



---

## FEP Medical Policy Manual

---

### FEP 1.01.09 Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation

---

**Effective Policy Date: April 1, 2021**

**Related Policies:**

**Original Policy Date: September 2012**

1.01.24 - Interferential Current Stimulation  
2.01.21 - Temporomandibular Joint Disorder  
7.01.29 - Percutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation and Percutaneous Neuromodulation Therapy

---

## Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation

### Description

Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) describes the application of electrical stimulation to the surface of the skin at the site of pain. In addition to more traditional settings such as a physician's office or an outpatient clinic, TENS can be self-administered in a patient's home.

### OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether the application of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation improves the net health outcome in individuals who suffer from chronic and/or acute pain.

---

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 STATEMENT

A trial of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) of at least 30 days may be considered **medically necessary** to establish efficacy for the management of refractory chronic pain (eg, chronic musculoskeletal pain or neuropathic pain) that causes significant disruption of function when the following conditions have been met:

- The pain is unresponsive to at least 3 months of conservative medical therapy; and
- The trial is monitored by a physician.

Continued use of TENS may be considered **medically necessary** for treatment of refractory chronic pain (eg, chronic musculoskeletal or neuropathic pain) that causes significant disruption of function when the following conditions have been met:

- Efficacy has been demonstrated in an initial therapeutic trial (see Policy Guidelines section); and
- Compliance has been demonstrated in the therapeutic trial with the device used on a regular basis (eg, daily or near daily use) throughout the trial period.

TENS is considered **investigational** for the management of acute pain (eg, postoperative or during labor and delivery).

The use of TENS for any other condition, including but not limited to the treatment of dementia and prevention of migraine headaches, is considered **investigational**.

## POLICY GUIDELINES

For the purposes of these policy guidelines, refractory chronic pain is defined as pain that causes significant disruption of function and has not responded to at least 3 months of conservative therapy, including nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory medications, ice, rest, and/or physical therapy.

Documentation for the trial should include:

- Initial assessment/evaluation of the nature, duration, and perceived intensity of pain;
- The types and duration of prior treatments;
- Treatment plan including ongoing medications and proposed use of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) unit, including the frequency and duration of treatment.

Clinical summary of the trial to determine efficacy should include:

- Perceived intensity of pain with and without TENS (eg, 2-point or 30% improvement in visual analog scale);
- Ongoing medication requirements for pain relief (if any);
- Other modalities (if any) in use for pain control;
- Actual use of TENS on a daily basis (frequency and duration of application).

TENS devices may be delivered through a practitioner and require a prescription, or obtained without a prescription. It is possible that prescribed devices provide higher intensity stimulation than units sold directly to the public.

---

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.

## Coding

There is no specific coding for the Cefaly device. Coding would most likely be reported with the miscellaneous durable medical equipment code E1399.

## BENEFIT APPLICATION

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

## FDA REGULATORY STATUS

TENS devices consist of an electrical pulse generator, usually battery-operated, connected by wire to 2 or more electrodes, which are applied to the surface of the skin at the site of the pain. Since 1977, a large number of devices have been cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process. Marketing clearance via the 510(k) process does not require data on clinical efficacy; as a result, these cleared devices are considered substantially equivalent to predicate devices marketed in interstate commerce before May 1976, the enactment date of the Medical Device Amendments. The cleared devices are also equivalent to devices that have been reclassified and do not require a premarket approval application. FDA product code: GZJ.

In 2014, the Cefaly (STX-Med), which is a TENS device, was granted a de novo 510(k) classification by the FDA for the prophylactic treatment of migraine in patients 18 years of age or older.<sup>1</sup> The Cefaly Acute and Cefaly Dual devices were cleared by the FDA through the 510(k) process for the acute treatment of migraine in patients in 18 years of age or older and for both the acute treatment and prophylaxis of migraines in adults, respectively, in 2017.<sup>2,3</sup> Other TENS devices cleared by the FDA through the 510(k) process for the prophylactic treatment of migraine in patients include Allive (Nu Eyne Co) and HeadTerm (EEspress).<sup>4,5</sup> FDA product code: PCC.

