

Medical Coverage Policy | Disposable Negative Pressure Wound Therapy



EFFECTIVE DATE: 07|01|2017

POLICY LAST UPDATED: 02|01|2023

OVERVIEW

Negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT) involves the use of negative pressure or suction device to aspirate and remove fluids, debris, and infectious materials from the wound bed to promote the formation of granulation tissue and wound healing.

This policy is applicable only to disposable negative pressure wound therapy.

MEDICAL CRITERIA

Not applicable

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

Not applicable

POLICY STATEMENT

Medicare Advantage Plans

The use of (powered or nonpowered) disposable single-use negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT) system devices for the treatment of acute or chronic wounds including but not limited to diabetic, venous, surgical, and traumatic wounds, is not covered, as they do not meet the durable medical equipment (DME) benefit durability requirement.

Commercial Products

The use of (powered or nonpowered) disposable single-use negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT) system devices for the treatment of acute or chronic wounds including but not limited to diabetic, venous, surgical, and traumatic wounds, is considered not medically necessary, as the evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

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

The management and treatment of chronic wounds, including decubitus ulcers, is challenging. Most chronic wounds will heal only if the underlying cause (ie, venous stasis, pressure, infection) is addressed. Also, cleaning the wound to remove nonviable tissue, microorganisms, and foreign bodies is essential to create optimal conditions for either re-epithelialization (ie, healing by secondary intention) or preparation for wound closure with skin grafts or flaps (ie, healing by primary intention). Therefore, debridement, irrigation, whirlpool treatments, and wet-to-dry dressings are common components of chronic wound care.

Negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT) involves the use of a negative pressure therapy or suction device to aspirate and remove fluids, debris, and infectious materials from the wound bed to promote the formation of granulation tissue. The devices may also be used as an adjunct to surgical therapy or as an alternative to surgery in a debilitated patient. Although the exact mechanism has not been elucidated, it is hypothesized that negative pressure contributes to wound healing by removing excess interstitial fluid, increasing the vascularity

of the wound, reducing edema, and/or creating beneficial mechanical forces that lead to cell growth and expansion.

Disposable negative pressure therapy or suction devices cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for treating chronic wounds include but are not limited to: Smart Negative Pressure Wound Care System, PICO Single Use Negative Pressure Wound Therapy System (Smith & Nephew), and the Prevena™ Incision Management System (KCI) is designed specifically for closed surgical incisions.

A nonpowered (mechanical) NPWT system has also been developed; the Smart Negative Pressure Wound Care System is portable and lightweight (3 oz) and can be worn underneath clothing. This system consists of a cartridge, dressing, and strap; the cartridge acts as the negative pressure source. The system is reported to generate negative pressure levels similar to other NPWT systems. This system is fully disposable.

For individuals who have diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds who receive portable, single-use outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, quality of life (QOL), and treatment-related morbidity. A 2019 RCT compared the PICO device with standard NPWT. In this study, the PICO device demonstrated noninferiority for wound area reduction. A statistically significant benefit in complete wound closure was noted for patients with diabetic foot ulcers (DFUs), but was not duplicated in the per protocol population due to a high number of exclusions. One study of the Smart Negative Pressure nonpowered Wound Care System (SNaP) showed noninferiority to a Vacuum-Assisted Closure Therapy (V.A.C.) device for wound size reduction. No significant difference in complete wound closure was reported. Interpretation of this study is limited by a high loss to follow-up. Well-designed comparative studies with larger numbers of patients powered to detect differences in complete wound closure are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency who receive portable, single-use outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. A 2019 RCT compared the PICO device with standard NPWT. In this study, the PICO device demonstrated noninferiority for wound area reduction. No significant benefit in complete wound closure was found in patients with venous ulcers. One study of the SNaP System showed noninferiority to a V.A.C. device for wound size reduction. A subgroup analysis of this study found a significant difference in complete wound closure for patients with venous ulcers. However, interpretation of this study is limited by a high loss to follow-up and a lack of a control group treated with standard dressings. Well-designed comparative studies with larger numbers of patients powered to detect differences in complete wound closure are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have traumatic or surgical wounds who receive portable, single-use outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. The PICO device was studied in an adequately powered but unblinded RCT of combined in- and outpatient use after total joint arthroplasty. The evidence base for the Prevena System is not sufficiently robust for conclusions on efficacy to be drawn. Well-designed comparative studies with larger numbers of patients treated in an outpatient setting are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

CODING

Medicare Advantage Plans and Commercial Products

The following HCPCS code(s) is not covered for Medicare Advantage Plans (as it does not meet the DME benefit durability requirement) and is not medically necessary for Commercial Products:

A9272 Wound suction, disposable, includes dressing, all accessories and components, any type, each

The following CPT code(s) are not covered for Medicare Advantage Plans and not medically necessary for Commercial Products:

- 97607** Negative pressure wound therapy, (eg, vacuum assisted drainage collection), utilizing disposable, non-durable medical equipment including provision of exudate management collection system, topical application(s), wound assessment, and instructions for ongoing care, per session; total wound(s) surface area less than or equal to 50 square centimeters
- 97608** Negative pressure wound therapy, (eg, vacuum assisted drainage collection), utilizing disposable, non-durable medical equipment including provision of exudate management collection system, topical application(s), wound assessment, and instructions for ongoing care, per session; total wound(s) surface area greater than 50 square centimeters

