant. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl*. Nov 2016; 98(8): 552-553. PMID 27490984
18. Siegert R. Partially implantable bone conduction hearing aids without a percutaneous abutment (Otomag): technique and preliminary clinical results. *Adv Otorhinolaryngol*. 2011; 71: 41-46. PMID 21389703
19. Powell HR, Rolfe AM, Birman CS. A Comparative Study of Audiologic Outcomes for Two Transcutaneous Bone-Anchored Hearing Devices. *Otol Neurotol*. Sep 2015; 36(9): 1525-31. PMID 26375976
20. O'Neil MB, Runge CL, Friedland DR, et al. Patient Outcomes in Magnet-Based Implantable Auditory Assist Devices. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Jun 2014; 140(6): 513-20. PMID 24763485
21. Centric A, Chennupati SK. Abutment-free bone-anchored hearing devices in children: initial results and experience. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. May 2014; 78(5): 875-8. PMID 24612554
22. Baker S, Centric A, Chennupati SK. Innovation in abutment-free bone-anchored hearing devices in children: Updated results and experience. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. Oct 2015; 79(10): 1667-72. PMID 26279245
23. Marsella P, Scorpecci A, Vallarino MV, et al. Sophono in Pediatric Patients: The Experience of an Italian Tertiary Care Center. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Aug 2014; 151(2): 328-32. PMID 24714216
24. Magliulo G, Turchetta R, Iannella G, et al. Sophono Alpha System and subtotal petrosectomy with external auditory canal blind sac closure. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. Sep 2015; 272(9): 2183-90. PMID 24908070
25. Carnevale C, Morales-Olavarría C, Til-Pérez G, et al. Bonebridge® bone conduction implant. Hearing outcomes and quality of life in patients with conductive/mixed hearing loss. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. Sep 05 2022. PMID 36063211
26. Cywka KB, Skarzynski PH, Krol B, et al. Evaluation of the Bonebridge BCI 602 active bone conductive implant in adults: efficacy and stability of audiological, surgical, and functional outcomes. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. Jul 2022; 279(7): 3525-3534. PMID 35182185
27. Huber AM, Strauchmann B, Caversaccio MD, et al. Multicenter Results With an Active Transcutaneous Bone Conduction Implant in Patients With Single-sided Deafness. *Otol Neurotol*. Feb 01 2022; 43(2):227-235. PMID 34816809
28. Hundertpfund J, Meyer JE, Ovari A. Long-term audiological benefit with an active transcutaneous bone-conduction device: a retrospective cohort analysis. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. Jul 2022; 279(7): 3309-3326. PMID 34424382
29. Seiwerth I, Fröhlich I, Schilde S, et al. Clinical and functional results after implantation of the bonebridge, a semi-implantable, active transcutaneous bone conduction device, in children and adults. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. Jan 2022; 279(1): 101-113. PMID 33674927
30. Šikolová S, Urík M, Hošnová D, et al. Two Bonebridge bone conduction hearing implant generations: audiological benefit and quality of hearing in children. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. Jul 2022; 279(7):3387-3398. PMID 34495351
31. Bravo-Torres S, Der-Mussa C, Fuentes-Lopez E. Active transcutaneous bone conduction implant: audiological results in paediatric patients with bilateral microtia associated with external auditory canal atresia. *Int J Audiol*. Jan2018; 57(1): 53-60. PMID 28857620

32. Schmerber S, Deguine O, Marx M, et al. Safety and effectiveness of the Bonebridge transcutaneous active direct-drive bone-conduction hearing implant at 1-year device use. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* Apr 2017; 274(4): 1835-1851. PMID 27475796
33. Rahne T, Seiwerth I, Gotze G, et al. Functional results after Bonebridge implantation in adults and children with conductive and mixed hearing loss. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* Nov 2015; 272(11): 3263-9. PMID 25425039