## RATIONALE

### Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have chronic pain (eg, musculoskeletal, neuropathic, and mixed pain conditions) who receive transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS), the evidence includes numerous randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and medication use. The overall strength of the evidence is weak. The best evidence exists for the treatment of chronic, intractable pain. Available evidence indicates that TENS can improve chronic intractable pain in some patients, and there is support for its use in clinical guidelines by specialty societies. To best direct TENS toward patients who will benefit, a short-term trial of TENS is appropriate, with continuation only in patients who show an initial improvement. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have acute pain (eg, surgical, musculoskeletal, labor, and mixed pain conditions) who receive TENS, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and medication use. Overall, evidence for the use of TENS from high-quality trials remains inconclusive for most indications. A Cochrane review of TENS for acute pain (eg, cervical laser treatment, venipuncture, screening flexible sigmoidoscopy, postpartum uterine contractions, rib fractures) found some evidence that TENS reduces pain intensity over and above that seen with placebo, but the high risk of bias made definitive conclusions impossible. Systematic reviews have found that TENS may help reduce pain in patients with post-operative pain (post-caesarean and total knee arthroplasty), dysmenorrhea, and pain associated with labor and delivery. For low back pain, systematic reviews have found insufficient evidence to support or refute the use of TENS. RCTs have reported mixed results in the efficacy of TENS across various acute pain conditions. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

---

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.

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

### Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

#### European Headache Federation

In 2013, the European Headache Federation, citing concerns about an ineffective sham procedure for TENS in headache methodology studies and the overall limited level of evidence, recommended that there was insufficient evidence for the use of TENS in headache prophylaxis and to abort an acute headache.<sup>83</sup>

#### Osteoarthritis Research Society International

In 2014, the guidelines from the Osteoarthritis Research Society International recommended that TENS was inappropriate for use in patients with multi-joint osteoarthritis; moreover, the guidelines suggested that TENS has an uncertain value for the treatment of knee-only osteoarthritis pain.<sup>84</sup> Updated guidance (2019) on the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis does not address TENS nor include it in their patient-focused treatment recommendations.<sup>85</sup>

#### National Comprehensive Cancer Network

National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines on adult cancer pain (v.1.2020 ) indicate that nonpharmacologic interventions, including TENS, may be considered in conjunction with pharmacologic interventions as needed (category 2A).<sup>86</sup>

#### National Cancer Institute

National Cancer Institute's Physician Data Query identifies TENS as a potential other nonpharmacological modality for pain control for postthoracotomy pain syndrome.<sup>87</sup>

#### North American Spine Society

In 2020, the North American Spine Society clinical guidelines on the diagnosis and treatment of low back pain provided guidance on the effectiveness of different physical medicine and rehabilitation therapies.<sup>88</sup> The guideline noted that there is conflicting evidence that TENS results in improvement in pain or function at short- to medium-term follow-up. The work group further recommended that randomized clinical trials with long-term follow-up are needed to evaluate the benefits of TENS compared to exercise/physical therapy or as adjunctive use to usual care for low back pain.

In 2011, the North American Spine Society clinical guidelines on the diagnosis and treatment of cervical radiculopathy from degenerative disorders discussed the role of ancillary treatments such as bracing, traction, electrical stimulation, acupuncture, and TENS in the treatment of cervical radiculopathy from degenerative disorders.<sup>89</sup> A consensus statement from the Society recommended that ozone injections, cervical halter traction, and combinations of medications, physical therapy, injections, and traction have been associated with improvements in patient-reported pain in uncontrolled case series. Such modalities may be considered, recognizing that no improvement relative to the natural history of cervical radiculopathy has been demonstrated.

---

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.

## American Academy of Neurology

In 2010, the American Academy of Neurology published an evidence-based review of the efficacy of TENS for the treatment of pain in neurologic disorders.<sup>28</sup> The Academy did not recommend TENS for the treatment of chronic low back pain due to lack of proven efficacy (level A, established evidence from 2 class I studies), and that TENS should be considered for the treatment of painful diabetic neuropathy (level B, probably effective, based on 2 class II studies).

## American Society of Anesthesiologists et al

In 2010, the practice guidelines from the American Society of Anesthesiologists and American Society of Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine recommended that TENS be used as part of a multimodal approach to management for patients with chronic back pain and may be used for other pain conditions (eg, neck and phantom limb pain).<sup>90</sup>

## National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

In 2016, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance on low back pain indicated that, despite the long history of use of TENS for back pain, the quality of research studies is poor.<sup>91</sup> This guidance recommended against TENS as a treatment.