RELATED POLICIES

Durable Medical Equipment

PUBLISHED

Provider Update, April 2023

Provider Update, June 2022

Provider Update, May 2021

Provider Update, April 2020

Provider Update, July 2019

REFERENCES

1. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. UPDATE on Serious Complications Associated with Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Systems: FDA Safety Communication. 2011 Feb; <http://wayback.archiveit.org/7993/20170722215801/https://www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/Safety/AlertsandNotices/ucm244211.htm>. Accessed December 21, 2021.
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Vacuum-assisted closure in the treatment of chronic wounds. TEC Assessments. 2000;Volume 15:Tab 23.
3. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Guidance for Industry. Chronic Cutaneous Ulcer and Burn Wounds - Developing Products for Treatment. June 2006; <https://www.fda.gov/media/71278/download>. Accessed December 21, 2021.
4. Rhee SM, Valle MF, Wilson LM, et al. Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Technologies For Chronic Wound Care in the Home Setting. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment (Contract No. 290-201-200007-I) Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2014.
5. Rhee SM, Valle MF, Wilson LM, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy technologies for chronic wound care in the home setting: A systematic review. *Wound Repair Regen.* Jul-Aug 2015; 23(4): 506-17. PMID 25845268
6. Sullivan N, Snyder DL, Tipton K, et al. Technology assessment: Negative pressure wound therapy devices (Contract No. 290-2007-10063). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2009.
7. Norman G, Goh EL, Dumville JC, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for surgical wounds healing by primary closure. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Jun 15 2020; 6: CD009261. PMID 32542647
8. Li HZ, Xu XH, Wang DW, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for surgical site infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* Nov 2019; 25(11): 1328-1338. PMID 31220604
9. Dumville JC, Hinchliffe RJ, Cullum N, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for treating foot wounds in people with diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Oct 17 2013; (10): CD010318. PMID 24132761
10. Ihezor-Ejiofor Z, Newton K, Dumville JC, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for open traumatic wounds. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Jul 03 2018; 7: CD012522. PMID 29969521
11. Wynn M, Freeman S. The efficacy of negative pressure wound therapy for diabetic foot ulcers: A systematized review. *J Tissue Viability.* Aug 2019; 28(3): 152-160. PMID 31056407

12. Chen L, Zhang S, Da J, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of efficacy and safety of negative pressure wound therapy in the treatment of diabetic foot ulcer. *Ann Palliat Med.* Oct 2021; 10(10): 10830-10839. PMID 34763444
13. Blume PA, Walters J, Payne W, et al. Comparison of negative pressure wound therapy using vacuum-assisted closure with advanced moist wound therapy in the treatment of diabetic foot ulcers: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care.* Apr 2008; 31(4): 631-6. PMID 18162494
14. Seidel D, Storck M, Lawall H, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy compared with standard moist wound care on diabetic foot ulcers in real-life clinical practice: results of the German DiaFu-RCT. *BMJ Open.* Mar 24 2020; 10(3): e026345. PMID 32209619
15. Borys S, Hohendorff J, Koblik T, et al. Negative-pressure wound therapy for management of chronic neuropathic noninfected diabetic foot ulcerations - short-term efficacy and long-term outcomes. *Endocrine.* Dec 2018; 62(3): 611-616. PMID 30099674
16. Kirsner R, Dove C, Reyzelman A, et al. A prospective, randomized, controlled clinical trial on the efficacy of a single-use negative pressure wound therapy system, compared to traditional negative pressure wound therapy in the treatment of chronic ulcers of the lower extremities. *Wound Repair Regen.* Sep 2019; 27(5): 519-529. PMID 31087729
17. Kirsner RS, Zimnitsky D, Robinson M. A prospective, randomized, controlled clinical study on the effectiveness of a single-use negative pressure wound therapy system, compared to traditional negative pressure wound therapy in the treatment of diabetic ulcers of the lower extremities. *Wound Repair Regen.* Nov 2021; 29(6): 908-911. PMID 34525239
18. Armstrong DG, Marston WA, Reyzelman AM, et al. Comparison of negative pressure wound therapy with an- ultraportable mechanically powered device vs. traditional electrically powered device for the treatment of chronic lower extremity ulcers: a multicenter randomized-controlled trial. *Wound Repair Regen.* Mar-Apr 2011; 19(2): 173-80. PMID 21362084
19. Armstrong DG, Marston WA, Reyzelman AM, et al. Comparative effectiveness of mechanically and electrically powered negative pressure wound therapy devices: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Wound Repair Regen.* May-Jun 2012; 20(3): 332-41. PMID 22564228
20. Lerman B, Oldenbrook L, Eichstadt SL, et al. Evaluation of chronic wound treatment with the SNaP wound care system versus modern dressing protocols. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Oct 2010; 126(4): 1253-1261. PMID 20885246
21. Wanner MB, Schwarzl F, Strub B, et al. Vacuum-assisted wound closure for cheaper and more comfortable healing of pressure sores: a prospective study. *Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Hand Surg.* 2003; 37(1): 28-33. PMID 12625392
22. Dumville JC, Land L, Evans D, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for treating leg ulcers. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Jul 14 2015; (7): CD011354. PMID 26171910
23. Vuerstaek JD, Vainas T, Wuite J, et al. State-of-the-art treatment of chronic leg ulcers: A randomized controlled trial comparing vacuum-assisted closure (V.A.C.) with modern wound dressings. *J Vasc Surg.* Nov 2006; 44(5): 1029- 37; discussion 1038. PMID 17000077
24. Marston WA, Armstrong DG, Reyzelman AM, et al. A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Treatment of Venous Leg Ulcers Using Mechanically Versus Electrically Powered Negative Pressure Wound Therapy. *Adv Wound Care (New Rochelle).* Feb 01 2015; 4(2): 75-82. PMID 25713749

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.

