



FEP Medical Policy Manual

FEP 1.04.05 Microprocessor-Controlled Prostheses for the Lower Limb

Effective Policy Date: July 1, 2022

Original Policy Date: December 2011

Related Policies:

1.04.04 - Myoelectric Prosthetic and Orthotic Components for the Upper Limb

8.03.01 - Functional Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation

Microprocessor-Controlled Prostheses for the Lower Limb

Description

Description

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

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether powered prostheses improve the net health outcome in individuals with lower-extremity amputations.

POLICY STATEMENT

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

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

A microprocessor-controlled knee is considered **not medically necessary** in individuals who do not meet these criteria.

A powered knee is considered **investigational**.

A microprocessor-controlled or powered ankle-foot is considered **investigational**.

POLICY GUIDELINES

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

Patient Selection and Identification

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

The following are guidelines from the Veterans Health Administration Prosthetic Clinical Management Program Clinical Practice Recommendations for Microprocessor Knees.

1. Contraindications for the use of the microprocessor knee should include the following:

- Any condition that prevents socket fitting, such as a complicated wound or intractable pain which precludes socket wear
- Inability to tolerate the weight of the prosthesis
- Medicare level K0-no ability or potential to ambulate or transfer
- Medicare level K1-limited ability to transfer or ambulate on level ground at fixed cadence
- Medicare level K2-limited community ambulator who does not have the cardiovascular reserve, strength, and balance to improve stability in stance to permit increased independence, less risk of falls, and potential to advance to a less restrictive walking device
- Inability to use swing and stance features of the knee unit
- Poor balance or ataxia that limits ambulation
- Significant hip flexion contracture (>20)
- Significant deformity of remaining limb that would impair the ability to stride

- o Limited cardiovascular and/or pulmonary reserve or profound weakness
- o Limited cognitive ability to understand gait sequencing or care requirements
- o Long-distance or competitive running
- o Falls outside of recommended weight or height guidelines of the manufacturer
- o Specific environmental factors such as excessive moisture or dust, or inability to charge the prosthesis
- o Extremely rural conditions where maintenance ability is limited.

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

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

3. Physical and Functional Fitting Criteria for New Amputees:

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

BENEFIT APPLICATION

Experimental or investigational procedures, treatments, drugs, or devices are not covered (See General Exclusion Section of brochure).

New technologies that use microprocessor control are being developed. Based on the currently available evidence, no microprocessor-controlled device has been shown to have better outcomes than other (eg, earlier) models. If more costly, the prosthesis would be considered not medically necessary using the Medical Policy Reference Manual definition of medical necessity.

FDA REGULATORY STATUS

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

RATIONALE

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have a transfemoral amputation who receive a prosthesis with a microprocessor-controlled knee, the evidence includes a number of within-subject comparisons of microprocessor-controlled knees versus non-microprocessor-controlled knee joints. Relevant outcomes are functional outcomes, health status measures, and quality of life. For K3- and K4-level amputees, studies have shown an objective improvement in function on some outcome measures, particularly for hill and ramp descent, and strong patient preference for microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knees. Benefits include a more normal gait, increased stability, and a decrease in falls. The evidence in Medicare level K2 ambulators suggests that a prosthesis with stance control only can improve activities that require balance and improve walking in this population. For these reasons, a microprocessor-controlled knee may provide incremental benefit for these individuals. The potential to achieve a higher functional level with a microprocessor-controlled knee includes having the appropriate physical and cognitive ability to use the advanced technology. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have a transfemoral amputation who receive a prosthesis with a powered knee, the evidence includes no data. Relevant outcomes are functional outcomes, health status measures, and quality of life. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have a tibial amputation who receive a prosthesis with a microprocessor-controlled ankle-foot, the evidence includes limited data. Relevant outcomes are functional outcomes, health status measures, and quality of life. The limited evidence available to date does not support an improvement in functional outcomes using microprocessor-controlled ankle-foot prostheses compared with standard prostheses. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have a tibial amputation who receive a prosthesis with a powered ankle-foot, the evidence includes limited data. Relevant outcomes are functional outcomes, health status measures, and quality of life. The limited evidence available to date does not support an improvement in functional outcomes using powered ankle-foot prostheses compared with standard prostheses. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in "Supplemental Information" if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

U.S Department of Veterans Affairs/Department of Defense

In 2019, the Veterans Affairs/Department of Defense Clinical Practice Guideline for Rehabilitation of Individuals with Lower Limb Amputation made the following recommendations:²⁸.

