Medical Coverage Policy | Amniotic Membrane and Amniotic Fluid

EFFECTIVE DATE: 07|01|2023
POLICY LAST REVIEWED: 09|03|2025

OVERVIEW

Several commercially available forms of human amniotic membrane (HAM) and amniotic fluid can be administered by patches, topical application, or injection. Amniotic membrane and amniotic fluid are being evaluated for the treatment of a variety of conditions, including chronic full-thickness diabetic lower extremity ulcers, venous ulcers, knee osteoarthritis, plantar fasciitis, and ophthalmic conditions.

MEDICAL CRITERIA

Not applicable

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

Not applicable

POLICY STATEMENT

Medicare Advantage Plans and Commercial Products

Treatment of nonhealing diabetic lower-extremity ulcers using human amniotic membrane products may be considered medically necessary when filed with a covered diagnosis identified below.

Human amniotic membrane grafts with or without suture may be considered medically necessary for the treatment of the following ophthalmic indications when filed with a covered diagnosis identified below:

- Neurotrophic keratitis;
- Corneal ulcers and melts;
- Corneal perforation;
- Bullous keratopathy;
- Partial limbal stem cell deficiency with extensive diseased tissue;
- Moderate or severe Stevens-Johnson syndrome;
- Persistent epithelial defects;
- Severe dry eye; or
- Moderate or severe acute ocular chemical burn

Human amniotic membrane grafts with suture or glue may be considered medically necessary for the treatment of the following ophthalmic indications when filed with a covered diagnosis identified below:

- Corneal perforation; or
- Pterygium repair

Medicare Advantage Plans

Human amniotic membrane grafts with or without suture are not covered for all ophthalmic indications not outlined above as the evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Injection of micronized or particulated human amniotic membrane and injection of human amniotic fluid is not covered for all indications, including but not limited to osteoarthritis and plantar fasciitis, as the evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

All other human amniotic membrane products and indications not listed above are not covered, including but not limited to treatment of lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency, as the evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

All other indications not listed above are considered not covered, including but not limited to treatment of lower extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency and repair following Mohs micrographic surgery as the evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Commercial Products
Human amniotic membrane grafts with or without suture are not medically necessary for all ophthalmic indications not outlined above as the evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Injection of micronized or particulated human amniotic membrane and injection of human amniotic fluid is considered not medically necessary for all indications, including but not limited to osteoarthritis and plantar fasciitis, as the evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

All other human amniotic membrane products and indications not listed above are not medically necessary, including but not limited to treatment of lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency, as the evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

All other indications not listed above are considered not medically necessary, including but not limited to treatment of lower extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency and repair following Mohs micrographic surgery 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 section of the Benefit Booklet, Evidence of Coverage or Subscriber Agreement for applicable surgery and not medically necessary/not covered benefits/coverage.

BACKGROUND
Human amniotic membrane
Human amniotic membrane (HAM) consists of 2 conjoined layers, the amnion, and chorion, and forms the innermost lining of the amniotic sac or placenta. When prepared for use as an allograft, the membrane is harvested immediately after birth, cleaned, sterilized, and either cryopreserved or dehydrated. Many products available using amnion, chorion, amniotic fluid, and umbilical cord are being studied for the treatment of a variety of conditions, including chronic full-thickness diabetic lower-extremity ulcers, venous ulcers, knee osteoarthritis, plantar fasciitis, and ophthalmic conditions. The products are formulated either as patches, which can be applied as wound covers, or as suspensions or particulates, or connective tissue extractions, which can be injected or applied topically.

Fresh amniotic membrane contains collagen, fibronectin, and hyaluronic acis, along with a combination of growth factors, cytokines, and anti-inflammatory proteins such as interleukin-1 receptor antagonist. There is evidence that the tissue has anti-flammatory, antifibroblastic, and antimicrobial properties. HAM is considered nonimmunogenic and has not been observed to cause a substantial immune response. It is believed that these properties are retained in cryopreserved HAM and HAM products, resulting in a readily available tissue with regenerative potential. In support, 1 HAM product has been shown to elute growth factors into saline and stimulate the migration of mesenchymal stem cells, both in vitro and in vivo.

