



## FEP Medical Policy Manual

---

### FEP 7.01.96 Computer-Assisted Musculoskeletal Surgical Navigational Orthopedic Procedure

---

**Effective Policy Date: July 1, 2020**

**Original Policy Date: December 2011**

**Related Policies:**

None

---

## Computer-Assisted Musculoskeletal Surgical Navigational Orthopedic Procedure

### Description

Computer-assisted navigation in orthopedic procedures describes the use of computer-enabled tracking systems to facilitate alignment in a variety of surgical procedures, including fixation of fractures, ligament reconstruction, osteotomy, tumor resection, preparation of the bone for joint arthroplasty, and verification of the intended implant placement.

### OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether the use of computer-assisted navigation improves the net health outcome when used for orthopedic procedures, including ligament reconstruction, surgery for trauma or fracture, hip arthroplasty, periacetabular osteotomy, and total knee arthroplasty.

### POLICY STATEMENT

Computer-assisted surgery for orthopedic procedures of the pelvis and appendicular skeleton is considered **investigational**.

---

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.

## POLICY GUIDELINES

None.

## BENEFIT APPLICATION

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

Reimbursement for the technical component of computer-assisted navigation may be sought through the use of the CPT codes or through hospital case rates.

## FDA REGULATORY STATUS

Because computer assisted navigation is a surgical information system in which the surgeon is only acting on the information that is provided by the navigation system, surgical navigation systems generally are subject only to 510(k) clearances from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). As such, the FDA does not require data documenting the intermediate or final health outcomes associated with computer assisted navigation. (In contrast, robotic procedures, in which the actual surgery is robotically performed, are subject to the more rigorous requirement of the premarket approval application process.)

A variety of surgical navigation procedures have been cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process with broad labeled indications. For example, The OEC FluoroTrak 9800 plus is marketed for locating anatomic structures anywhere on the human body.

Several navigation systems (eg, PiGalileo™ Computer-Assisted Orthopedic Surgery System, PLUS Orthopedics; OrthoPilot Navigation System, Braun; Navitrack Navigation System, ORTHOsoft) have received the FDA clearance specifically for total knee arthroscopy. The FDA cleared indications for the PiGalileo™ system are representative. This system "is intended to be used in computer-assisted orthopedic surgery to aid the surgeon with bone cuts and implant positioning during joint replacement. It provides information to the surgeon that is used to place surgical instruments during surgery using anatomical landmarks and other data specifically obtained intraoperatively (eg, ligament tension, limb alignment). Examples of some surgical procedures include but are not limited to:

- Total knee replacement supporting both bone referencing and ligament balancing techniques
- Minimally invasive total knee replacement."

FDA product code: HAW.

In 2013, the VERASENSE™ Knee System (OrthoSensor) and the iASSIST™ Knee (Zimmer) were cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process. FDA product codes: ONN, OLO.

Several computer-assisted navigation devices cleared by the FDA are listed in the table below.

**Table 1. Computer-Assisted Navigation Devices Cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration**

Device	Manufacturer	Date Cleared	510(k) No.	Indication
Vital Navigation System	Zimmer Biomet Spine, Inc.	12/02/19	K191722	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
Stryker Navigation System With Spinemap Go Software Application, Fluoroscopy Trackers And Fluoroscopy Adapters. Spinemask Tracker	Stryker Corporation	02/14/2019	K183196	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery

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.

NuVasive Pulse System	NuVasive Inc.	6/29/2018	K180038	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
VERASENSE for Zimmer Biomet Persona	OrthoSensor Inc.	6/7/2018	K180459	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
NuVasive Next Generation NVM5 System	NUVASIVE Inc.	3/16/2017	K162313	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
Stryker OrthoMap Versatile Hip System	Stryker Corporation	2/23/2017	K162937	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
JointPoint	JointPoint Inc.	8/3/2016	K160284	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
ExactechGPS	Blue Ortho	7/13/2016	K152764	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
Verasense Knee System	OrthoSensor Inc.	4/15/2016	K150372	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
iASSIST Knee System	Zimmer CAS	9/11/2014	K141601	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
CTC TCAT(R)-TPLAN(R) Surgical System	Curexo Technology Corporation	8/18/2014	K140585	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery
Digimatch Orthodoc Robodoc Encore Surgical System	Curexo Technology Corporation	5/27/2014	K140038	Computer-assisted Navigation for Orthopedic Surgery

## RATIONALE

### Summary of Evidence

For individuals who are undergoing orthopedic surgery for trauma or fracture and receive computer-assisted navigation, the evidence includes one retrospective clinical trial, reviews, and in vitro studies. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, and functional outcomes. Functional outcomes were not included in the clinical trial, although it did note fewer complications with computer-assisted navigation versus conventional methods. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on net health outcomes.