"We suggest offering microprocessor knee units over non-microprocessor knee units for ambulation to reduce risk of falls and maximize patient satisfaction. There is insufficient evidence to recommend for or against any particular socket design, prosthetic foot categories, and suspensions and interfaces. (From Table 3. Clinical practice guideline evidence-based recommendations and evidence strength)."

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage

There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

REFERENCES

1. Flynn K. Short Report: Computerized lower limb prosthesis (VA Technology Assessment Program). No. 2. Boston, MA: Veterans Health Administration; 2000.
2. Theeven P, Hemmen B, Rings F, et al. Functional added value of microprocessor-controlled knee joints in daily life performance of Medicare Functional Classification Level-2 amputees. *J Rehabil Med.* Oct 2011; 43(10): 906-15. PMID 21947182
3. Theeven PJ, Hemmen B, Geers RP, et al. Influence of advanced prosthetic knee joints on perceived performance and everyday life activity level of low-functional persons with a transfemoral amputation or knee disarticulation. *J Rehabil Med.* May 2012; 44(5): 454-61. PMID 22549656
4. Burnfield JM, Eberly VJ, Gronely JK, et al. Impact of stance phase microprocessor-controlled knee prosthesis on ramp negotiation and community walking function in K2 level transfemoral amputees. *Prosthet Orthot Int.* Mar 2012; 36(1): 95-104. PMID 22223685
5. Orendurff MS, Segal AD, Klute GK, et al. Gait efficiency using the C-Leg. *J Rehabil Res Dev.* Mar-Apr 2006; 43(2): 239-46. PMID 16847790
6. Klute GK, Berge JS, Orendurff MS, et al. Prosthetic intervention effects on activity of lower-extremity amputees. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* May 2006; 87(5): 717-22. PMID 16635636
7. Williams RM, Turner AP, Orendurff M, et al. Does having a computerized prosthetic knee influence cognitive performance during amputee walking?. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* Jul 2006; 87(7): 989-94. PMID 16813788
8. Hafner BJ, Smith DG. Differences in function and safety between Medicare Functional Classification Level-2 and -3 transfemoral amputees and influence of prosthetic knee joint control. *J Rehabil Res Dev.* 2009; 46(3): 417-33. PMID 19675993
9. Highsmith MJ, Kahle JT, Miro RM, et al. Ramp descent performance with the C-Leg and interrater reliability of the Hill Assessment Index. *Prosthet Orthot Int.* Oct 2013; 37(5): 362-8. PMID 23327837
10. Howard CL, Wallace C, Perry B, et al. Comparison of mobility and user satisfaction between a microprocessor knee and a standard prosthetic knee: a summary of seven single-subject trials. *Int J Rehabil Res.* Mar 2018; 41(1): 63-73. PMID 29293160
11. Hafner BJ, Willingham LL, Buell NC, et al. Evaluation of function, performance, and preference as transfemoral amputees transition from mechanical to microprocessor control of the prosthetic knee. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* Feb 2007; 88(2): 207-17. PMID 17270519
12. Kaufman KR, Bernhardt KA, Symms K. Functional assessment and satisfaction of transfemoral amputees with low mobility (FASTK2): A clinical trial of microprocessor-controlled vs. non-microprocessor-controlled knees. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon).* Oct 2018; 58: 116-122. PMID 30077128
13. Kaufman KR, Levine JA, Brey RH, et al. Gait and balance of transfemoral amputees using passive mechanical and microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knees. *Gait Posture.* Oct 2007; 26(4): 489-93. PMID 17869114
14. Kaufman KR, Levine JA, Brey RH, et al. Energy expenditure and activity of transfemoral amputees using mechanical and microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knees. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* Jul 2008; 89(7): 1380-5. PMID 18586142
15. Johansson JL, Sherrill DM, Riley PO, et al. A clinical comparison of variable-damping and mechanically passive prosthetic knee devices. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* Aug 2005; 84(8): 563-75. PMID 16034225
16. Carse B, Scott H, Brady L, et al. Evaluation of gait outcomes for individuals with established unilateral transfemoral amputation following the provision of microprocessor controlled knees in the context of a clinical service. *Prosthet Orthot Int.* Jun 01 2021; 45(3): 254-261. PMID 34016870
17. Hofstad C, Linde H, Limbeek J, et al. Prescription of prosthetic ankle-foot mechanisms after lower limb amputation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2004; (1): CD003978. PMID 14974050
18. Alimusaj M, Fradet L, Braatz F, et al. Kinematics and kinetics with an adaptive ankle foot system during stair ambulation of transtibial amputees. *Gait Posture.* Oct 2009; 30(3): 356-63. PMID 19616436