Use of a HAM graft, which is fixated by sutures, is an established treatment for disorders of the corneal surface, including neurotrophic keratitis, corneal ulcers and melts, following pterygium repair, Stevens-Johnson syndrome, and persistent epithelial defects. Amniotic membrane products that are inserted like a

contact lens have more recently been investigated for the treatment of corneal and ocular surface disorders. Amniotic membrane patches are also being evaluated for the treatment of various other conditions, including skin wounds, burns, leg ulcers, and prevention of tissue adhesion in surgical procedures. Additional indications studied in preclinical models include tendonitis, tendon repair, and nerve repair. The availability of HAM opens the possibility of regenerative medicine for an array of conditions.

Amniotic fluid

Amniotic fluid surrounds the fetus during pregnancy and provides protection and nourishment. In the second half of gestation, most of the fluid is a result of micturition and secretion from the respiratory tract and gastrointestinal tract of the fetus, along with urea. The fluid contains proteins, carbohydrates, peptides, fats, amino acids, enzymes, hormones, pigments, and fetal cells. Use of human and bovine amniotic fluid for orthopedic conditions was first reported in 1927. Amniotic fluid has been compared with synovial fluid, containing hyaluronan, lubricant, cholesterol, and cytokines. Injection of amniotic fluid or amniotic fluid–derived cells is currently being evaluated for the treatment of osteoarthritis and plantar fasciitis.

Diabetic Lower-Extremity Ulcers

For individuals who have non-healing diabetic lower-extremity ulcers who receive a patch or flowable formulation of HAM or placental membrane (ie, Affinity, AmnioBand Membrane, AmnioExcel, Biovance, EpiCord, EpiFix, Grafix), the evidence includes randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The RCTs evaluating amniotic and placental membrane products for the treatment of non-healing (<20% healing with ≥2 weeks of standard care) diabetic lower-extremity ulcers have compared HAM with standard care or with an established advanced wound care product. These trials used wound closure as the primary outcome measure, and some used power analysis, blinded assessment of wound healing, and intention-to-treat analysis. For the HAM products that have been sufficiently evaluated (ie, Affinity, AmnioBand Membrane, Biovance, EpiCord, EpiFix, Grafix), results have shown improved outcomes compared with standard care, and outcomes that are at least as good as an established advanced wound care product. Improved health outcomes in the RCTs are supported by multicenter registries. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Lower-Extremity Ulcers due to Venous Insufficiency

For individuals who have lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency who receive a patch or flowable formulation of HAM, the evidence includes 2 RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The published evidence on HAM for the treatment of venous leg ulcers includes 2 multicenter RCTs with EpiFix. One RCT reported a larger percent wound closure at 4 weeks, but the percentage of patients with complete wound closure at 4 weeks did not differ between EpiFix and the standard of care. A second RCT evaluated complete wound closure at 12 weeks after weekly application of EpiFix or standard dressings with compression, but interpretation is limited by methodologic concerns. Two additional studies with other HAM products have been completed but not published, raising further questions about the efficacy of HAM for venous insufficiency ulcers. Therefore, corroboration with well-designed and well-conducted RCTs evaluating wound healing is needed to demonstrate efficacy for this indication. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Osteoarthritis

For individuals who have knee osteoarthritis who receive an injection of suspension or particulate formulation of HAM or amniotic fluid, the evidence includes a feasibility study. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The pilot study assessed the feasibility of a larger RCT evaluating HAM injection. Additional trials, which will have a larger sample size and longer follow-up, are needed to permit conclusions on the effect of this treatment. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Plantar Fasciitis
The evidence on injection of amniotic membrane for the treatment of plantar fasciitis includes preliminary studies and a larger (N =145) patient-blinded comparison of micronized injectable-HAM and placebo control. Injection of micronized amniotic membrane resulted in greater improvements in the visual analog score for pain and the Foot Functional Index compared to placebo controls. The primary limitation of the study is that this is an interim report with 12-month results pending. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Ophthalmic Conditions
Sutured HAM transplant has been used for many years for the treatment of ophthalmic conditions. Many of these conditions are rare, leading to difficulty in conducting RCTs. The rarity, severity, and variability of the ophthalmic condition was taken into consideration in evaluating the evidence.