34. Laske RD, Roosli C, Pfiffner F, et al. Functional Results and Subjective Benefit of a Transcutaneous Bone Conduction Device in Patients With Single-Sided Deafness. *Otol Neurotol.* Aug 2015; 36(7): 1151-6. PMID26111077
35. Riss D, Arnoldner C, Baumgartner WD, et al. Indication criteria and outcomes with the Bonebridge transcutaneous bone-conduction implant. *Laryngoscope.* Dec 2014; 124(12): 2802-6. PMID 25142577
36. Manrique M, Sanhueza I, Manrique R, et al. A new bone conduction implant: surgical technique and results. *OtolNeurotol.* Feb 2014; 35(2): 216-20. PMID 24448280
37. Ihler F, Volbers L, Blum J, et al. Preliminary functional results and quality of life after implantation of a new bone conduction hearing device in patients with conductive and mixed hearing loss. *Otol Neurotol.* Feb 2014; 35(2): 211-5. PMID 24448279
38. Desmet J, Wouters K, De Bodt M, et al. Long-term subjective benefit with a bone conduction implant sound processor in 44 patients with single-sided deafness. *Otol Neurotol.* Jul 2014; 35(6): 1017-25. PMID 24751733
39. Iseri M, Orhan KS, Kara A, et al. A new transcutaneous bone anchored hearing device - the Baha(R) Attract System: the first experience in Turkey. *Kulak Burun Bogaz Ihtis Derg.* Mar-Apr 2014; 24(2): 59-64. PMID 24835899
40. Peters JP, Smit AL, Stegeman I, et al. Review: Bone conduction devices and contralateral routing of sound systems in single-sided deafness. *Laryngoscope.* Jan 2015; 125(1): 218-26. PMID 25124297
41. Baguley DM, Bird J, Humphriss RL, et al. The evidence base for the application of contralateral bone anchored hearing aids in acquired unilateral sensorineural hearing loss in adults. *Clin Otolaryngol.* Feb 2006; 31(1): 6-14. PMID 16441794
42. den Besten CA, Monksfield P, Bosman A, et al. Audiological and clinical outcomes of a transcutaneous bone conduction hearing implant: Six-month results from a multicentre study. *Clin Otolaryngol.* Mar 2019; 44(2): 144-157. PMID 30358920
43. Leterme G, Bernardeschi D, Bensemman A, et al. Contralateral routing of signal hearing aid versus transcutaneous bone conduction in single-sided deafness. *Audiol Neurootol.* 2015; 20(4): 251-60. PMID 26021779
44. Snapp HA, Holt FD, Liu X, et al. Comparison of Speech-in-Noise and Localization Benefits in Unilateral Hearing Loss Subjects Using Contralateral Routing of Signal Hearing Aids or Bone-Anchored Implants. *Otol Neurotol.* Jan2017; 38(1): 11-18. PMID 27846038
45. Zeitler DM, Snapp HA, Telischi FF, et al. Bone-anchored implantation for single-sided deafness in patients with less than profound hearing loss. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Jul 2012; 147(1): 105-11. PMID 22368043
46. Pai I, Kelleher C, Nunn T, et al. Outcome of bone-anchored hearing aids for single-sided deafness: a prospective study. *Acta Otolaryngol.* Jul 2012; 132(7): 751-5. PMID 22497318
47. Saroul N, Nicolas S, Akkari M, et al. Long-term benefit and sound localization in patients with single-sided deafness rehabilitated with an osseointegrated bone-conduction device. *Otol Neurotol.* Jan 2013; 34(1): 111-4. PMID 23202156
48. Lin LM, Bowditch S, Anderson MJ, et al. Amplification in the rehabilitation of unilateral deafness: speech in noise and directional hearing effects with bone-anchored hearing and contralateral routing of signal amplification. *Otol Neurotol.* Feb 2006; 27(2): 172-82. PMID 16436986
49. Kunst SJ, Leijendeckers JM, Mylanus EA, et al. Bone-anchored hearing aid system application for unilateral congenital conductive hearing impairment: audiometric results. *Otol Neurotol.* Jan 2008; 29(1): 2-7. PMID18199951

50. Kunst SJ, Hol MK, Mylanus EA, et al. Subjective benefit after BAHA system application in patients with congenital unilateral conductive hearing impairment. *Otol Neurotol.* Apr 2008; 29(3): 353-58. PMID 18494142