19. Fradet L, Alimusaj M, Braatz F, et al. Biomechanical analysis of ramp ambulation of transtibial amputees with an adaptive ankle foot system. *Gait Posture*. Jun 2010; 32(2): 191-8. PMID 20457526
20. Darter BJ, Wilken JM. Energetic consequences of using a prosthesis with adaptive ankle motion during slope walking in persons with a transtibial amputation. *Prosthet Orthot Int*. Feb 2014; 38(1): 5-11. PMID 23525888
21. Gailey RS, Gaunaud I, Agrawal V, et al. Application of self-report and performance-based outcome measures to determine functional differences between four categories of prosthetic feet. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2012; 49(4): 597-612. PMID 22773262
22. Delussu AS, Brunelli S, Paradisi F, et al. Assessment of the effects of carbon fiber and bionic foot during overground and treadmill walking in transtibial amputees. *Gait Posture*. Sep 2013; 38(4): 876-82. PMID 23702342
23. Thomas-Pohl M, Villa C, Davot J, et al. Microprocessor prosthetic ankles: comparative biomechanical evaluation of people with transtibial traumatic amputation during standing on level ground and slope. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol*. Jan 2021; 16(1): 17-26. PMID 31535903
24. Au S, Berniker M, Herr H. Powered ankle-foot prosthesis to assist level-ground and stair-descent gaits. *Neural Netw*. May 2008; 21(4): 654-66. PMID 18499394
25. Ferris AE, Aldridge JM, Rabago CA, et al. Evaluation of a powered ankle-foot prosthetic system during walking. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. Nov 2012; 93(11): 1911-8. PMID 22732369
26. Herr HM, Grabowski AM. Bionic ankle-foot prosthesis normalizes walking gait for persons with leg amputation. *Proc Biol Sci*. Feb 07 2012; 279(1728): 457-64. PMID 21752817
27. Mancinelli C, Patriiti BL, Tropea P, et al. Comparing a passive-elastic and a powered prosthesis in transtibial amputees. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*. 2011; 2011: 8255-8. PMID 22256259
28. Webster JB, Crunkhorn A, Sall J, et al. Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Lower Limb Amputation: An Update from the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. Sep 2019; 98(9): 820-829. PMID 31419214

POLICY HISTORY - THIS POLICY WAS APPROVED BY THE FEP® PHARMACY AND MEDICAL POLICY COMMITTEE ACCORDING TO THE HISTORY BELOW:

Date	Action	Description
December 2011	New policy	
September 2013	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review; Rationale revised; References added, reordered, some deleted; Policy statements for investigational separated for knee and foot.
June 2014	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review; references 17, 25, and 27 added; policy statements unchanged
June 2015	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review; reference 19 added; policy statements unchanged.
March 2017	Replace policy	Policy reviewed. No changes to policy statements.
December 2017	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through August 28, 2017; no references added. Policy statements unchanged
June 2018	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 5, 2018; reference 10 and 26 added. Policy statements unchanged
June 2019	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 26, 2019; references added. Policy statements unchanged.
June 2020	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 24, 2020; reference added, Policy statements unchanged.
June 2021	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through January 25, 2021; no references added. Policy statements unchanged.
June 2022	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through January 24, 2022; references added. Policy statements unchanged.

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.