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INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

This Medical Policy provides assistance in interpreting UnitedHealthcare benefit plans. When deciding coverage, the member specific benefit plan document must be referenced. The terms of the member specific benefit plan document [e.g., Certificate of Coverage (COC), Schedule of Benefits (SOB), and/or Summary Plan Description (SPD)] may differ greatly from the standard benefit plan upon which this Medical Policy is based. In the event of a conflict, the member specific benefit plan document supersedes this Medical Policy. All reviewers must first identify member eligibility, any federal or state regulatory requirements, and the member specific benefit plan coverage prior to use of this Medical Policy. Other Policies and Coverage Determination Guidelines may apply. UnitedHealthcare reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to modify its Policies and Guidelines as necessary. This Medical Policy is provided for informational purposes. It does not constitute medical advice.

UnitedHealthcare may also use tools developed by third parties, such as the MCG™ Care Guidelines, to assist us in administering health benefits. The MCG™ Care Guidelines are intended to be used in connection with the independent professional medical judgment of a qualified health care provider and do not constitute the practice of medicine or medical advice.

BENEFIT CONSIDERATIONS

Before using this policy, please check the member specific benefit plan document and any federal or state mandates, if applicable.

Essential Health Benefits for Individual and Small Group

For plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2014, the Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA) requires fully insured non-grandfathered individual and small group plans (inside and outside of Exchanges) to provide coverage for ten categories of Essential Health Benefits (“EHBs”). Large group plans (both self-funded and fully insured), and small group ASO plans, are not subject to the requirement to offer coverage for EHBs. However, if such plans choose to provide coverage for benefits which are deemed EHBs, the ACA requires all dollar limits on those benefits to be removed on all Grandfathered and Non-Grandfathered plans. The determination of which benefits constitute EHBs is made on a state by state basis. As such, when using this policy, it is important to refer to the member specific benefit plan document to determine benefit coverage.

COVERAGE RATIONALE

When used for walking, functional electrical stimulation (FES), a form of neuromuscular electrical stimulation (NMES), is proven and/or medically necessary when used as one component of a comprehensive rehabilitation program in persons with paralyzed lower limbs due to spinal cord injury (SCI) with all of the following characteristics:

• Intact lower motor units (L1 and below) (both muscle and peripheral nerves)
Muscle and joint stability for weight bearing at upper and lower extremities that can demonstrate balance and control to maintain an upright support posture independently;
Demonstrate brisk muscle contraction to NMES and have sensory perception of electrical stimulation (ES) sufficient for muscle contraction;
Possess high motivation, commitment and cognitive ability to use such devices for walking;
Able to transfer independently and demonstrate independent standing tolerance for at least 3 minutes;
Demonstrate hand and finger function to manipulate controls;
Post recovery from SCI and restorative surgery of at least 6-months;
No hip and knee degenerative disease and no history of long bone fracture secondary to osteoporosis

FES is unproven and/or not medically necessary for treating ANY other indication not listed above as proven and medically necessary, including but not limited to:
- Disuse muscle atrophy in persons with SCI
- Disuse muscle atrophy in persons with multiple sclerosis (MS)
- Gait disorders (e.g., foot drop) of central neurologic origin, including but not limited to stroke or MS

Further studies are needed to confirm that FES promotes bone remineralization and prevents or reverses muscle atrophy. Only a few studies have looked at FES as a modality of treatment of MS, and the results are limited and conflicting regarding whether FES improves treatment outcomes in MS when offered in addition to other rehabilitative treatment modalities. There is insufficient evidence in the peer reviewed literature that use of FES will improve health outcomes in individuals with gait disorders. Published studies have included small heterogeneous patient populations, short-term follow-ups, and various treatment protocols, outcome measures, and FES devices.

NMES is proven and/or medically necessary for treating the following indications:
- Disuse muscle atrophy if:
  - The nerve supply to the muscle is intact; and
  - The disuse muscle atrophy is not of neurological origin but originates from conditions such as casting, splinting or contractures.
- To improve wrist and finger function and prevent or correct shoulder subluxation in persons with partial paralysis following stroke.

NMES is unproven and/or not medically necessary for treating ANY other indication not listed above as proven and medically necessary. There is insufficient evidence in the peer reviewed literature that use of ES will improve health outcomes for the treatment of multiple conditions other than those identified above as proven. Overall, studies in the form of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and case series included small, heterogeneous patient populations and short-term follow-ups. Some systematic reviews have reported that no improvement was seen with NMES, outcomes were conflicting and/or in some cases, when improvement was noted, the effects did not last. Heterogeneity of treatment regimens and outcome measures make it difficult to establish that NMES resulted in meaningful clinical outcomes (e.g., decrease pain, functional improvement, improvement in quality of life (QOL) and ability to carry out activities of daily living (ADLs)) for these other conditions and indications.

Interferential therapy (IFT) is unproven and/or not medically necessary for treating the following indications:
- For the treatment of musculoskeletal disorders or injuries
- For stimulating healing of nonsurgical soft tissue injuries
- To facilitate the healing of bone fractures

There is limited evidence from the available studies to conclude that IFT reduces the pain or promotes healing of bone fractures, musculoskeletal or nonsurgical soft tissue injuries. Although a few studies reported some improvement in pain or disability following IFT for these conditions, none of the double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled studies reported a positive treatment effect of IFT for nonsurgical soft tissue injuries or bone fractures.

Pulsed electrical stimulation (PES) is unproven and/or not medically necessary for treating osteoarthritis (OA).
There is insufficient evidence to conclude that PES provides health benefits to individuals with OA. RCTs are necessary to assess the durability of this procedure in comparison to other types of treatment.

Peripheral subcutaneous field stimulation (PSFS) or peripheral nerve field stimulation (PNFS) is unproven and/or not medically necessary for all indications, including but not limited to pain and opioid management.
Evidence for the effectiveness of PSFS or PNFS based on controlled studies is limited. Additional studies are needed to evaluate the efficacy of this treatment.
Microcurrent electrical nerve stimulation (MENS) therapy is unproven and/or not medically necessary. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that MENS is safe and effective. Robust clinical trials are needed to evaluate this therapy in comparison to other types of treatment.

Percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (PENS) or percutaneous neuromodulation therapy (PNT) is unproven and/or not medically necessary for treating pain. There is limited evidence in the peer reviewed literature to support that PENS or PNT will improve health outcomes in individuals with pain. RCTs assessing larger patient groups and long-term follow up are needed to further clarify its role.

Dorsal root ganglion (DRG) stimulation is unproven and/or not medically necessary. There is limited evidence in the peer reviewed literature to support that DRG stimulation will improve health outcomes in individuals with pain. RCTs assessing larger patient groups and long-term follow up are needed to further clarify its role.

**APPLICABLE CODES**

The following list(s) of procedure and/or diagnosis codes is provided for reference purposes only and may not be all inclusive. Listing of a code in this policy does not imply that the service described by the code is a covered or non-covered health service. Benefit coverage for health services is determined by the member specific benefit plan document and applicable laws that may require coverage for a specific service. The inclusion of a code does not imply any right to reimbursement or guarantee claim payment. Other Policies and Coverage Determination Guidelines may apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63650</td>
<td>Percutaneous implantation of neurostimulator electrode array, epidural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63655</td>
<td>Laminectomy for implantation of neurostimulator electrodes, plate/paddle, epidural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63685</td>
<td>Insertion or replacement of spinal neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver, direct or inductive coupling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association*

**Coding Clarification:** Transcutaneous electrical joint stimulation devices (E0762) are noninvasive devices that deliver low-amplitude pulsed electrical stimulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCPCS Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E0744</td>
<td>Neuromuscular stimulator for scoliosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0745</td>
<td>Neuromuscular stimulator, electronic shock unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0762</td>
<td>Transcutaneous electrical joint stimulation device system, includes all accessories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0764</td>
<td>Functional neuromuscular stimulation, transcutaneous stimulation of sequential muscle groups of ambulation with computer control, used for walking by spinal cord injured, entire system, after completion of training program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0770</td>
<td>Functional electrical stimulator, transcutaneous stimulation of nerve and/or muscle groups, any type, complete system, not otherwise specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1399</td>
<td>Durable medical equipment, miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8679</td>
<td>Implantable neurostimulator, pulse generator, any type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8680</td>
<td>Implantable neurostimulator electrode, each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8682</td>
<td>Implantable neurostimulator radiofrequency receiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8685</td>
<td>Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, single array, rechargeable, includes extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8686</td>
<td>Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, single array, nonrechargeable, includes extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8687</td>
<td>Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, dual array, rechargeable, includes extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8688</td>
<td>Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, dual array, nonrechargeable, includes extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8130</td>
<td>Interferential current stimulator, 2 channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8131</td>
<td>Interferential current stimulator, 4 channel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electrical stimulators provide direct, alternating, pulsating and/or pulsed waveform forms of energy. The devices are used to exercise muscles, demonstrate a muscular response to stimulation of a nerve, relieve pain, relieve incontinence, and provide test measurements. Electrical stimulators may have controls for setting the pulse length, pulse repetition frequency, pulse amplitude, and triggering modes. Electrodes for such devices may be indwelling, implanted transcutaneously, or surface.