51. Gluth MB, Eager KM, Eikelboom RH, et al. Long-term benefit perception, complications, and device malfunction rate of bone-anchored hearing aid implantation for profound unilateral sensorineural hearing loss. *Otol Neurotol.* Dec 2010; 31(9): 1427-34. PMID 20729779
52. Faber HT, Nelissen RC, Kramer SE, et al. Bone-anchored hearing implants in single-sided deafness patients: Long-term use and satisfaction by gender. *Laryngoscope.* Dec 2015; 125(12): 2790-5. PMID 26152833
53. Monini S, Musy I, Filippi C, et al. Bone conductive implants in single-sided deafness. *Acta Otolaryngol.* Apr 2015;135(4): 381-8. PMID 25720582
54. AlFarraj A, AlIbrahim M, AlHajjaj H, et al. Transcutaneous Bone Conduction Implants in Patients With Single-Sided Deafness: Objective and Subjective Evaluation. *Ear Nose Throat J.* May 02 2022;1455613221099996. PMID 35499947
55. Amonoo-Kuofi K, Kelly A, Neeff M, et al. Experience of bone-anchored hearing aid implantation in children younger than 5 years of age. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol.* Apr 2015; 79(4): 474-80. PMID 25680294
56. Marsella P, Scorpecci A, Pacifico C, et al. Pediatric BAHA in Italy: the "Bambino Gesù" Children's Hospital's experience. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* Feb 2012; 269(2): 467-74. PMID 21739094
57. Davids T, Gordon KA, Clutton D, et al. Bone-anchored hearing aids in infants and children younger than 5 years. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Jan 2007; 133(1): 51-5. PMID 17224524
58. McDermott AL, Williams J, Kuo MJ, et al. The role of bone anchored hearing aids in children with Down syndrome. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol.* Jun 2008; 72(6): 751-7. PMID 18433885
59. Schwab B, Wimmer W, Severens JL, et al. Adverse events associated with bone-conduction and middle-ear implants: a systematic review. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* Feb 2020; 277(2): 423-438. PMID 31749056
60. Verheij E, Bezdjian A, Grolman W, et al. A Systematic Review on Complications of Tissue Preservation Surgical Techniques in Percutaneous Bone Conduction Hearing Devices. *Otol Neurotol.* Aug 2016; 37(7): 829-37. PMID 27273402
61. Kiringoda R, Lustig LR. A meta-analysis of the complications associated with osseointegrated hearing aids. *Otol Neurotol.* Jul 2013; 34(5): 790-4. PMID 23739555
62. Dun CA, Faber HT, de Wolf MJ, et al. Assessment of more than 1,000 implanted percutaneous bone conduction devices: skin reactions and implant survival. *Otol Neurotol.* Feb 2012; 33(2): 192-8. PMID 22246385
63. Hobson JC, Roper AJ, Andrew R, et al. Complications of bone-anchored hearing aid implantation. *J Laryngol Otol.* Feb 2010; 124(2): 132-6. PMID 19968889
64. Wallberg E, Granstrom G, Tjellstrom A, et al. Implant survival rate in bone-anchored hearing aid users: long-term results. *J Laryngol Otol.* Nov 2011; 125(11): 1131-5. PMID 21774847
65. Kraai T, Brown C, Neeff M, et al. Complications of bone-anchored hearing aids in pediatric patients. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol.* Jun 2011; 75(6): 749-53. PMID 21470698
66. Allis TJ, Owen BD, Chen B, et al. Longer length Baha abutments decrease wound complications and revision surgery. *Laryngoscope.* Apr 2014; 124(4): 989-92. PMID 24114744
67. Calvo Bodnia N, Foghsgaard S, Nue Moller M, et al. Long-term results of 185 consecutive osseointegrated hearing device implantations: a comparison among children, adults, and elderly. *Otol Neurotol.* Dec 2014; 35(10): e301-6. PMID 25122598
68. Rebol J. Soft tissue reactions in patients with bone anchored hearing aids. *Ir J Med Sci.* Jun 2015; 184(2): 487-91. PMID 24913737
69. Larsson A, Tjellstrom A, Stalfors J. Implant losses for the bone-anchored hearing devices are more frequent in some patients. *Otol Neurotol.* Feb 2015; 36(2): 336-40. PMID 24809279