Neurotrophic Keratitis with Ocular Surface Damage and Inflammation That Does Not Respond to Conservative Therapy
For individuals who have neurotrophic keratitis with ocular surface damage and inflammation that does not respond to conservative therapy who receive HAM, the evidence includes RCT. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. An RCT of 30 patients showed no benefit of sutured HAM graft compared to tarsorrhaphy or bandage contact lens. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Corneal Ulcers and Melts That Do Not Respond to Initial Medical Therapy
For individuals who have corneal ulcers and melts, that do not respond to initial medical therapy who receive HAM, the evidence includes a systematic review of primarily case series and a non-randomized comparative study. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. Corneal ulcers and melts are uncommon and variable and additional RCTs are not expected. The systematic review showed healing in 97% of patients with an improvement of vision in 53% of eyes. One retrospective comparative study with 22 patients found more rapid and complete epithelialization and more patients with a clinically significant improvement in visual acuity following early treatment with self-retained amniotic membrane when compared to historical controls. Corneal ulcers and melts are uncommon and variable and RCTs are not expected. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Corneal Perforation When There is Active Inflammation After Corneal Transplant Requiring Adjunctive Treatment
For individuals who have corneal perforation when there is active inflammation after corneal transplant requiring adjunctive treatment who receive HAM, the evidence is limited. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. No comparative evidence was identified for this indication. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Bullous Keratopathy as a Palliative Measure in Patients Who are Not Candidates for a Curative Treatment (eg, Endothelial or Penetrating Keratoplasty)
For individuals who have bullous keratopathy and who are not candidates for curative treatment (eg, endothelial or penetrating keratoplasty) who receive HAM, the evidence includes an RCT. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. An RCT found no advantage of sutured HAM over the simpler stromal puncture procedure for the treatment of pain from bullous keratopathy. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Partial Limbal Stem Cell Deficiency with Extensive Diseased Tissue Where Selective Removal Alone is Not Sufficient
For individuals who have partial limbal stem cell deficiency with extensive diseased tissue where selective removal alone is not sufficient who receive HAM, the evidence is limited. Relevant outcomes are symptoms,

morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. No comparative trials were identified on HAM for limbal stem cell deficiency. Improvement in visual acuity has been reported for some patients who have received HAM in conjunction with removal of the diseased limbus. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Moderate or Severe Stevens-Johnson Syndrome
For individuals who have moderate or severe Stevens-Johnson syndrome who receive HAM, the evidence includes an RCT. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The evidence on HAM for the treatment of Stevens-Johnson syndrome (includes 1 RCT with 25 patients [50 eyes]) found improved symptoms and function with HAM compared to medical therapy alone. Large RCTs are unlikely due to the severity and rarity of the disease. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Persistent Epithelial Defects and Ulceration That Do Not Respond to Conservative Therapy
For individuals who have persistent epithelial defects that do not respond to conservative therapy who receive HAM, the evidence is limited. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. No comparative trials were identified on persistent epithelial defects and ulceration. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Severe Dry Eye with Ocular Surface Damage and Inflammation That Does Not Respond to Conservative Therapy
For individuals who have severe dry eye with ocular surface damage and inflammation that does not respond to conservative therapy, who receive HAM, the evidence includes an RCT and a large case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The evidence on HAM for severe dry eye with ocular surface damage and inflammation includes an RCT with 20 patients and a retrospective series of 84 patients (97 eyes). Placement of self-retained HAM for 2 to 11 days reduced symptoms and restored a smooth corneal surface and corneal nerve density for as long as 3 months. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Moderate or Severe Acute Ocular Chemical Burns
For individuals who have moderate or severe acute ocular chemical burn who receive HAM, the evidence includes 3 RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. Evidence includes a total of 197 patients with acute ocular chemical burns who were treated with HAM transplantation plus medical therapy or medical therapy alone. Two of the 3 RCTs did not show a faster rate of epithelial healing, and there was no significant benefit for other outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Corneal Perforation When Corneal Tissue is Not Immediately Available
For individuals who have corneal perforation when corneal tissue is not immediately available who receive sutured HAM, the evidence is limited. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The standard treatment for corneal perforation is corneal transplantation, however, HAM may provide temporary coverage of the severe defect when corneal tissue is not immediately available. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Pterygium Repair When There is Insufficient Healthy Tissue to Create a Conjunctival Autograft
For individuals who have pterygium repair when there is insufficient healthy tissue to create a conjunctival autograft who receive HAM, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. Systematic reviews of RCTs have been published that found that conjunctival or limbal autograft is more effective than HAM graft in reducing the rate of pterygium recurrence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Repair Following Mohs Micrographic Surgery
For individuals who have undergone Mohs micrographic surgery for skin cancer on the face, head, neck, or dorsal hand who receive human amniotic/chorionic membrane, the evidence includes a nonrandomized, comparative study and no RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. A retrospective analysis using data from medical records compared a dehydrated human amniotic/chorionic membrane product (dHACM, Epifix) to repair using autologous surgery in 143 propensity-score matched pairs of patients requiring same-day reconstruction after Mohs microsurgery for skin cancer on the head, face, or neck. A greater proportion of patients who received dHACM repair experienced zero complications (97.9% vs. 71.3%; p<.0001; relative risk 13.97; 95% CI, 4.33 to 43.12). Placental allograft reconstructions developed less infection (p=.004) and were less likely to experience poor scar cosmesis (p<.0001). This study is limited by its retrospective observational design. Well-designed and conducted prospective studies are lacking. 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 HCPCS codes identified in the attached list are considered medically necessary when filed with the ICD-10 diagnosis codes also included in the attached list.