In 2014, the NICE guidance on osteoarthritis care and management in adults indicated that TENS be considered "as an adjunct to core treatments for pain relief."<sup>92</sup>

In 2017, the NICE guidance on intrapartum care recommended against the use of TENS for "established labour."<sup>93</sup>

## American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

In 2007, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) guidelines for women's health care state that methods of neurostimulation, such as TENS, acupuncture, and massage, were based on the gate theory of pain control.<sup>94</sup> These treatments can be useful for pain control, particularly when the pain is severe. The guidelines recommended that because different methods of treatment work by different mechanisms (eg, relaxation techniques, TENS, physical therapy, vocational rehabilitation, biofeedback), the use of multiple treatment modalities in synergy should be considered.

In 2019, the ACOG guidelines on labor and delivery found that TENS may "help women cope with labor more than directly affect pain scores."<sup>95</sup>

## American College of Physicians

In 2017, the American College of Physicians published guidelines on noninvasive therapies for acute and low back pain.<sup>96</sup> No recommendations for TENS were made; the College concluded that "evidence was insufficient to determine the effectiveness" of TENS and that there was no long-range data.

## European Federation of Neurological Societies

In 2007, the European Federation of Neurological Societies published guidelines on neurostimulation for neuropathic pain.<sup>97</sup> The guidelines did not offer conclusive recommendations, with only approximately 200 patients with different diseases, based on studies using different parameters and comparators, and having variable results. The societies concluded that standard high-frequency TENS is possibly (level C) better than placebo and probably (level B) worse than acupuncture-like or any other kind of electrical stimulation.

## U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

## Medicare National Coverage

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services currently have a number of national coverage decisions on TENS. [98.99.100](#). The different coverage decisions address the use of TENS in the treatment of chronic intractable pain, noncoverage of TENS for chronic low back pain except to conduct research for said indication, and coverage for acute postoperative pain.

## REFERENCES

1. Food and Drug Administration. De Novo Classification Request for Cefaly Device. 2012; [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/reviews/K122566.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/reviews/K122566.pdf). Accessed October 7, 2020.
2. Food and Drug Administration. Cefaly Dual Device: K173006. 2017; [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf17/K173006.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf17/K173006.pdf). Accessed October 7, 2020.
3. Food and Drug Administration. Cefaly Acute Device: K171446. 2017; [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf17/K171446.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf17/K171446.pdf). Accessed October 7, 2020.
4. Food and Drug Administration. HeadTerm Device: K172450. 2018; [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf17/K172450.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf17/K172450.pdf). Accessed October 7, 2020.
5. Food and Drug Administration. Allive Device: K192773. 2019; [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf19/K192773.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf19/K192773.pdf). Accessed October 7, 2020.
6. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). TENS or PENS in the treatment of chronic and postoperative pain. TEC Assessments. 1996; Volume 11, Tab 21. PMID
7. Bronfort G, Nilsson N, Haas M, et al. Non-invasive physical treatments for chronic/recurrent headache. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2004; (3): CD001878. PMID 15266458
8. Brosseau L, Judd MG, Marchand S, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis in the hand. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2003; (3): CD004377. PMID 12918009
9. Brosseau LU, Pelland LU, Casimiro LY, et al. Electrical stimulation for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2002; (2): CD003687. PMID 12076504
10. Cameron M, Lonergan E, Lee H. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for dementia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2003; (3): CD004032. PMID 12917999
11. Carroll D, Moore RA, McQuay HJ, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for chronic pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2001; (3): CD003222. PMID 11687055
12. Dowswell T, Bedwell C, Lavender T, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for pain relief in labour. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Apr 15 2009; (2): CD007214. PMID 19370680
13. Hurlow A, Bennett MI, Robb KA, et al. Transcutaneous electric nerve stimulation (TENS) for cancer pain in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Mar 14 2012; (3): CD006276. PMID 22419313
14. Khadilkar A, Milne S, Brosseau L, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for chronic low-back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Jul 20 2005; (3): CD003008. PMID 16034883
15. Khadilkar A, Odebiyi DO, Brosseau L, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) versus placebo for chronic low-back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Oct 08 2008; (4): CD003008. PMID 18843638
16. Kroeling P, Gross A, Goldsmith CH, et al. Electrotherapy for neck pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Oct 07 2009; (4): CD004251. PMID 19821322
17. Martimbianco ALC, Porfirio GJ, Pacheco RL, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for chronic neck pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Dec 12 2019; 12: CD011927. PMID 31830313
18. Milne S, Welch V, Brosseau L, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for chronic low back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2001; (2): CD003008. PMID 11406059
19. Mulvey MR, Bagnall AM, Johnson MI, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for phantom pain and stump pain following amputation in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* May 12 2010; (5): CD007264. PMID 20464749
20. Nnoaham KE, Kumbang J. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for chronic pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Jul 16 2008; (3): CD003222. PMID 18646088

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.