**Functional Electrical Stimulation (FES)**

FES is the direct application of electric current to intact nerve fibers in a coordinated fashion to cause involuntary but purposeful contraction. FES bypasses the central nervous system and targets motor neurons innervating either skeletal muscle or other organ systems. Electrodes may be on the surface of the skin or may be surgically implanted along with a stimulator. FES is categorized as therapeutic and functional. Therapeutic FES enables typically resistive exercise, with the goal of preventing muscular atrophy and promoting cardiovascular conditioning. Functional FES enables or enhances standing, ambulation, grasping, pinching, reaching, respiration, bowel or bladder voiding, or ejaculation. The two goals of FES are mutually supportive. FES is a task-specific variant of NMES (Hayes, 2015).

**Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation (NMES)**

NMES involves the use of transcutaneous application of electrical currents to cause muscle contractions. The goal of NMES is to promote reinnervation, to prevent or retard disuse atrophy, to relax muscle spasms, and to promote voluntary control of muscles in patients who have lost muscle function due to surgery, neurological injury, or disabling condition (Hayes, 2008).

**Interferential Therapy (IFT)**

IFT is the superficial application of a medium-frequency alternating current modulated to produce low frequencies up to 150 Hz. It is thought to increase blood flow to tissues and provide pain relief and is considered more comfortable for patients than transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (Chou, et al., 2007).

**Pulsed Electrical Stimulation (PES)**

PES is hypothesized to facilitate bone formation, cartilage repair, and alter inflammatory cell function. Some chondrocyte and osteoblast functions are mediated by electrical fields induced in the extracellular matrix by mechanical stresses. Electrostatic and electrodynamic fields may also alter cyclic adenosine monophosphate or DNA synthesis in cartilage and bone cells.

**Peripheral Subcutaneous Field Stimulation (PSFS)**

PSFS, also known as peripheral nerve field stimulation (PNFS), is a technique used when the field to be stimulated is not well defined or does not fit exactly within the area served by any one or two peripheral nerves. Different from spinal cord stimulation (SCS) or peripheral nerve stimulation (PNS), the electrode arrays are implanted within the subcutaneous tissue of the painful area, not on or around identified neural structures, but most probably in or around cutaneous nerve endings of the intended nerve to stimulate (Abejon and Krames, 2009).

**Microcurrent Electrical Nerve Stimulation Therapy (MENS)**

MENS is intended for pain relief and to facilitate wound healing, delivering current in the microampere range. One micro amp (μA) equals 1/1000th of a milliamp (mA). By comparison, TENS therapy delivers currents in the milliamp range causing muscle contraction, pulsing and tingling sensations. The microcurrent stimulus is subsensorial, so users cannot not detect it. Although microcurrent devices are approved in the category of TENS for regulatory convenience, in practical use they are in no way similar and cannot be compared to TENS in their effect (Curtis, et al. 2010; Zuim, et al. 2006). MENS is also referred to as microelectrical therapy (MET) or microelectrical neuro-stimulation. Examples of MENS devices currently in use include, but are not limited to, Algonix®, Alpha-Stim®100, Microcurrent, and Micro Plus™.

**Percutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (PENS)**

PENS is a conservative, minimally invasive treatment for pain in which acupuncture-like needles connected through a cable to an external power source are inserted into the skin. Needle placement is near the area of pain and is percutaneous instead of cutaneous (e.g., TENS). PENS electrodes are not permanently implanted as in SCS. The mechanism of action of PENS is theorized to modulate the hypersensitivity of nerves from which the persistent pain arises, potentially involving endogenous opioid-like substances. The term percutaneous neuromodulation therapy (PNT) is sometimes used interchangeably with PENS. However, reports indicate PNT is a variant of PENS in which electrodes are placed in patterns that are uniquely different than placement in PENS (Hayes, 2017).
**Dorsal Root Ganglion Stimulation**

DRG stimulation therapy may be prescribed for pain that is limited to a specific area of the body that starts in a lower part of the body (e.g., foot, knee, hip and groin) following an injury or surgical procedure and grows worse over time. DRGs are spinal structures densely populated with sensory nerves that transmit information to the brain via the spinal column. Through the use of a neurostimulator system, (for example, Axium™ or the next-generation implantable pulse generator Proclaim™), physicians are able to directly treat targeted areas of the body where pain occurs (St. Jude Medical, 2017).

**CLINICAL EVIDENCE**

**Functional Electrical Stimulation (FES)**

FES has been proposed for improving ambulation in individuals with gait disorders such as drop foot, hemiplegia due to stroke, cerebral injury, or incomplete SCI. RCTs and case series have primarily included small patient populations with short-term follow-ups.

Hayes performed evidence review from 8 studies that evaluated FES for treatment of foot drop in patients with MS. There was no available evidence regarding implantable FES devices and the majority of the studies used the Odstock ODFS devices, and the others used the WalkAide System. Overall, low-quality body of evidence derived from the studies suggests that during well-controlled walking tests, FES can increase walking speed, improve gait quality, reduce falls, and improve ADLs and QOL in patients with foot drop due to MS. However, while some studies reported significant increases in walking speed with FES, ranging from 7% to 27% compared with baseline, it is unclear whether these improvements are clinically meaningful in a real-life setting. There was no evidence suggesting that the use of the FES device helped MS patients reach normal walking speed. In addition, there was very limited evidence on the effect of FES on other patient-relevant, functional measures. For example, none of the studies evaluated whether FES enabled patients to walk up and down stairs, walk on uneven ground, or perform side steps; or whether its use improved confidence while performing these various activities. Future, well-designed, sufficiently powered RCTs with adequate follow-up are necessary to compare the use of FES with appropriate placebo controls, such as sham treatments, and establish the magnitude of benefit of FES devices. Future research should compare different applications of FES, including implanted or surface stimulation. Methods of independent assessment should be incorporated since adequate blinding is not always feasible for this technology. Additional well-designed studies are necessary to adequately assess the impact of FES on functional status with a particular emphasis on practical dimensions of ADL. Studies with a priori plans for subgroup analyses are also needed to determine the patient and disease characteristics that are associated with clinically relevant, successful outcomes (2011, updated 2017).

Chiu and Ada (2014) conducted a systematic review to determine the effectiveness of FES versus activity training alone in children with cerebral palsy (CP). Five RCTs met inclusion criteria. The experimental group had to receive FES while performing an activity such as walking. The studies used outcome measures of activity that best reflected the activity used in the study. When continuous data (e.g., walking speed) were not available, ordinal data (e.g., Gross Motor Function Measurement) were used. A statistically significant between-group difference in activity in the FES groups was reported for the 3 studies that compared FES with no FES. Improvements were seen immediately after the intervention period, but long-term follow-up was not reported. The 2 studies investigating the effects of FES vs. activity training reported no significant differences between the groups. The results reported that FES is better than no FES but that FES is not more effective than activity training. The authors stated that they may be fairly confident that FES is effective given that all 3 trials reported between-group differences in favor of FES, but with no meta-analysis providing an effect size, it is not possible to judge the clinical significance of the benefit. Limitations of the studies included the heterogeneous patient populations and the variations in the frequency, intensity and duration of the interventions.