Amniotic Membrane and Amniotic Fluid HCPCS and ICD-10 Codes

RELATED POLICIES

Not applicable

PUBLISHED

Provider Update, November 2025
Provider Update, August 2024
Provider Update, May 2023
Provider Update, June 2022, December 2022
Provider Update, December 2021

REFERENCES

1. Parolini O, Soncini M, Evangelista M, et al. Amniotic membrane and amniotic fluid-derived cells: potential tools for regenerative medicine?. Regen Med. Mar 2009; 4(2): 275-91. PMID 19317646
2. Koob TJ, Rennert R, Zabek N, et al. Biological properties of dehydrated human amnion/chorion composite graft: implications for chronic wound healing. Int Wound J. Oct 2013; 10(5): 493-500. PMID 23902526
3. Shimberg M, Wadsworth K. The use of amniotic-fluid concentrate in orthopaedic conditions. J Bone Joint Surg. 1938;20(I):167-177.
4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Regulatory Considerations for Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products: Minimal Manipulation and Homologous Use Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff. 2017 https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=FDA-2017-D-6146-0003 Accessed January 10, 2022.
5. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Summary: ProKeraTM Bio-Tissue Inc. (K032104). 2003; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf3/K032104.pdf. Accessed January 10, 2022.
6. Serena TE, Yaakov R, Moore S, et al. A randomized controlled clinical trial of a hypothermically stored amniotic membrane for use in diabetic foot ulcers. J Comp Eff Res. Jan 2020; 9(1): 23-34. PMID 31691579
7. Ananian CE, Dhillon YS, Van Gils CC, et al. A multicenter, randomized, single-blind trial comparing the efficacy of viable cryopreserved placental membrane to human fibroblast-derived dermal substitute for the treatment of chronic diabetic foot ulcers. Wound Repair Regen. May 2018; 26(3): 274-283. PMID 30098272
8. Tettelbach W, Cazzell S, Sigal F, et al. A multicentre prospective randomised controlled comparative parallel study of dehydrated human umbilical cord (EpiCord) allograft for the treatment of diabetic foot ulcers. Int Wound J. Feb 2019; 16(1): 122-130. PMID 30246926