70. den Besten CA, Nelissen RC, Peer PG, et al. A Retrospective Cohort Study on the Influence of Comorbidity on Soft Tissue Reactions, Revision Surgery, and Implant Loss in Bone-anchored Hearing Implants. *Otol Neurotol*. Jun 2015; 36(5): 812-8. PMID 25811351
71. Mohamad S, Khan I, Hey SY, et al. A systematic review on skin complications of bone-anchored hearing aids in relation to surgical techniques. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. Mar 2016; 273(3): 559-65. PMID 25503356
72. Fontaine N, Hemar P, Schultz P, et al. BAHA implant: implantation technique and complications. *Eur Ann Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Dis*. Feb 2014; 131(1): 69-74. PMID 23835074
73. Hulcrantz M, Lanis A. A five-year follow-up on the osseointegration of bone-anchored hearing device implantation without tissue reduction. *Otol Neurotol*. Sep 2014; 35(8): 1480-5. PMID 24770406
74. Nelissen RC, Stalfors J, de Wolf MJ, et al. Long-term stability, survival, and tolerability of a novel osseointegrated implant for bone conduction hearing: 3-year data from a multicenter, randomized, controlled, clinical investigation. *Otol Neurotol*. Sep 2014; 35(8): 1486-91. PMID 25080037
75. Singam S, Williams R, Saxby C, et al. Percutaneous bone-anchored hearing implant surgery without soft-tissue reduction: up to 42 months of follow-up. *Otol Neurotol*. Oct 2014; 35(9): 1596-600. PMID 25076228
76. Roplekar R, Lim A, Hussain SS. Has the use of the linear incision reduced skin complications in bone-anchored hearing aid implantation?. *J Laryngol Otol*. Jun 2016; 130(6): 541-4. PMID 27160014
77. American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery. Position Statement: Bone Conduction Hearing Devices. Position Statements 2016; <http://www.entnet.org/content/position-statement-bone-conduction-hearing-devices>. Accessed December 7, 2022.
78. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Medicare Policy Benefit Manual. Chapter 16 - General Exclusions from Coverage (Rev. 198). 2014; Rev. 189. <http://www.cms.gov/manuals/Downloads/bp102c16.pdf>. Accessed December 8, 2022.
79. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Fact sheets: CMS Updates Policies and Payment Rates for End- Stage Renal Disease Facilities for CY 2015 and Implementation of Competitive Bidding-Based Prices for Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies. 2014; <https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/fact-sheets/cms-updates-policies-and-payment-rates-end-stage-renal-disease-facilities-cy-2015-and-implementation>. Accessed December 7, 2022.

CLICK THE ENVELOPE ICON BELOW TO SUBMIT COMMENTS

This medical policy is made available to you for informational purposes only. It is not a guarantee of payment or a substitute for your medical judgment in the treatment of your patients. Benefits and eligibility are determined by the member's subscriber agreement or member certificate and/or the employer agreement, and those documents will supersede the provisions of this medical policy. For information on member-specific benefits, call the provider call center. If you provide services to a member which are determined to not be medically necessary (or in some cases medically necessary services which are non-covered benefits), you may not charge the member for the services unless you have informed the member and they have agreed in writing in advance to continue with the treatment at their own expense. Please refer to your participation agreement(s) for the applicable provisions. This policy is current at the time of publication; however, medical practices, technology, and knowledge are constantly changing. BCBSRI reserves the right to review and revise this policy for any reason and at any time, with or without notice. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