A 2016 RCT by El-Shamy and Abdelaal investigated the effects of the WalkAide FES on gait pattern and energy expenditure in children with hemiplegic CP. Seventeen children were assigned to the study group, whose members received FES (pulse width, 300 μs; frequency, 33 Hz, 2 hours/d, 3 days/week for 3 consecutive months). Seventeen other children were assigned to the control group, whose members participated in a conventional physical therapy exercise program for 3 successive months. Baseline and posttreatment assessments were performed using the GAITRite system to evaluate gait parameters and using an open-circuit indirect calorimeter to evaluate energy expenditure. Children in the study group showed a significant improvement when compared with those in the control group (P < 0.005). The gait parameters (stride length, cadence, speed, cycle time, and stance phase percentage) after treatment were (0.74 m,119 steps/min, 0.75 m/s, 0.65 s, 55.9%) and (0.5 m,125 steps/min, 0.6 m/s, 0.49 s, 50.4%) for the study group and control group, respectively. The mean energy expenditures after treatment were 8.18 ± 0.88 and 9.16 ± 0.65 mL/kg per minute for the study and control groups, respectively. The authors concluded that WalkAide FES may be a useful tool for improving gait pattern and energy expenditure in children with hemiplegic CP. The study was limited to a small sample size.
A pilot study by Ratchford et al. (2010) evaluated whether NMES applied to the ankle dorsiflexors during gait improves muscle volume and strength in children with unilateral spastic CP. The study involved 32 children (mean age of 10.5 years) and a Gross Motor Function Classification System of I or II. Participants were randomly assigned to either the 8-week daily NMES treatment group or control group (usual or conventional treatments). Outcomes at week 8 (post-NMES) and week 14 (carryover) included magnetic resonance imaging for muscle volumes (tibialis anterior, anterior compartment, and gastrocnemius), strength (hand-held dynamometry for isometric dorsiflexion strength and heel raise for functional strength), and clinical measures for lower limb selective motor control. At week 8, the treatment group demonstrated significantly (p<0.05) increased muscle volumes and dorsiflexion strength not only when compared to their baseline values but also when compared to the control group at week 8. At week 14, both tibialis anterior and lateral gastrocnemius volumes in the treatment group remained significantly increased when compared to their baseline values. However, only lateral gastrocnemius volumes had significantly greater values when compared to the control group at week 14. There were no between group differences in the clinical measures for lower limb selective motor control at week 8 and 14. The authors concluded that 8 weeks of daily NMES-assisted gait increases muscle volume and strength of the stimulated ankle dorsiflexors in children with unilateral spastic CP. These changes are use-dependent and do not carry over after the 8-week treatment period. Gastrocnemius volume also increased post-treatment with carryover at week 14 (2016).

In 2014, Pool and colleagues also studied children with unilateral spastic CP to determine the effects of FES on the main impairments affecting gait. A 20-week, multiple single-subject A-B-A design included a 6-week pre-FES phase, an 8-week FES phase, and a 6-week post-FES phase. Twelve children (aged 5 to 16 years) wore an FES device (the Walk Aide) daily for 8 weeks. Weekly measures included ankle range of motion (ROM), selective motor control, dorsiflexion and plantar flexion strength, gastrocnemius spasticity, single-limb balance, Observational Gait Scale (OGS) score, and self-reported toe drag and falls in the community. Compared with the pre-FES phase, the FES phase showed significant improvements in ankle ROM, selective motor control and strength, and reductions in spasticity, toe drag, and falls, but no change in OGS score. These improvements were maintained during the post-FES phase. The authors concluded that intermittent, short-term use of FES is potentially effective for reducing impairments affecting gait in children with unilateral spastic CP. The study was limited to a small sample size.

Broekmans et al. (2011) conducted a RCT involving 36 persons with MS to examine the effect(s) of unilateral long-term (20 weeks) standardized resistance training with and without simultaneous electro-stimulation on leg muscle strength and overall functional mobility. The authors found, that long-term light to moderately intense resistance training improves muscle strength in persons with MS but simultaneous electro-stimulation does not further improve training outcome.

A pilot study by Ratchford et al. (2010) evaluated the safety and preliminary efficacy of home FES cycling in 5 patients with chronic progressive MS (CPMS) to explore how it changes cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) cytokine levels. Outcomes were measured by: 2-Minute Walk Test, Timed 25-foot Walk, Timed Up and Go Test, leg strength, Expanded Disability Status Scale (EDSS) score, and Multiple Sclerosis Functional Composite (MSFC) score. QOL was measured using the Short-Form 36 (SF-36). Cytokines and growth factors were measured in the CSF before and after FES cycling. Improvements were seen in the 2-Minute Walk Test, Timed 25-foot Walk, and Timed Up and Go tests. Strength improved in muscles stimulated by the FES cycle, but not in other muscles. No change was seen in the EDSS score, but the MSFC score improved. The physical and mental health subscores and the total SF-36 score improved. The authors concluded that FES cycling was reasonably well tolerated by CPMS patients and encouraging improvements were seen in walking and QOL. The study is limited by small sample. Larger studies are needed to evaluate the effects of FES for patients with MS.

The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) published a guidance document for the use of FES for foot drop of central neurological origin. NICE concluded that the evidence on safety and efficacy appears adequate to
support the use of FES for foot drop in terms of improving gait, but further publication on the efficacy of FES would be useful regarding patient-reported outcomes, such as QOL and ADLs (2009, updated 2012).

Preliminary evidence indicates that paraplegics can benefit from FES that exercises muscles without providing locomotion. In one study, electrically stimulated use of an exercise cycle by paraplegics restored muscle mass (Baldi, 1998). In another study, bone mineral density improved in some bones of patients with SCI after use of the FES bicycle (Chen, 2005). Despite these increased risks, the benefits of electrically stimulated ambulation do not appear to exceed those of electrically stimulated isometric or cycling exercise. While most studies involved patients with many years of muscular atrophy, Baldi et al. utilized patients with less than 4 months of atrophy. Moreover, electrically stimulated isometric exercise stimulated bone remineralization that was not observed with electrically stimulated walking (Needham-Shropshire, 1997B). Even if the ambulation provided by devices such as the Parastep significantly improves, it will still only be usable by a subset of paraplegic patients such as those with T4-T11 SCIs (Klose, 1997). Stationary electrically stimulated exercise can be performed by a much larger group of patients including quadriplegics. To summarize, electrically stimulated ambulation cannot be considered safer or more beneficial than electrically stimulated stationary exercise unless the benefits of ambulation are shown to be superior in large-scale trials in which paraplegic patients are randomized to these 2 therapies. Further studies also need to be performed to confirm the benefits of electrically stimulated stationary exercise since the controlled trials conducted to date have used very small study populations and have assessed a limited set of outcome measures.

**Professional Societies**

**American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA)**

The AOTA practice guidelines for adults with stroke state that for improved occupational performance of individuals with motor impairments, there is high certainty based on evidence that the use of ES has a moderate net benefit. The guidelines also state that the evidence is weak regarding whether or not this therapy improves patient outcomes (Wolf and Nilsen, 2015).

**Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation (NMES) for Muscle Rehabilitation**

Although the evidence is limited, NMES for the treatment of disuse atrophy in individuals where the nerve supply to the muscle is intact appears to be considered standard of care. There is some evidence that the use of NMES may be an effective rehabilitative regimen to prevent muscle atrophy associated with prolonged knee immobilization following ligament reconstruction surgery or injury; however, controlled clinical trials are necessary to determine if the addition of NMES to the rehabilitation program will improve health outcomes.

Knutson et al. (2016) evaluated whether contralaterally controlled FES (CCFES) or cyclic NMES (cNMES) was more effective for post-stroke upper limb rehabilitation in an interventional, phase II, randomized trial conducted at a single institution (NCT00891319). Stroke patients (n=80) with chronic (> 6 months) moderate to severe upper extremity (UE) hemiparesis were randomized into 2 groups, receiving 10 sessions/week of CCFES- or cNMES-assisted hand opening exercise at home plus 20 sessions of functional task practice in the lab over 12 weeks. The primary outcome was improvement in Box and Blocks Test (BBT) score at 6-months post-treatment, with UE Fugl-Meyer motor assessment (UEFMA) and Arm Motor Abilities Test (AMAT) also being measured. Evaluation of participants occurred at baseline, every 3 weeks during the treatment period, at end-of-treatment, and 2, 4, and 6 months post-treatment by a blinded assessor. At 6-months post-treatment, the CCFES group had greater improvement than the cNMES group on the BBT, 4.6 versus 1.8, respectively, and a between-group difference of 2.8. No significant between-group difference was found for the UEFMA or AMAT. The authors concluded that 12 weeks of CCFES therapy resulted in improved manual dexterity compared to cNMES in stroke survivors experiencing chronic moderate to severe hand impairment, with advantage given to those whose impairment was moderate and were < 2 years post-stroke. The translatability of CCFES therapy to other research sites and to clinical practice still has not been established.