9. DiDomenico LA, Orgill DP, Galiano RD, et al. Use of an aseptically processed, dehydrated human amnion and chorion membrane improves likelihood and rate of healing in chronic diabetic foot ulcers: A prospective, randomised, multi-centre clinical trial in 80 patients. Int Wound J. Dec 2018; 15(6): 950-957. PMID 30019528
10. Snyder RJ, Shimozaki K, Tallis A, et al. A Prospective, Randomized, Multicenter, Controlled Evaluation of the Use of Dehydrated Amniotic Membrane Allograft Compared to Standard of Care for the Closure of Chronic Diabetic Foot Ulcer. Wounds. Mar 2016; 28(3): 70-7. PMID 26978860
11. Zelen CM, Gould L, Serena TE, et al. A prospective, randomised, controlled, multi-centre comparative effectiveness study of healing using dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane allograft, bioengineered skin substitute or standard of care for treatment of chronic lower extremity diabetic ulcers. Int Wound J. Dec 2015; 12(6): 724-32. PMID 25424146
12. Zelen CM, Serena TE, Gould L, et al. Treatment of chronic diabetic lower extremity ulcers with advanced therapies: a prospective, randomised, controlled, multi-centre comparative study examining clinical efficacy and cost. Int Wound J. Apr 2016; 13(2): 272-82. PMID 26695998
13. Tettelbach W, Cazzell S, Reyzelman AM, et al. A confirmatory study on the efficacy of dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane dHACM allograft in the management of diabetic foot ulcers: A prospective, multicentre, randomised, controlled study of 110 patients from 14 wound clinics. Int Wound J. Feb 2019; 16(1): 19-29. PMID 30136445
14. Lavery LA, Fulmer J, Shebetka KA, et al. The efficacy and safety of Grafix((R)) for the treatment of chronic diabetic foot ulcers: results of a multi-centre, controlled, randomised, blinded, clinical trial. Int Wound J. Oct 2014; 11(5): 554-60. PMID 25048468
15. Smiell JM, Treadwell T, Hahn HD, et al. Real-world Experience With a Decellularized Dehydrated Human Amniotic Membrane Allograft. Wounds. Jun 2015; 27(6): 158-69. PMID 26061491
16. Frykberg RG, Gibbons GW, Walters JL, et al. A prospective, multicentre, open-label, single-arm clinical trial for treatment of chronic complex diabetic foot wounds with exposed tendon and/or bone: positive clinical outcomes of viable cryopreserved human placental membrane. Int Wound J. Jun 2017; 14(3): 569-577. PMID 27489115
17. Serena TE, Carter MJ, Le LT, et al. A multicenter, randomized, controlled clinical trial evaluating the use of dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane allografts and multilayer compression therapy vs. multilayer compression therapy alone in the treatment of venous leg ulcers. Wound Repair Regen. Nov-Dec 2014; 22(6): 688-93. PMID 25224019
18. Bianchi C, Cazzell S, Vayser D, et al. A multicentre randomised controlled trial evaluating the efficacy of dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane (EpiFix (R)) allograft for the treatment of venous leg ulcers. Int Wound J. Feb 2018; 15(1): 114-122. PMID 29024419
19. Bianchi C, Tettelbach W, Istwan N, et al. Variations in study outcomes relative to intention-to-treat and per-protocol data analysis techniques in the evaluation of efficacy for treatment of venous leg ulcers with dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane allograft. Int Wound J. Jun 2019; 16(3): 761-767. PMID 30864259
20. Vines JB, Aliprantis AO, Gomoll AH, et al. Cryopreserved Amniotic Suspension for the Treatment of Knee Osteoarthritis. J Knee Surg. Aug 2016; 29(6): 443-50. PMID 26683979
21. Tsikopoulos K, Vasiliadis HS, Mavridis D. Injection therapies for plantar fasciopathy ('plantar fasciitis'): a systematic review and network meta-analysis of 22 randomised controlled trials. Br J Sports Med. Nov 2016; 50(22): 1367-1375. PMID 27143138
22. Zelen CM, Poka A, Andrews J. Prospective, randomized, blinded, comparative study of injectable micronized dehydrated amniotic/chorionic membrane allograft for plantar fasciitis--a feasibility study. Foot Ankle Int. Oct 2013; 34(10): 1332-9. PMID 23945520
23. Cazzell S, Stewart J, Agnew PS, et al. Randomized Controlled Trial of Micronized Dehydrated Human Amnion/Chorion Membrane (dHACM) Injection Compared to Placebo for the Treatment of Plantar Fasciitis. Foot Ankle Int. Oct 2018; 39(10): 1151-1161. PMID 30058377
24. Suri K, Kosker M, Raber IM, et al. Sutureless amniotic membrane ProKera for ocular surface disorders: short-term results. Eye Contact Lens. Sep 2013; 39(5): 341-7. PMID 23945524
25. Liu J, Li L, Li X. Effectiveness of Cryopreserved Amniotic Membrane Transplantation in Corneal Ulceration: A Meta-Analysis. Cornea. Apr 2019; 38(4): 454-462. PMID 30702468