21. Osiri M, Welch V, Brosseau L, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for knee osteoarthritis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2000; (4): CD002823. PMID 11034768
22. Price CI, Pandyan AD. Electrical stimulation for preventing and treating post-stroke shoulder pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2000; (4): CD001698. PMID 11034725
23. Proctor ML, Smith CA, Farquhar CM, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation and acupuncture for primary dysmenorrhoea. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2002; (1): CD002123. PMID 11869624
24. Robb KA, Bennett MJ, Johnson MI, et al. Transcutaneous electric nerve stimulation (TENS) for cancer pain in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Jul 16 2008; (3): CD006276. PMID 18646140
25. Rutjes AW, Nuesch E, Sterchi R, et al. Transcutaneous electrostimulation for osteoarthritis of the knee. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Oct 07 2009; (4): CD002823. PMID 19821296
26. Walsh DM, Howe TE, Johnson MI, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for acute pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Apr 15 2009; (2): CD006142. PMID 19370629
27. Zimpel SA, Torloni MR, Porfirio GJ, et al. Complementary and alternative therapies for post-caesarean pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Sep 01 2020; 9: CD011216. PMID 32871021
28. Dubinsky RM, Miyasaki J. Assessment: efficacy of transcutaneous electric nerve stimulation in the treatment of pain in neurologic disorders (an evidence-based review): report of the Therapeutics and Technology Assessment Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. *Neurology.* Jan 12 2010; 74(2): 173-6. PMID 20042705
29. Wu LC, Weng PW, Chen CH, et al. Literature Review and Meta-Analysis of Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation in Treating Chronic Back Pain. *Reg Anesth Pain Med.* May 2018; 43(4): 425-433. PMID 29394211
30. Leemans L, Elma O, Nijs J, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation and heat to reduce pain in a chronic low back pain population: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Braz J Phys Ther.* May 12 2020. PMID 32434666
31. Keskin EA, Onur O, Keskin HL, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation improves low back pain during pregnancy. *Gynecol Obstet Invest.* 2012; 74(1): 76-83. PMID 22722614
32. Jamison RN, Wan L, Edwards RR, et al. Outcome of a High-Frequency Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulator (hfTENS) Device for Low Back Pain: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Pain Pract.* Jun 2019; 19(5): 466-475. PMID 30636101
33. Chen FC, Jin ZL, Wang DF. A retrospective study of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for chronic pain following ankylosing spondylitis. *Medicine (Baltimore).* Jul 2018; 97(27): e11265. PMID 29979392
34. Kong X, Gozani SN. Effectiveness of fixed-site high-frequency transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation in chronic pain: a large-scale, observational study. *J Pain Res.* 2018; 11: 703-714. PMID 29670397
35. Gossrau G, Wahner M, Kuschke M, et al. Microcurrent transcutaneous electric nerve stimulation in painful diabetic neuropathy: a randomized placebo-controlled study. *Pain Med.* Jun 2011; 12(6): 953-60. PMID 21627767
36. Dailey DL, Rakel BA, Vance CG, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation reduces pain, fatigue and hyperalgesia while restoring central inhibition in primary fibromyalgia. *Pain.* Nov 2013; 154(11): 2554-62. PMID 23900134
37. Lauretti GR, Chubaci EF, Mattos AL. Efficacy of the use of two simultaneously TENS devices for fibromyalgia pain. *Rheumatol Int.* Aug 2013; 33(8): 2117-22. PMID 23423539
38. Schneider MP, Tellenbach M, Mordasini L, et al. Refractory chronic pelvic pain syndrome in men: can transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation help?. *BJU Int.* Jul 2013; 112(2): E159-63. PMID 23433012
39. Cherian JJ, Harrison PE, Benjamin SA, et al. Do the Effects of Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation on Knee Osteoarthritis Pain and Function Last?. *J Knee Surg.* Aug 2016; 29(6): 497-501. PMID 26540652
40. Palmer S, Domaille M, Cramp F, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation as an adjunct to education and exercise for knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken).* Mar 2014; 66(3): 387-94. PMID 23983090
41. Vance CG, Rakel BA, Blodgett NP, et al. Effects of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation on pain, pain sensitivity, and function in people with knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial. *Phys Ther.* Jul 2012; 92(7): 898-910. PMID 22466027
42. Chen WL, Hsu WC, Lin YJ, et al. Comparison of intra-articular hyaluronic acid injections with transcutaneous electric nerve stimulation for the management of knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* Aug 2013; 94(8): 1482-9. PMID 23628378
43. Sawant A, Dadurka K, Overend T, et al. Systematic review of efficacy of TENS for management of central pain in people with multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* May 2015; 4(3): 219-27. PMID 26008938
44. Amatya B, Young J, Khan F. Non-pharmacological interventions for chronic pain in multiple sclerosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Dec 19 2018; 12: CD012622. PMID 30567012
45. Johnson MI, Mulvey MR, Bagnall AM. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for phantom pain and stump pain following amputation in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Aug 18 2015; 8: CD007264. PMID 26284511
46. Boldt I, Eriks-Hoogland I, Brinkhof MW, et al. Non-pharmacological interventions for chronic pain in people with spinal cord injury. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Nov 28 2014; (11): CD009177. PMID 25432061
47. Schoenen J, Vandersmissen B, Jeanette S, et al. Migraine prevention with a supraorbital transcutaneous stimulator: a randomized controlled trial. *Neurology.* Feb 19 2013; 80(8): 697-704. PMID 23390177