De Oliveira Melo et al. (2013) conducted a systematic review to identify the evidence for NMES for strengthening quadriceps muscles in elderly patients with knee OA. Six RCTs met inclusion criteria. Four studies included ≤ 50 patients. Study designs and outcome measures were heterogeneous and comparators varied. NMES parameters were poorly reported. The trials scored extremely low on the allocation concealment and blinding items. In most of the trials, the randomization methods were not described. Due to the poor methodology of the studies and poor description of the strength measurement methods, no or insufficient evidence was found to support NMES alone or combined with other modalities for the treatment of elderly patients with OA. Due to the study limitations, no meta-analysis was performed.

Lin et al. (2011) completed a single-blinded, RCT to investigate the long-term efficacy of NMES in enhancing motor recovery in the UEs of stroke patients. A total of 46 patients with stroke were assigned to a NMES group or a control group. Patients in the NMES group received the treatment for 30 min, 5 days a week for 3 weeks. Measurements were recorded before treatment, at the 2nd and 3rd week of treatment and 1, 3 and 6 months after treatment ended. The Modified Ashworth Scale for spasticity, the UE section of the FMA, and the Modified Barthel Index were used to assess the results. Significant improvements were found in both groups in terms of FMA and Modified Ashworth Scale scores.
after the 3rd week of treatment. The significant improvements persisted 1 month after treatment had been discontinued. At 3 and 6 months post-treatment, the average scores in the NMES group were significantly better than those in the control group. The authors concluded that 3 weeks of NMES to the affected UE of patients with stroke improves motor recovery. One limitation of this study was the absence of a sham stimulation group. Future studies, using similar stimulation protocols with a larger sample, are needed to gain further insight into the potential to induce functionally beneficial neuroplasticity in stroke patients.

In a RCT by Shen et al. (2015), CCFES was compared to NMES as an innovative method to improve UE functions after stroke. Sixty-six patients were also treated with conventional medical treatment and rehabilitation training, and were equally randomized into 2 groups. The treatments were administered in 20 minute sessions, 5 times per week for 3 weeks. Tools to assess results included the FMA, motricity index (MI), the Hong Kong version of functional test for the hemiplegic UE (FTHUE-HK) and active range of motion (AROM) of wrist extension. Patient status was measured before and after 3 weeks of treatment. Both groups showed significant improvements in all the measurements after treatment. Patients in CCFES group showed significantly higher UE FMA, FTHUE-HK scores and AROM of wrist extension than those in NMES group. The authors concluded that compared with the conventional NMES, CCFES provides better recovery of UE function in patients with stroke.

Hsu et al. (2010) conducted a RCT to investigate the effects of different doses of NMES on UE function in acute stroke patients with severe motor deficit. Sixty-six acute stroke patients were equally randomized to 3 groups: high NMES, low NMES, or control. The treatment groups received NMES 5 days per week with the high-NMES group receiving 60 minutes of stimulation per day, and low-NMES group receiving 30 minutes per day for 4 weeks. The FMA, Action Research Arm Test, and Motor Activity Log (MAL) were used to assess the patients at baseline, 4 and 12 weeks. Twelve subjects were lost to follow-up. Both NMES groups showed significant improvement on FMA and Action Research Arm Test scales compared with the control group at weeks 4 and 12. The high-NMES group showed treatment effects similar to those of the low-NMES group. The authors concluded that both higher and lower doses of NMES led to similar improvements in motor function.

In a prospective, longitudinal RCT, 66 patients, aged 50 to 85 years and planning a primary unilateral total knee arthroplasty (TKA), were randomly assigned to receive either standard rehabilitation (control) or standard rehabilitation plus NMES applied to the quadriceps muscle (initiated 48 hours after surgery). The NMES was applied twice daily at the maximum tolerable intensity for 15 contractions. Data for muscle strength, functional performance, and self-report measures were obtained before surgery and 3.5, 6.5, 13, 26, and 52 weeks after TKA. At 3.5 weeks after TKA, significant improvements with NMES were found for quadriceps and hamstring muscle strength, functional performance, and knee extension AROM. At 52 weeks, the differences between groups were attenuated, but improvements with NMES were still significant for quadriceps and hamstring muscle strength, functional performance, and some self-report measures. The authors concluded that the early addition of NMES effectively attenuated loss of quadriceps muscle strength and improved functional performance following TKA. The effects were most pronounced and clinically meaningful within the first month after surgery, but persisted through 1 year after surgery. Further research focused on early intervention after TKA is warranted to continue to optimize patient outcomes (Stevens-Lapsley et al., 2012).

There are also studies that NMES can be effective when used for quadriceps strength training following anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) reconstruction or prior to TKA. In a small RCT of NMES for quadriceps strength training following ACL reconstruction, the group that received NMES demonstrated moderately greater quadriceps strength at 12 weeks and moderately higher levels of knee function at both 12 and 16 weeks of rehabilitation compared to the control group (Fitzgerald, 2003). Another small study by Walls et al. (2010) evaluated the effects of preoperative NMES for 9 patients undergoing TKA. Five patients served as a control group. Preoperative quadriceps muscle strength increased by 28% in NMES group. Early postoperative strength loss was similar in both groups; however the NMES group had a faster recovery with greater strength over the control group at 12 weeks postoperatively.

In 2010, Weber et al. conducted a RCT to assess whether Onabotulinum toxin A injections and occupational therapy with or without FES improved upper limb motor function in 23 stroke patients with chronic spastic hemiparesis. The primary outcome was progression in upper limb motor function as measured by improvement in the Motor Activity Log instrument after 12 weeks of therapy. Although improvements in motor activity were seen among all patients after 6 and 12 weeks, no additional benefit was observed among patients treated with functional NMES versus the comparison group, potentially due to small sample size.

NMES has been used to treat a variety of other conditions including strengthening leg muscles after hip fracture and SCI, increasing wrist extension and reducing arm impairment after stroke, and providing exercise for individuals with severe physical limitations due to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or heart disease. Although RCTs that met the criteria for detailed review provided some evidence that NMES might benefit some patients with these conditions, these trials were small and did not involve sufficient follow-up to provide convincing evidence of the benefits of NMES.
Treatment. A detailed search of the medical peer-reviewed literature did not identify any clinical studies that evaluated ES for the treatment of scoliosis.

**Professional Societies**

**American Heart Association/American Stroke Association (AHA/ASA)**

In its Guidelines for Adult Stroke Rehabilitation and Recovery, the AHA/ASA state that NMES combined with therapy may improve spasticity, but there is insufficient evidence that the addition of NMES improves functional gait or hand use. The AHA/ASA guidelines are endorsed by the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation and the American Society of Neurorehabilitation (Winston et al., 2016).

**Interferential Therapy (IFT)**

IFT is a treatment modality that is proposed to relieve musculoskeletal pain and increase healing in soft tissue injuries and bone fractures. Two medium-frequency, pulsed currents are delivered via electrodes placed on the skin over the targeted area producing a low-frequency current. IFT delivers a crisscross current resulting in deeper muscle penetration. It is theorized that IFT prompts the body to secrete endorphins and other natural painkillers and stimulates parasympathetic nerve fibers to increase blood flow and reduce edema. The body of evidence on IFT includes a number of RCTs and a meta-analysis of RCTs. Several studies reported no significant difference between IFT treatment groups compared to placebo or other co-interventions. Studies which have reported some benefit of IFT treatment for pain have been limited by small sample size, limited follow-up, and lack of placebo control groups. Overall, the evidence suggests that IFT is not found to be more effective than alternative interventions for improving pain, function and/or range of motion for individuals with musculoskeletal conditions.