26. Yin HY, Cheng AMS, Tighe S, et al. Self-retained cryopreserved amniotic membrane for treating severe corneal ulcers: a comparative, retrospective control study. Sci Rep. Oct 12 2020; 10(1): 17008. PMID 33046729
27. Paris Fdos S, Goncalves ED, Campos MS, et al. Amniotic membrane transplantation versus anterior stromal puncture in bullous keratopathy: a comparative study. Br J Ophthalmol. Aug 2013; 97(8): 980-4. PMID 23723410
28. Kheirkhah A, Casas V, Raju VK, et al. Sutureless amniotic membrane transplantation for partial limbal stem cell deficiency. Am J Ophthalmol. May 2008; 145(5): 787-94. PMID 18329626
29. Pachigolla G, Prasher P, Di Pascuale MA, et al. Evaluation of the role of ProKera in the management of ocular surface and orbital disorders. Eye Contact Lens. Jul 2009; 35(4): 172-5. PMID 19474753
30. Sharma N, Thenarasun SA, Kaur M, et al. Adjuvant Role of Amniotic Membrane Transplantation in Acute Ocular Stevens-Johnson Syndrome: A Randomized Control Trial. Ophthalmology. Mar 2016; 123(3): 484-91. PMID 26686968
31. Bouchard CS, John T. Amniotic membrane transplantation in the management of severe ocular surface disease: indications and outcomes. Ocul Surf. Jul 2004; 2(3): 201-11. PMID 17216092
32. John T, Tighe S, Sheha H, et al. Corneal Nerve Regeneration after Self-Retained Cryopreserved Amniotic Membrane in Dry Eye Disease. J Ophthalmol. 2017; 2017: 6404918. PMID 28894606
33. McDonald MB, Sheha H, Tighe S, et al. Treatment outcomes in the DRy Eye Amniotic Membrane (DREAM) study. Clin Ophthalmol. 2018; 12: 677-681. PMID 29670328
34. Tandon R, Gupta N, Kalaivani M, et al. Amniotic membrane transplantation as an adjunct to medical therapy in acute ocular burns. Br J Ophthalmol. Feb 2011; 95(2): 199-204. PMID 20675729
35. Eslani M, Baradaran-Rafii A, Cheung AY, et al. Amniotic Membrane Transplantation in Acute Severe Ocular Chemical Injury: A Randomized Clinical Trial. Am J Ophthalmol. Mar 2019; 199: 209-215. PMID 30419194
36. Tamhane A, Vajpayee RB, Biswas NR, et al. Evaluation of amniotic membrane transplantation as an adjunct to medical therapy as compared with medical therapy alone in acute ocular burns. Ophthalmology. Nov 2005; 112(11): 1963-9. PMID 16198422
37. Kaufman SC, Jacobs DS, Lee WB, et al. Options and adjuvants in surgery for pterygium: a report by the American Academy of Ophthalmology. Ophthalmology. Jan 2013; 120(1): 201-8. PMID 23062647
38. Clearfield E, Muthappan V, Wang X, et al. Conjunctival autograft for pterygium. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Feb 11 2016; 2: CD011349. PMID 26867004
39. Lavery LA, Davis KE, Berriman SJ, et al. WHS guidelines update: Diabetic foot ulcer treatment guidelines. Wound Repair Regen. Jan-Feb 2016; 24(1): 112-26. PMID 26663430
40. Hingorani A, LaMuraglia GM, Henke P, et al. The management of diabetic foot: A clinical practice guideline by the Society for Vascular Surgery in collaboration with the American Podiatric Medical Association and the Society for Vascular Medicine. J Vasc Surg. Feb 2016; 63(2 Suppl): 3S-21S. PMID 26804367

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.