For individuals who are undergoing ligament reconstruction and receive computer-assisted navigation, the evidence includes a systematic review of 5 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of computer-assisted navigation versus conventional surgery for anterior and posterior cruciate ligament. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, and functional outcomes. Trial results showed no consistent improvement of tunnel placement with computer-assisted navigation, and no trials looked at functional outcomes or need for revision surgery with computer-assisted navigation. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on net health outcomes.

For individuals who are undergoing hip arthroplasty and periacetabular osteotomy and receive computer-assisted navigation, the evidence includes older RCTs, a systematic review, and comparison studies. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, and

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.

functional outcomes. Evidence on the relative benefits of computer-assisted navigation with conventional or minimally invasive total hip arthroscopy is inconsistent, and more recent RCTs are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on net health outcomes.

For individuals who are undergoing total knee arthroscopy and receive computer-assisted navigation, the evidence includes RCTs, systematic reviews of RCTs, and comparative studies. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, and functional outcomes. The main difference found between total knee arthroscopy with computer-assisted navigation and total knee arthroscopy without computer-assisted navigation is increased surgical time with computer-assisted navigation. Few differences in clinical and functional outcomes were seen at up to 10 years post-procedure. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on net health outcomes.

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

### Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

No guidelines or statements were identified.

### 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

- Hofstetter R, Slomczykowski M, Krettek C, et al. Computer-assisted fluoroscopy-based reduction of femoral fractures and antetorsion correction. *Comput Aided Surg*. Feb 2000;5(5):311-325. PMID 11169877
- Schep NW, Broeders IA, van der Werken C. Computer assisted orthopaedic and trauma surgery. State of the art and future perspectives. *Injury*. May 2003;34(4):299-306. PMID 12667784
- Slomczykowski MA, Hofstetter R, Sati M, et al. Novel computer-assisted fluoroscopy system for intraoperative guidance: feasibility study for distal locking of femoral nails. *J Orthop Trauma*. Feb 2001;15(2):122-131. PMID 11232651
- Liebergall M, Ben-David D, Weil Y, et al. Computerized navigation for the internal fixation of femoral neck fractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Aug 2006;88(8):1748-1754. PMID 16882897
- Eggerding V, Reijman M, Scholten RJ, et al. Computer-assisted surgery for knee ligament reconstruction. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Aug 4 2014;8(8):CD007601. PMID 25088229
- Plaweski S, Cazal J, Rosell P, et al. Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using navigation: a comparative study on 60 patients. *Am J Sports Med*. Apr 2006;34(4):542-552. PMID 16556753
- Hart R, Krejzla J, Svab P, et al. Outcomes after conventional versus computer-navigated anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Arthroscopy*. May 2008;24(5):569-578. PMID 18442690
- Meuffels DE, Reijman M, Verhaar JA. Computer-assisted surgery is not more accurate or precise than conventional arthroscopic ACL reconstruction: a prospective randomized clinical trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Sep 5 2012;94(17):1538-1545. PMID 22832975
- Mauch F, Apic G, Becker U, et al. Differences in the placement of the tibial tunnel during reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament with and without computer-assisted navigation. *Am J Sports Med*. Nov 2007;35(11):1824-1832. PMID 17878429
- Parratte S, Argenson JN. Validation and usefulness of a computer-assisted cup-positioning system in total hip arthroplasty. A prospective, randomized, controlled study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Mar 2007;89(3):494-499. PMID 17332097
- Lass R, Kubista B, Olischar B, et al. Total hip arthroplasty using imageless computer-assisted hip navigation: a prospective randomized study. *J Arthroplasty*. Apr 2014;29(4):786-791. PMID 24290738

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.