**Musculoskeletal Pain**

To evaluate the effectiveness of passive physical modalities (which included IFT) on soft tissue injuries of the shoulder, Yu et al. (2015) conducted a systematic review of literature published between January 1, 1990, and April 18, 2013. RCTs and cohort and case-control studies were eligible. Of the 22 eligible articles, 11 studies were found to have a low risk of bias and so were analyzed, although the collective number of patients within the 11 studies was not cited. IFT was one of multiple modalities that were ineffective in reducing shoulder pain. The authors concluded that most passive physical modalities, including IFT, do not benefit patients with subacromial impingement syndrome.

In 2010, Fuentes and colleagues published a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies evaluating the effectiveness of IFS for treating pain. A total of 20 studies met the following inclusion criteria: RCT; included adults diagnosed with a painful musculoskeletal condition; compared IFS (alone or as a co-intervention) to placebo, no treatment, or an alternative intervention; and assessed pain on a numeric scale. Fourteen of the trials reported data that could be included in a pooled analysis. IFS as a stand-alone intervention was not found to be more effective than placebo or an alternative intervention.

**Osteoarthritis (OA)**

Gundog et al. (2012) conducted a RCT to compare the effectiveness of IFT to sham IFT for the treatment of OA. Sixty patients were allocated to 3 active IFT groups (40, 100, and 180 Hz), and one sham IFT group. Treatments were administered for 20 minutes, 5 times per week, for 3 consecutive weeks. Each patient was assessed at the end of the treatments and at the first month using the following measurements: Visual Analog Scale (VAS) (pain at rest and with movement), physician and patient judgments regarding treatment effectiveness, 15-meter walking time (in minutes), ROM, the Western Ontario and McMaster University Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC), and paracetamol intake. Although there were significant improvements in most variables measured in all groups, the improvements were greater in active IFT groups than in the sham group. The improvement in WOMAC stiffness was observed only in active IFT treatment groups. No significant difference between different amplitude-modulated frequencies of IFS treatments was observed. The authors concluded that the study demonstrated the superiority of the IFT with some advantages on pain and disability outcomes when compared with sham IFT for the management of knee OA. Limitations of the study included small patient population, difficulty finding patients who met inclusion criteria, and short-term follow-up.

Zeng et al. (2015) performed a systematic review and Bayesian network meta-analysis of 27 RCTs over a 30-year period, which compared different ES therapies (high-frequency TENS (h-TENS), low-frequency TENS (l-TENS), NMES, IFC, PES and noninvasive interactive neurostimulation (NIN)) with the control group (sham or no intervention) for relief of knee pain in 1253 patients with OA. The primary goal was to identify whether or not the different ES modalities offered pain management by measuring the degree of pain intensity and the change pain score at last follow-up time point. Of the 6 therapy modalities, IFT was the only significantly effective treatment in both pain intensity and changed pain score at last follow-up time point when compared with the control group. In addition, IFT was deemed the best probable option for pain relief among the 6 therapy modalities. The authors’ conclusions were that IFT was the most promising for management of knee pain related to OA. The other ES therapies were considered safe for patients with knee OA, although some were considered inappropriate. Study limitations included a small number of included trials as well as heterogeneity of the evidence.
A multi-center, single-blind, RCT by Burch et al. (2008) investigated the benefits of combined interferential (IF) and patterned muscle stimulation in the treatment of OA of the knee. The study randomized 116 patients to a test or control group. The test group received 15 minutes of IF stimulation followed by 20 minutes of patterned muscle stimulation. The control group received 35 minutes of low-current TENS. Both groups were treated for 8 weeks. Subjects completed questionnaires at baseline and after 2, 4 and 8 weeks. Primary outcomes included the pain and physical function subscales of the WOMAC OA Index and VAS for pain and QOL. Compared to the control group, the test group showed reduced pain and increased function. The test group showed a greater decrease in the WOMAC pain subscale (P=0.002), function subscale (P=0.003) and stiffness subscale (P=0.004). More than 70% of the test group, compared to less than 50% of the control group, had at least a 20% reduction in the WOMAC pain subscale.

At the end of the 2 weeks, there was improvement in nearly all components of the VAS and Laitinen scale for both groups. There was no statistically significant difference between the groups related to incidence of adverse events. The authors concluded that in patients with OA of the knee, home-based patterned stimulation appears to be a promising therapy for relieving pain, decreasing stiffness, and increasing function. Study limitations included manufacturer sponsoring, 10% drop out rate and the treatment effect did not reflect a sufficient significant difference.

**Professional Societies**

**American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS)**

In its clinical practice guideline on the treatment of OA of the knee, the AAOS cannot recommend for or against the use of physical agents (including electrotherapeutic modalities) due to inconsistent findings (2013).

**Anterior Cruciate Ligament/Meniscectomy/Knee Chondroplasty**

Jarit et al. (2003) conducted a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of home-based IFT in 87 patients who had undergone ACL reconstruction, meniscectomy, or knee chondroplasty. Patients were divided into 3 groups based on type of knee surgery and within each group randomized into treatment and placebo group. All patients were given home IFT devices. The treatment groups received working IFT units while the placebo groups received units set to deliver no current. At baseline, there were no statistically significant differences between IFT and control groups in edema or ROM. All IFT subjects reported significantly less pain and had significantly greater ROM at all post-operative time points. ACL and meniscectomy IFT subjects experienced significantly less edema at all time points, while chondroplasty subjects experienced significantly less edema until 4 weeks postoperatively. The authors concluded that IFT may help to reduce pain, need for pain medication and edema as well as enhance recovery of function after knee surgery. The study is limited by subjective reporting of edema by patients, small treatment and control groups and lack of comparison to other treatment modalities. In addition, the control group was aware they were not receiving IFT, thereby confounding the results.

**Tibial Fractures**

Fourie and Bowerbank (1997) studied IFT as a treatment to accelerate healing of tibial fractures in a double blind, RCT. Forty-one men received IFT, 35 received sham, and 151 received no intervention. Outcomes were measured by the time to union or incidence of nonunion. IFTs were applied to the experimental group via suction electrodes for 30 minutes per day for 10 days. The placebo group had only suction electrodes applied producing a rhythmical massage effect. The control group received no intervention. The data analysis reflected no difference in the time for union in the 3 groups. The authors concluded that IFT did not reduce healing time for new tibial fractures or prevent nonunion, and that further investigation was recommended.

**Low Back Pain**

Franco et al. (2016) conducted a double-blind single institution RCT on 148 patients with chronic nonspecific low back pain (LBP) to determine whether IFT before Pilates exercises is more effective than placebo. The primary outcome measures were pain intensity, pressure pain threshold, and disability after 6 weeks of therapy. The study groups consisted of active IFT + Pilates group, and placebo IFT + Pilates group. Eighteen treatment sessions were offered 3 times a week for 6 weeks. Both groups showed significant improvement in outcomes after 6 weeks, with improvements in pain and disability being considered clinically significant as well. However, the authors concluded that active IFT combined with Pilates exercises is no better than placebo IFC plus Pilates. Further studies are suggested.

To assess the influence of TENS and IFT on pain relief and to compare the analgesic efficacy of the 2 modalities, Grabiańska et al. (2015) studied 60 patients with LBP. The participants were equally and randomly divided into 2 groups. Depending on the groups, patients were given a series of ten 20-minute sessions over a 2 week period using either IFT or TENS currents. In all patients, VAS and Laitinen modified scale were taken before and after treatment. At the end of the 2 weeks, there was improvement in nearly all components of the VAS and Laitinen scale for both groups. There was no statistically significant difference between the groups in reducing the intensity and other aspects of pain (e.g., frequency, pain medication and activity limitation). The authors concluded that both IFT and TENS
therapy are effective for pain relief in patients with LBP, as their study results demonstrated equal analgesic efficacy of both therapy modalities.

Hurley et al. (2001) conducted a single-blind, RCT on 60 subjects with LBP, evaluating whether the IFT applied to the associated spinal nerve is more efficacious than placing the current over the painful area. These investigators found a statistically significant reduction in functional disability scores for the spinal nerve therapy group compared with the control group or the painful area therapy group. However, no advantage was observed for the spinal nerve therapy group in pain or QOL scores. The authors’ findings showed that IFT electrode placement technique affects LBP-specific functional disability, providing preliminary implications for future clinical studies.

