

Medical Coverage Policy | Microprocessor-Controlled Prostheses for the Lower Limb



EFFECTIVE DATE: 01|01|2023

POLICY LAST UPDATED: 09|07|2022

OVERVIEW

Microprocessor-controlled prostheses use feedback from sensors to adjust joint movement on a real-time as-needed basis. Active joint control is intended to improve safety and function, particularly for patients who can maneuver on uneven terrain and with variable gait.

MEDICAL CRITERIA

Medicare Advantage Plans and Commercial Products

Criteria below is only applicable for the following HCPCS code: K1014.

For all other microprocessor-controlled prostheses for the lower limb HCPCS codes (L5856, L5857, L5858 & L5973), please use the online tool for participating providers. See the Related Policies section.

A microprocessor-controlled knee may be considered medically necessary in individuals with transfemoral amputation who meet the following requirements:

- demonstrated need for long-distance ambulation at variable rates (use of the limb in the home or for basic community ambulation is not sufficient to justify provision of the computerized limb over standard limb applications) OR demonstrated patient need for regular ambulation on uneven terrain or for regular use on stairs (use of the limb for limited stair climbing in the home or employment environment is not sufficient evidence for prescription of this device over standard prosthetic application); AND
- physical ability, including adequate cardiovascular and pulmonary reserve, for ambulation at faster than normal walking speed; AND
- adequate cognitive ability to master use and care requirements for the technology

Amputees should be evaluated by an independent, qualified professional to determine the most appropriate prosthetic components and control mechanism. A trial period may be indicated to evaluate the tolerability and efficacy of the prosthesis in a real-life setting. Decisions about the potential benefits of microprocessor knees involve multiple factors including activity levels and the patient's physical and cognitive ability. A patient's need for daily ambulation of at least 400 continuous yards, daily and frequent ambulation at variable cadence or on uneven terrain (eg, gravel, grass, curbs), and daily and frequent use of ramps and/or stairs (especially stair descent) should be considered as part of the decision. Typically, the daily and frequent need of 2 or more of these activities would be needed to show benefit.

Patient Selection and Identification

For patients in whom the potential benefits of the microprocessor knees are uncertain, patients may first be fitted with a standard prosthesis to determine their level of function with the standard device.

- A. Contraindications for the use of the microprocessor knee should include the following:
 - Any condition that prevents socket fitting, such as a complicated wound or intractable pain which precludes socket wear
 - Inability to tolerate the weight of the prosthesis
 - Medicare level K0-no ability or potential to ambulate or transfer
- Medicare level K1-limited ability to transfer or ambulate on level ground at fixed cadence

- Medicare level K2-limited community ambulator who does not have the cardiovascular reserve, strength, and balance to improve stability in stance to permit increased independence, less risk of falls, and potential to advance to a less restrictive walking device
- Inability to use swing and stance features of the knee unit
- Poor balance or ataxia that limits ambulation
- Significant hip flexion contracture (>20°)
- Significant deformity of remaining limb that would impair the ability to stride
- Limited cardiovascular and/or pulmonary reserve or profound weakness
- Limited cognitive ability to understand gait sequencing or care requirements
- Long-distance or competitive running
- Falls outside of recommended weight or height guidelines of the manufacturer
- Specific environmental factors such as excessive moisture or dust, or inability to charge the prosthesis
- Extremely rural conditions where maintenance ability is limited.

B. Indications for the use of the microprocessor knee should include the following:

- Adequate cardiovascular and pulmonary reserve to ambulate at variable cadence
- Adequate strength and balance in stride to activate the knee unit
- Should not exceed the weight or height restrictions of the device
- Adequate cognitive ability to master technology and gait requirements of the device
- Hemi-pelvectomy through knee-disarticulation level of amputation, including bilateral; lower-extremity amputees are candidates if they meet functional criteria as listed
- The patient is an active walker and requires a device that reduces energy consumption to permit longer distances with less fatigue
- Daily activities or job tasks that do not permit full focus of concentration on knee control and stability—such as uneven terrain, ramps, curbs, stairs, repetitive lifting, and/or carrying
- Medicare level K2-limited community ambulator, but only if improved stability in stance permits increased independence, less risk of falls, and potential to advance to a less restrictive walking device, and the patient has the cardiovascular reserve, strength, and balance to use the prosthesis. The microprocessor enables fine-tuning and adjustment of the hydraulic mechanism to accommodate the unique motor skills and demands of the functional level K2 ambulator.
- Medicare level K3-unlimited community ambulator
- Medicare level K4-active adult athlete who needs to function as a K3 level in daily activities
- Potential to lessen back pain by providing more secure stance control, using less muscle control to keep the knee stable
- Potential to unload and decrease stress on remaining limb
- Potential to return to an active lifestyle.