12. Manzotti A, Cerveri P, De Momi E, et al. Does computer-assisted surgery benefit leg length restoration in total hip replacement? Navigation versus conventional freehand. *Int Orthop*. Jan 2011;35(1):19-24. PMID 19904533
13. Ulrich SD, Bonutti PM, Seyler TM, et al. Outcomes-based evaluations supporting computer-assisted surgery and minimally invasive surgery for total hip arthroplasty. *Expert Rev Med Devices*. Nov 2007;4(6):873-883. PMID 18035952
14. Reininga IH, Stevens M, Wagenmakers R, et al. Comparison of gait in patients following a computer-navigated minimally invasive anterior approach and a conventional posterolateral approach for total hip arthroplasty: a randomized controlled trial. *J Orthop Res*. Feb 2013;31(2):288-294. PMID 22886805
15. Hsieh PH, Chang YH, Shih CH. Image-guided periacetabular osteotomy: computer-assisted navigation compared with the conventional technique: a randomized study of 36 patients followed for 2 years. *Acta Orthop*. Aug 2006;77(4):591-597. PMID 16929435
16. Stiehler M, Goronzy J, Hartmann A, et al. The First SICOT Oral Presentation Award 2011: imageless computer- assisted femoral component positioning in hip resurfacing: a prospective randomised trial. *Int Orthop*. Apr 2013;37(4):569-581. PMID 23385606
17. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center. Computer-assisted navigation for total knee arthroplasty. *Technology Assessment Feb 2007;Volume 22:Tab 10*. PMID 18411501
18. Xie C, Liu K, Xiao L, et al. Clinical outcomes after computer-assisted versus conventional total knee arthroplasty. *Orthopedics*. May 1 2012;35(5):e647-653. PMID 22588405
19. Rebal BA, Babatunde OM, Lee JH, et al. Imageless computer navigation in total knee arthroplasty provides superior short term functional outcomes: a meta-analysis. *J Arthroplasty*. May 2014;29(5):938-944. PMID 24140274
20. Gothesen O, Espehaug B, Havelin LI, et al. Functional outcome and alignment in computer-assisted and conventionally operated total knee replacements: a multicentre parallel-group randomised controlled trial. *Bone Joint J*. May 2014;96-B(5):609-618. PMID 24788494
21. Blyth MJ, Smith JR, Anthony IC, et al. Electromagnetic navigation in total knee arthroplasty-a single center, randomized, single-blind study comparing the results with conventional techniques. *J Arthroplasty*. Feb 2015;30(2):199-205. PMID 25263246
22. Hsu RW, Hsu WH, Shen WJ et al. Comparison of computer-assisted navigation and conventional instrumentation for bilateral total knee arthroplasty: The outcomes at mid-term follow-up. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2019 Nov;98(47). PMID 31764842
23. Cip J, Obwegeser F, Benesch T, et al. Twelve-Year Follow-Up of Navigated Computer-Assisted Versus Conventional Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Prospective Randomized Comparative Trial. *J Arthroplasty*. 2018 May;33(5):1404-1411. PMID: 29426792
24. Blakeney WG, Khan RJ, Palmer JL. Functional outcomes following total knee arthroplasty: a randomised trial comparing computer-assisted surgery with conventional techniques. *Knee*. Mar 2014;21(2):364-368. PMID 24703685
25. Lutzner J, Dixel J, Kirschner S. No difference between computer-assisted and conventional total knee arthroplasty: five-year results of a prospective randomised study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. Oct 2013;21(10):2241-2247. PMID 23851969
26. Cip J, Widemschek M, Luegmair M, et al. Conventional versus computer-assisted technique for total knee arthroplasty: a minimum of 5-year follow-up of 200 patients in a prospective randomized comparative trial. *J Arthroplasty*. Sep 2014;29(9):1795-1802. PMID 24906519
27. Song EK, Agrawal PR, Kim SK, et al. A randomized controlled clinical and radiological trial about outcomes of navigation-assisted TKA compared to conventional TKA: long-term follow-up. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. Nov 2016;24(11):3381-3386. PMID 26831857
28. Kim YH, Kim JS, Choi Y, et al. Computer-assisted surgical navigation does not improve the alignment and orientation of the components in total knee arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Jan 2009;91(1):14-19. PMID 19122074
29. Kim YH, Park JW, Kim JS. Computer-navigated versus conventional total knee arthroplasty a prospective randomized trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Nov 21 2012;94(22):2017-2024. PMID 23052635
30. Hoppe S, Mainzer JD, Frauchiger L, et al. More accurate component alignment in navigated total knee arthroplasty has no clinical benefit at 5-year follow-up. *Acta Orthop*. Dec 2012;83(6):629-633. PMID 23140107
31. Yaffe M, Chan P, Goyal N, et al. Computer-assisted versus manual TKA: no difference in clinical or functional outcomes at 5-year follow-up. *Orthopedics*. May 1 2013;36(5):e627-632. PMID 23672916
32. Hoffart HE, Langenstein E, Vasak N. A prospective study comparing the functional outcome of computer- assisted and conventional total knee replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. Feb 2012;94(2):194-199. PMID 22323685
33. Dyrhovden GS, Fenstad AM, Furnes O, et al. Survivorship and relative risk of revision in computer-navigated versus conventional total knee replacement at 8-year follow-up. *Acta Orthop*. Dec 2016;87(6):592-599. PMID 27775460

---

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.

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

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>
December 2011	New Policy	
June 2012	Replace Policy	Policy statement changed to "not medically necessary".
September 2013	Replace Policy	Policy updated with literature search; references 6, 9, 14, 16, 19, 21-23,25-27, and 32 added; policy statement unchanged.
March 2017	Replace Policy	Policy updated with literature review through November 7, 2016;references 7,12,21,24, 26 and 32 added; some references removed.Title changed to "Computer-Assisted Navigation for OrthopedicProcedure". Policy statement unchanged except "not medicallynecessary" corrected to "investigational" due to FDA 510(k) clearance.
June 2018	Replace Policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 5, 2018; noreferences added. Policy statement unchanged.
June 2019	Replace Policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 4, 2019; references added. Policy statement unchanged.
June 2020	Replace Policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 11, 2020; no 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.