In a later study, Hurley et al. (2004) investigated the outcomes of manipulative therapy and IFT used as sole modalities or in combination for treatment of acute LBP. Eighty patients received manipulative therapy, 80 received IFT, and 80 received a combination of both. The primary outcome was a change in functional disability on the Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire. Follow-up questionnaires were posted at discharge and at 6 and 12 months. At discharge, all interventions significantly reduced functional disability. At 12 months, there were no significant differences found between the groups for recurrence of back pain, work absenteeism, medication consumption, exercise participation or the use of healthcare. The authors concluded that there was no difference between the effects of a combined manipulative therapy and IFT package and either of the therapy modalities alone.

In 2016, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) issued a comparative effectiveness review on the benefits and harms of pharmacological and non-pharmacological noninvasive treatments for LBP. Of the 2,545 citations identified at the title and abstract level, a total of 156 publications were included. Relative to IFT, the authors concluded that the evidence was insufficient from 4 trials to determine effects of IFT versus other interventions, or IFT plus another intervention versus the other intervention alone, due to methodological limitations and imprecision (Chou et al).

**Professional Societies**

**American College of Physicians (ACP)**

In their clinical practice guideline addressing noninvasive treatments for acute, subacute, and chronic LBP, the ACP states clinicians and patients should initially select non-pharmacologic treatments including but not limited to exercise (e.g., tai chi, yoga, motor control exercise) and multidisciplinary rehabilitation (e.g., ES therapies) when managing chronic LBP (Qaseem et al., 2017).

**Pulsed Electrical Stimulation (PES)**

PES is designed to reduce pain and improve function in individuals with OA of the knee who do not respond well to nonsteroidal, anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) treatment or who are not appropriate candidates for, or do not wish to undergo, TKA. The noninvasive device consists of a signal generator, signal applicator, and electrodes encased in either a supportive knee brace or a soft wrap.

A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial by Fary et al. (2011) evaluated the effectiveness of PES in the symptomatic management of OA of the knee. Thirty-four patients were randomized to PES and 36 to placebo. Primary outcomes measured pain by VAS. Other measures included WOMAC scores for pain, function, and joint stiffness and Short-Form 36 (SF-36) health survey, as well as perceived effect on QOL and physical activity. Over 26 weeks, both groups showed improvement in pain scores. There were no differences between groups for changes in WOMAC pain, function, and stiffness scores, SF-36 physical and mental component summary scores, patient’s global assessment of disease activity or activity measures. Compared to the control group at 44% improvement, 56% of the PES-treated group achieved a clinically relevant 20-mm improvement in VAS pain score at 26 weeks. Overall however, the authors concluded that PES was no more effective than placebo in managing OA of the knee.

Farr et al. (2006) reported on a prospective, cohort study examining the use of PES for the treatment of OA of the knee in 288 patients. The device was used for 16-600 days with a mean of 889 hours. Improvement in all efficacy variables was reported. A dose-response relationship between the effect and hours of usage was observed as cumulative time increased to more than 750 hours. Improvements in the patient's or physician's global evaluation of the patient's condition occurred in 59% of patients who used PES less than 750 hours and in 73% of patients who used it more than 750 hours. The lack of a control group weakens the evidence in this study.

Mont et al. (2006) examined the use of PES to defer TKA for patients with knee OA. One hundred fifty seven patients who had been referred for a TKA were treated by PES daily for 1 year. They were compared to a matched group of 101 patients. TKA was deferred in 83% of patients in the PES group at 1 year, 75% of patients at 2 years, 65% of patients at 3 years, and 60% of patients at 4 years. In the matched group, TKA was deferred in 67%, 51%, 46%, and 35% of patients at 1-4 years respectively. While the differences in deferral were statistically significant, the investigators concluded that none of the demographic variables studied influenced the need for TKA.
AHRL conducted a Comparative Effectiveness Review assessing the efficacy of a variety of noninvasive interventions (including but not limited to ES techniques [including TENS], NMES, and pulsed electromagnetic field therapy [PEMF]) for treating OA of the knee. RCTs, single-arm, and prospective observational studies were included in the analysis, comparing any of the interventions of interest with placebo (sham) or any other intervention that reported a clinical outcome (including pain, function, and QOL). PEMF showed short term pain relief, but the strength of evidence was considered low. The review found that the evidence was insufficient to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of many interventions, secondary to heterogeneous and low quality studies. Larger RCTs were suggested (Newberry et al., 2017).

**Professional Societies**

**American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS)**

In its clinical practice guideline on the treatment of OA of the knee, the AAOS cannot recommend for or against the use of physical agents (including electrotherapeutic modalities) due to inconsistent findings (2013).

**Peripheral Subcutaneous Field Stimulation (PSFS) or Peripheral Nerve Field Stimulation (PNFS)**

PSFS (also referred to as PNFS) is a neuromodulation modality that has increased in its utilization during the past decade. This treatment transmits an electrical current via an electrode that has been implanted subcutaneously around the selected peripheral nerve, with the objective of blocking or disrupting the normal transmission of pain signals.

McRoberts et al. (2013) conducted a multi-site, 2-phase, crossover RCT evaluating the safety and efficacy of PNFS in 44 patients with localized chronic intractable pain of the back. During phase I, patients rotated through 4 stimulation groups (minimal, subthreshold, low frequency, and standard stimulation). If a 50% reduction in pain was achieved during any of the 3 active stimulation groups (responder), the patient proceeded to phase II, which began with implant of the permanent system and remained in place for 52 weeks. The primary endpoint was a reduction in pain, assessed by the VAS. Of the 44 patients enrolled, 30 completed phase I. Twenty-four patients were classified as responders in phase I, and 23 received permanent system placement. Significant differences in VAS scores were observed between baseline and all follow-up visits during phase II. The authors concluded that PNFS is safe and effective as an aid in the management of chronic, localized back pain. Limitations to this trial are small study group size.

Yakovlev et al. (2011) evaluated PNFS as an alternative treatment option for patients with postlaminectomy syndrome (PLS) when conventional treatments did not provide adequate relief of intractable LBP. Eighteen patients underwent an uneventful PNFS trial with percutaneous placement of 4 temporary quadripolar leads. The leads were placed subcutaneously over the lumbar or thoraco-lumbar area. The temporary leads were removed when patients experienced excellent pain relief over the next 2 days. The patients were then implanted with permanent leads. All patients reported sustained pain relief 12 months after implantation. The authors concluded that PNFS may be more effective in treating intractable LBP than SCS in patients with PLS after multilevel spinal surgeries. The lack of a control group limits the validity of the conclusions of this study.

Verrills et al. (2011) evaluated the clinical outcomes of 100 consecutive patients receiving PNFS for chronic pain in a prospective, observational study. The patients received PNFS for the treatment of chronic craniofacial, thorax, lumbosacral, abdominal, pelvic, and groin pain conditions. Overall, 72% of patients reduced their analgesic use following PNFS. Patients receiving a lumbosacral PNFS for chronic LBP reported a significant reduction in disability following treatment, as determined by the Oswestry Disability Index. No long-term complications were reported. The authors concluded that PNFS can be a safe and effective treatment option for intractable chronic pain conditions. This study was not randomized or case controlled.

To aid in alleviating symptoms associated with opioid withdrawal, a PNFS delivery system known as the NSS-2 Bridge is marketed for use as a non-pharmacologic component of an inpatient or outpatient detox treatment program. One single-arm retrospective pilot study has been published (Miranda and Taca, 2017), citing 64 of 73 patients successfully transitioning to medically-assisted treatment after using the device with no reports of adverse events. While several guidelines on the management of opioid withdrawal are available, none addressed the use of this type of device for this indication. Prospects for the NSS-2 Bridge System are unclear at this time (Hayes, 2017).

Evidence on PNFS is limited, consisting of small uncontrolled and case studies. Prospective controlled trials are needed to evaluate the efficacy of this treatment.