C. Physical and Functional Fitting Criteria for New Amputees:

- New amputees may be considered if they meet certain criteria as outlined above
- Premorbid and current functional assessment important determinant
- Requires stable wound and ability to fit the socket
- Immediate postoperative fit is possible
- Must have potential to return to an active lifestyle

POLICY STATEMENT

Medicare Advantage Plans and Commercial Products

A microprocessor-controlled knee in individuals with transfemoral amputation is considered medically necessary when the criteria above are met.

COVERAGE

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

BACKGROUND

Lower-Extremity Prosthetics

More than 100 different prosthetic ankle-foot and knee designs are currently available. The choice of the most appropriate design may depend on the patient's underlying activity level. For example, the requirements of a prosthetic knee in an elderly, largely homebound individual will differ from those of a younger, active person. Key elements of prosthetic knee design involve providing stability during both the stance and swing phase of the gait. Prosthetic knees vary in their ability to alter the cadence of the gait, or the ability to walk on rough or uneven surfaces. In contrast to more simple prostheses, which are designed to function optimally at 1 walking cadence, fluid and hydraulic-controlled devices are designed to allow amputees to vary their walking speed by matching the movement of the shin portion of the prosthesis to the movement of the upper leg. For example, the rate at which the knee flexes after "toe-off" and then extends before heel strike depends in part on the mechanical characteristics of the prosthetic knee joint. If the resistance to flexion and extension of the joint does not vary with gait speed, the prosthetic knee extends too quickly or too slowly relative to the heel strike if the cadence is altered. When properly controlled, hydraulic or pneumatic swing-phase controls allow the prosthetist to set a pace adjusted to the individual amputee, from very slow to a race-walking pace. Hydraulic prostheses are heavier than other options and require gait training; for these reasons, these prostheses are prescribed for athletic or fit individuals. Other design features include multiple centers of rotation, referred to as "polycentric knees." The mechanical complexity of these devices allows engineers to optimize selected stance and swing-phase features.

Regulatory Status

According to the manufacturers, microprocessor-controlled prostheses are considered a class I device by the FDA and are exempt from 510(k) requirements. This classification does not require submission of clinical data regarding efficacy but only notification of FDA prior to marketing. FDA product codes: ISW, KFX.

CODING

Medicare Advantage Plans and Commercial Products

The following HCPCS code(s) is medically necessary for Medicare Advantage Plans and Commercial Products when the medical criteria above has been met:

K1014 Addition, endoskeletal knee-shin system, 4 bar linkage or multiaxial, fluid swing and stance phase control

RELATED POLICIES

Prior Authorization via Web-Based Tool for Durable Medical Equipment (DME)

PUBLISHED

Provider Update, November 2022

REFERENCES

1. Flynn K. Short Report: Computerized lower limb prosthesis (VA Technology Assessment Program). No. 2. Boston, MA: Veterans Health Administration; 2000.
2. Theeven P, Hemmen B, Rings F, et al. Functional added value of microprocessor-controlled knee joints in daily life performance of Medicare Functional Classification Level-2 amputees. *J Rehabil Med*. Oct 2011; 43(10): 906-15. PMID 21947182
3. Theeven PJ, Hemmen B, Geers RP, et al. Influence of advanced prosthetic knee joints on perceived performance and everyday life activity level of low-functional persons with a transfemoral amputation or knee disarticulation. *J Rehabil Med*. May 2012; 44(5): 454-61. PMID 22549656
4. Burnfield JM, Eberly VJ, Gronely JK, et al. Impact of stance phase microprocessor-controlled knee prosthesis on ramp negotiation and community walking function in K2 level transfemoral amputees. *Prosthet Orthot Int*. Mar 2012; 36(1): 95-104. PMID 22223685
5. Orendurff MS, Segal AD, Klute GK, et al. Gait efficiency using the C-Leg. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. Mar-Apr 2006; 43(2): 239-46. PMID 16847790