**Microcurrent Electrical Nerve Stimulation Therapy (MENS)**

Koopman et al. evaluated the efficacy of MENS in treating aspecific, chronic LBP in a double-blind, randomized, crossover pilot trial. Ten succeeding patients presenting with nonspecific, chronic LBP in the university setting were included. Patients started with two, 9-day baseline periods followed by a 5-day treatment period. During the treatment periods, either a placebo or MCT (verum) patch was randomly assigned. Mean and worst pain scores were
evaluated daily by VAS score. Analgesic use, side effects, and QOL were assessed after each period. Differences between the last 4 days of a treatment period and the baseline period were calculated. Differences between verum and placebo periods per patient were also compared. A 20-mm VAS score reduction was considered clinically relevant. All outcome measures demonstrated efficacy with the verum treatment, except for an increase in NSAID use. However, none of the findings were statistically significant. The authors concluded that a positive trend in MENS use for a specific, chronic LBP could be reported, but that further research is required to evaluate the significance and relevance of these findings (2009).

Gossreau et al. (2011) conducted a single-blinded, placebo-controlled randomized trial to assess the efficacy of MENS for reduction of painful diabetic neuropathy (PDN) in 41 patients. Participants were divided into 2 groups: 22 treated with MENS therapy and 19 with placebo. Treatment plan was 3 therapy sessions per week for 4 weeks. Primary outcomes measured included pain intensity, pain disability, and QOL at baseline, and the end of treatment, and 4 weeks post-treatment using standardized questionnaires. Patients with a minimum of 30% reduction in neuropathic pain score (NPS) were defined as therapy responders. After 4 weeks, only 6 of 21 patients in the study group (30%) responded to MENS therapy versus 10 of 19 (53%) of the placebo group. The differences in Pain Disability Index (PDI) for both groups were not statistically significant. The authors concluded that MENS therapy for PDN is not superior to placebo.

Zuim et al. (2006) evaluated the effect of MENS therapy compared with occlusal splint therapy in temporomandibular disorders (TMD) patients with muscle pain. Twenty TMD patients were divided into 4 groups: occlusal splint therapy and MENS (group I); occlusal splints and placebo MENS (group II); only MENS (group III), and placebo MENS (group IV). Sensitivity derived from muscle palpation was evaluated using a VAS. There was reduction of pain level in all groups: group I reported a 47.7% reduction rate; group II, 66.7%; group III, 49.7% and group IV, 16.5%. However, the differences between groups relating to TMD muscle pain reduction were not statistically significant after 4 weeks. The authors concluded that MENS was not statistically superior to occlusal splints in the treatment of masticatory muscle pain in TMD patients. Study limitations include small study group and short follow-up period.

MENS therapy has been studied in other small RCTs and case series for conditions such as delayed onset muscle soreness (Curtis et al. 2010) and diabetes, hypertension, and chronic wounds (Lee, et al. 2009). None of these studies are large controlled trials designed to test the effectiveness of MENS therapy against a placebo device. Therefore, due to the limited evidence in the peer reviewed literature, conclusions cannot be reached regarding the safety, efficacy, or utility of MENS therapy to decrease pain and/or facilitate healing for any condition.

**Percutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (PENS)**

A Hayes report evaluated the peer-reviewed literature related to PENS for the treatment of chronic LBP and PNT for the treatment of LBP. Evidence from the available studies (which included 3 RCTs with a range of 34-200 participants and 1 pretest/posttest study) was considered to be fair, poor, or very poor quality. The 3 RCTs evaluated the efficacy and safety of PENS for CLBP in adults and remaining study evaluated PNT for subacute radiating LBP. The authors concluded that was insufficient published evidence to assess the clinical validity of PENS alone or in combination with physical therapy or general conditioning exercise in patients with chronic LBP. Additionally, the report concluded that there is insufficient published evidence to assess the impact of PNT on health outcomes or patient management for the treatment of LBP (2017).

Rossi et al. (2016) conducted a multicenter, prospective, observational study to evaluate the short- and long-term efficacy of a single probe and single shot PENS approach to treat chronic neuropathic pain. Seventy-six patients affected by neuralgia were enrolled in the study and divided into 3 groups depending on the etiology of the neuralgia (21 herpes zoster infection, 31 causalgia, 24 postoperative pain). In the study, Numerical Rating Scale (NRS) and Neuropathic Pain Scale (NPS) were assessed at baseline, 60 minutes after PENS, 1 week, and 1, 3, and 6 months post-therapy. Perceived health outcome was measured with Euroqol-5 dimension (EQ-5D) questionnaire at baseline and at 6 months. Pain assessment ratings decreased significantly after 60 minutes of PENS therapy and the reduction remained constant throughout the follow up period. Perceived health outcome measured with EQ-5D increased significantly from baseline. The authors concluded that PENS therapy produced significant and long-lasting pain relief in chronic peripheral neuropathic pain of different etiologies. The study limitations included small sample size, non-randomized observational study, short follow up period, and high prevalence of post-herpetic and occipital neuralgias.

In 2011, Wanich and colleagues conducted a RCT to study the use of the Deepwave PNT system in patients who underwent primary TKA. Trial participants (n=23) were categorized into 2 groups (experimental or control). Following surgery, patients underwent either Deepwave or sham treatments. A Brief Pain Inventory questionnaire and the amount of all pain medications taken were recorded. The study results demonstrated a significant reduction in patient’s subjective rating of pain and VAS score in the experimental group (p < 0.05), with a trend toward decreased opioid use but this was not statistically significant (p = 0.09). The authors concluded that the Deepwave device was effective in reducing the subjective measures of pain with a trend toward decreased opioid use in patients following TKA. Details regarding the duration of treatments or the length of follow up were not documented.
Raphael et al. (2011) conducted a randomized double-blind sham-controlled crossover trial on 31 patients suffering from chronic pain with surface hyperalgesia to investigate the efficacy of PENS. The study results demonstrated statistically significant improvements from pre-therapy ratings and assessment of pain in the PENS group versus the sham group using the numerical rating scale (NRS) and the pain pressure threshold (PPT). The authors concluded that PENS therapy appeared to be effective in providing short-term pain relief in chronic pain conditions; however, studies, involving larger sample sizes and longer follow-up were recommended.

In 2013, NICE published guidance related to the use of PENS to control neuropathic pain. The guidance states, “The current evidence on the safety of PENS for refractory neuropathic pain raises no major safety concerns and there is evidence of efficacy in the short term.” Therefore this procedure may be used with normal arrangements for clinical governance, consent and audit. The guideline also indicates that NICE encourages further research into PENS for refractory neuropathic pain, particularly to provide more information about selection criteria and long-term outcomes, with clear documentation of the indications for treatment.

**Professional Societies**

**American Academy of Neurology (AAN)**, **American Association of Neuromuscular and Electrodiagnostic Medicine (AANEM)**, **American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation (AAPMR)**

In a joint guideline report on the treatment of painful diabetic neuropathy (PDN), the AAN, AANEM, and AAPMR concluded that PENS should be considered for the treatment of PDN (Bril et al., 2011).

While some studies have compared the effectiveness of PENS to placebo, the overall quality of the evidence is weak and quite limited. Further robust studies are needed to evaluate the efficacy of this therapy for chronic pain.

**Dorsal Root Ganglion (DRG) Stimulation**

A multicenter prospective trial was conducted by Liem et al. (2013) to evaluate the clinical performance of a new neurostimulation system designed to treat chronic pain through the electrical neuromodulation of the DRG neurophysiologically associated with painful regions of the limbs and/or trunk. Thirty-two subjects were implanted with a novel neuromodulation device. Pain ratings during stimulation were followed up to 6 months and compared with baseline ratings. Subjects also completed 2 separate reversal periods in which stimulation was briefly stopped in order to establish the effects of the intervention. At all assessments, more than half of subjects reported pain relief of 50% or better. At 6 months postimplant, average overall pain ratings were 58% lower than baseline, and the proportions of subjects experiencing 50% or more reduction in pain specific to back, leg, and foot regions were 57%, 70%, and 89%, respectively. When stimulation was discontinued for a short time, pain returned to baseline levels. Discrete coverage of hard-to-treat areas was obtained across a variety of anatomical pain distributions. Paresthesia intensity remained stable over time and there was no significant difference in the paresthesia intensity perceived during different body postures/positions (standing up vs. lying down). The authors concluded that this trial demonstrated that neurostimulation of the DRG is a viable neuromodulatory technique for the treatment of chronic pain. Additionally, the capture of discrete painful areas such as the feet combined with stable paresthesia intensities across body positions suggest that this stimulation modality may allow more selective targeting of painful areas and reduce unwanted side-effects observed in traditional SCS. Limitations include small sample size and short duration of follow-up.

Deer et al. conducted an industry-sponsored single arm pilot study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of the Axium™ DRG system in 10 patients with chronic intractable pain of the trunk and/or limbs. The study was conducted across 4 centers for a period of 4 weeks. The study protocol and lead implantation procedures were similar to those reported by Liem et al. (2013); however, only results of trial DRGs over a period of 3-7 days were reported. On average, there was a 70% reduction in pain following stimulation. Eight of the nine patients experienced a clinically meaningful (>30%) reduction in pain, and 7 of 9 reduced their pain medication utilization. The study did not consider longer term effects with a permanently implanted device. No device-related adverse events were reported. The authors concluded that initial results suggest that stimulation of the DRG can reduce pain in those patients suffering from chronic pain and may offer several potential benefits over other neuromodulation techniques, including the ability to target difficult-to-reach anatomies such as the low back and foot. Limitations of the study include small sample size, non-randomization, and noted no considerations of long term effects with a permanently implanted device (2013).

Acknowledging their earlier research, Liem et al. reported on the maintenance of pain relief, improvement in mood, and QOL over 12 months. Subjects with intractable pain in the back and/or lower limbs were implanted with an active neurostimulator device. Up to 4 percutaneous leads were placed epidurally near DRGs. Overall, pain was reduced by 56% at 12 months post-implantation, and 60% of subjects reported greater than 50% improvement in their pain. Pain localized to the back, legs, and feet was reduced by 42%, 62%, and 80%, respectively. Measures of QOL and mood were also improved over the course of the study, and subjects reported high levels of satisfaction. Importantly, excellent pain-paresthesia overlap was reported, remaining stable through 12 months. The authors concluded that despite methodological differences in the literature, DRG-SCS appears to be comparable to traditional SCS in terms of...
pain relief and associated benefits in mood and QOL. Its benefits may include the ability to achieve precise pain-paresthesia concordance, including in regions that are typically difficult to target with SCS, and to consistently maintain that coverage over time. However, long-term evaluations of the results, larger study group size, and prospective randomized studies are still needed (2015).

Schu et al. (2015) conducted a retrospective review of data from patients with groin pain of various etiologies treated using neuromodulation of the DRG. Twenty-nine patients with neuropathic groin pain were reviewed. Patients underwent trial therapy where specifically designed leads were implanted at the target DRGs between T12 and L4. Patients who had a successful trial (> 50% improvement) received the fully implantable neuromodulation system. Pain scores were captured on a VAS at baseline and at regular follow-up visits. Twenty-five patients (86.2%) received fully implantable neurostimulators, and the average follow-up period was 27.8 ± 4.3 weeks. The average pain reduction was 71.4 ± 5.6%, and 82.6% (19/23) of patients experienced a > 50% reduction in their pain at the latest follow-up. Individual cases showed improvement with a variety of etiologies and pain distributions; a subanalysis of postherniorrhaphy cohort also showed significant improvement. The authors concluded that early findings suggest that neuromodulation of the DRG may be an effective treatment for chronic neuropathic pain conditions in the groin region. This technique offers a useful alternative for pain conditions that do not always respond optimally to traditional SCS therapy. Neuromodulation of the DRG provided excellent cross-dermatomal paresthesia coverage, even in cases with patients with discrete pain areas. The therapy can be specific, sustained, and independent of body position. Study limitations include non-randomization and small sample size.

A prospective, multi-center RCT to assess the safety and efficacy of the Spinal Modulation™ AXIUM™ Neurostimulator System in the treatment of chronic pain (ACCURATE Trial, NCT01923285) was completed in October 2016. Study results have not yet been posted. Additional information is available at www.clinicaltrials.gov.

**U.S. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION (FDA)**

**Functional Electrical Stimulation (FES) Devices**
Products used for FES are extensive. See the following website for more information and search by product name in device name section: [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm).
(Accessed January 18, 2018)

**Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation (NMES) for Muscle Rehabilitation Devices**
Products used for NMES for muscle rehabilitation are extensive. See the following website for more information and search by product name in device name section: [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm).
(Accessed January 18, 2018)

**Interferential Therapy (IFT) Devices**
Products used for IFT are extensive. See the following website for more information and search by product name in device name section: [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm).
(Accessed January 18, 2018)

**Pulsed Electrical Stimulation (PES) Devices**
There are multiple products used for PES. See the following website for more information and search by product name in device name section: [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm).
(Accessed January 18, 2018)

**Peripheral Subcutaneous Field Stimulation (PSFS) or Peripheral Nerve Field Stimulation (PNFS) Devices**
PSFS or PNFS using a fully implantable system is not currently approved by the FDA.

The NSS-2 System, a PNFS system marketed as an aid to reduce the symptoms of opioid withdrawal, was FDA approved on 11/15/17. For more information, please go to: [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf17/DEN170018.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf17/DEN170018.pdf). (Accessed January 31, 2018)

**Microcurrent Electrical Nerve Stimulation Therapy (MENS) Devices**
MENS devices are categorized as TENS devices intended for pain relief. They are regulated by the FDA’s premarket approval (PMA) process.

**Percutaneous Electrical Nerve stimulation (PENS)**
The FDA regulates PENS stimulators as class II devices (Product Code NHI). Several PENS devices have been approved by the FDA. See the following website for more information and search by product name in device name section: [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm). (Accessed January 18, 2018)
Dorsal Root Ganglion (DRG) Stimulation Devices

There are several devices used for DRG stimulation. See the following website for more information and search by product name in device name section: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm. (Accessed January 18, 2018)

CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES (CMS)

Medicare covers neuromuscular electrical stimulation (NMES) and functional electrical stimulation (FES) when criteria are met. See the National Coverage Determinations (NCDs) for Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation (NMES) (160.12) and Supplies Used in the Delivery of Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) and Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation (NMES) (160.13). Local Coverage Determinations (LCDs) do not exist at this time.

Medicare does not have an NCD for interferential therapy (IFT). LCDs exist; see the LCDs for Medicine: Physical Therapy-Outpatient, Outpatient Occupational Therapy, Outpatient Physical Therapy and Outpatient Physical and Occupational Therapy Services.

Medicare does not have an NCD for peripheral subcutaneous field stimulation (PSFS) or peripheral nerve field stimulation (PNFS). LCDs exist; see LCDs for Non-Covered Services, Peripheral Nerve and Peripheral Nerve Field Stimulation and Services That Are Not Reasonable and Necessary.

Medicare does not have an NCD for microcurrent electrical nerve stimulation (MENS) therapy, pulsed electrical stimulation (PES) or dorsal root ganglion (DRG) stimulation. LCDs do not exist at this time. (Accessed October 27, 2017)

Medicare does not have an NCD for percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (PENS) or percutaneous neuromodulation therapy (PNT) at this time. Local Coverage Articles (LCAs) exist; see the LCAs for Percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (PENS) or percutaneous neuromodulation therapy (PNT). (Accessed October 31, 2017)
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**POLICY HISTORY/REVISION INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2018</td>
<td>• Replaced references to “patients” with “individuals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revised coverage rationale; replaced language indicating:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o “[The listed services] are proven and medically necessary” with “[the listed services] are proven and/or medically necessary”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o “[The listed services] are unproven and not medically necessary” with “[the listed services] are unproven and/or not medically necessary”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o “Peripheral subcutaneous field stimulation (PSFS) or peripheral nerve field stimulation (PNFS) is unproven and not medically necessary for treating pain” with “peripheral subcutaneous field stimulation (PSFS) or peripheral nerve field stimulation (PNFS) is unproven and/or not medically necessary for all indications, including but not limited to pain and opioid management”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence for the effectiveness of PSFS or PNFS based on controlled studies is lacking; randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are needed to evaluate the efficacy of this treatment” with “evidence for the effectiveness of PSFS or PNFS based on controlled studies is limited; additional studies are needed to evaluate the efficacy of this treatment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Updated supporting information to reflect the most current clinical evidence, FDA information, and references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Archived previous policy version 2018T0126W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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