6. Klute GK, Berge JS, Orendurff MS, et al. Prosthetic intervention effects on activity of lower-extremity amputees. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* May 2006; 87(5): 717-22. PMID 16635636
7. Williams RM, Turner AP, Orendurff M, et al. Does having a computerized prosthetic knee influence cognitive performance during amputee walking?. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* Jul 2006; 87(7): 989-94. PMID 16813788
8. Hafner BJ, Smith DG. Differences in function and safety between Medicare Functional Classification Level-2 and -3 transfemoral amputees and influence of prosthetic knee joint control. *J Rehabil Res Dev.* 2009; 46(3): 417-33. PMID 19675993
9. Highsmith MJ, Kahle JT, Miro RM, et al. Ramp descent performance with the C-Leg and interrater reliability of the Hill Assessment Index. *Prosthet Orthot Int.* Oct 2013; 37(5): 362-8. PMID 23327837
10. Howard CL, Wallace C, Perry B, et al. Comparison of mobility and user satisfaction between a microprocessor knee and a standard prosthetic knee: a summary of seven single-subject trials. *Int J Rehabil Res.* Mar 2018; 41(1): 63-73. PMID 29293160
11. Hafner BJ, Willingham LL, Buell NC, et al. Evaluation of function, performance, and preference as transfemoral amputees transition from mechanical to microprocessor control of the prosthetic knee. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* Feb 2007; 88(2): 207-17. PMID 17270519
12. Kaufman KR, Bernhardt KA, Symms K. Functional assessment and satisfaction of transfemoral amputees with low mobility (FASTK2): A clinical trial of microprocessor-controlled vs. non-microprocessor-controlled knees. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon).* Oct 2018; 58: 116-122. PMID 30077128
13. Kaufman KR, Levine JA, Brey RH, et al. Gait and balance of transfemoral amputees using passive mechanical and microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knees. *Gait Posture.* Oct 2007; 26(4): 489-93. PMID 17869114
14. Kaufman KR, Levine JA, Brey RH, et al. Energy expenditure and activity of transfemoral amputees using mechanical and microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knees. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* Jul 2008; 89(7): 1380-5. PMID 18586142
15. Johansson JL, Sherrill DM, Riley PO, et al. A clinical comparison of variable-damping and mechanically passive prosthetic knee devices. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* Aug 2005; 84(8): 563-75. PMID 16034225
16. Carse B, Scott H, Brady L, et al. Evaluation of gait outcomes for individuals with established unilateral transfemoral amputation following the provision of microprocessor controlled knees in the context of a clinical service. *Prosthet Orthot Int.* Jun 01 2021; 45(3): 254-261. PMID 34016870
17. Hofstad C, Linde H, Limbeek J, et al. Prescription of prosthetic ankle-foot mechanisms after lower limb amputation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2004; (1): CD003978. PMID 14974050
18. Alimusaj M, Fradet L, Braatz F, et al. Kinematics and kinetics with an adaptive ankle foot system during stair ambulation of transtibial amputees. *Gait Posture.* Oct 2009; 30(3): 356-63. PMID 19616436
19. Fradet L, Alimusaj M, Braatz F, et al. Biomechanical analysis of ramp ambulation of transtibial amputees with an adaptive ankle foot system. *Gait Posture.* Jun 2010; 32(2): 191-8. PMID 20457526
20. Darter BJ, Wilken JM. Energetic consequences of using a prosthesis with adaptive ankle motion during slope walking in persons with a transtibial amputation. *Prosthet Orthot Int.* Feb 2014; 38(1): 5-11. PMID 23525888
21. Gailey RS, Gaunaurd I, Agrawal V, et al. Application of self-report and performance-based outcome measures to determine functional differences between four categories of prosthetic feet. *J Rehabil Res Dev.* 2012; 49(4): 597-612. PMID 22773262
22. Delussu AS, Brunelli S, Paradisi F, et al. Assessment of the effects of carbon fiber and bionic foot during overground and treadmill walking in transtibial amputees. *Gait Posture.* Sep 2013; 38(4): 876-82. PMID 23702342
23. Thomas-Pohl M, Villa C, Davot J, et al. Microprocessor prosthetic ankles: comparative biomechanical evaluation of people with transtibial traumatic amputation during standing on level ground and slope. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol.* Jan 2021; 16(1): 17-26. PMID 31535903
24. Au S, Berniker M, Herr H. Powered ankle-foot prosthesis to assist level-ground and stair-descent gaits. *Neural Netw.* May 2008; 21(4): 654-66. PMID 18499394
25. Ferris AE, Aldridge JM, Rabago CA, et al. Evaluation of a powered ankle-foot prosthetic system during walking. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* Nov 2012; 93(11): 1911-8. PMID 22732369
26. Herr HM, Grabowski AM. Bionic ankle-foot prosthesis normalizes walking gait for persons with leg amputation. *Proc Biol Sci.* Feb 07 2012; 279(1728): 457-64. PMID 21752817

27. Mancinelli C, Patrilli BL, Tropea P, et al. Comparing a passive-elastic and a powered prosthesis in transtibial amputees. Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc. 2011; 2011: 8255-8. PMID 22256259
28. Webster JB, Crunkhorn A, Sall J, et al. Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Lower Limb Amputation: An Update from the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense. Am J Phys Med Rehabil. Sep 2019; 98(9): 820-829. PMID 31419214

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.