---

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.

48. Magis D, Sava S, d'Elia TS, et al. Safety and patients' satisfaction of transcutaneous supraorbital neurostimulation (tSNS) with the Cefaly(R) device in headache treatment: a survey of 2,313 headache sufferers in the general population. *J Headache Pain*. Dec 01 2013; 14: 95. PMID 24289825
49. De Giorgi I, Castroflorio T, Sartoris B, et al. The use of conventional transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation in chronic facial myalgia patients. *Clin Oral Investig*. Jan 2017; 21(1): 275-280. PMID 27000071
50. Ferreira AP, Costa DR, Oliveira AI, et al. Short-term transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation reduces pain and improves the masticatory muscle activity in temporomandibular disorder patients: a randomized controlled trial. *J Appl Oral Sci*. Mar-Apr 2017; 25(2): 112-120. PMID 28403351
51. Ahmed S, Plazier M, Ost J, et al. The effect of occipital nerve field stimulation on the descending pain pathway in patients with fibromyalgia: a water PET and EEG imaging study. *BMC Neurol*. Nov 12 2018; 18(1): 191. PMID 30419855
52. Takla MKN. Low-frequency high-intensity versus medium-frequency low-intensity combined therapy in the management of active myofascial trigger points: A randomized controlled trial. *Physiother Res Int*. Oct 2018; 23(4): e1737. PMID 30095858
53. Gibson W, Wand BM, Meads C, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for chronic pain - an overview of Cochrane Reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Apr 03 2019; 4: CD011890. PMID 30941745
54. Johnson M, Martinson M. Efficacy of electrical nerve stimulation for chronic musculoskeletal pain: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Pain*. Jul 2007; 130(1-2): 157-65. PMID 17383095
55. Deyo RA, Walsh NE, Martin DC, et al. A controlled trial of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) and exercise for chronic low back pain. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 07 1990; 322(23): 1627-34. PMID 2140432
56. Machin D, Lewith GT, Wylson S. Pain measurement in randomized clinical trials: A comparison of two pain scales. *Clin J Pain*. 1988;4:161-168. PMID
57. Oosterhof J, De Boo TM, Oostendorp RA, et al. Outcome of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation in chronic pain: short-term results of a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *J Headache Pain*. Sep 2006; 7(4): 196-205. PMID 16897618
58. Oosterhof J, Samwel HJ, de Boo TM, et al. Predicting outcome of TENS in chronic pain: a prospective, randomized, placebo controlled trial. *Pain*. May 2008; 136(1-2): 11-20. PMID 17659838
59. Oosterhof J, Wilder-Smith OH, de Boo T, et al. The long-term outcome of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation in the treatment for patients with chronic pain: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Pain Pract*. Sep 2012; 12(7): 513-22. PMID 22304690
60. Lang T, Barker R, Steinlechner B, et al. TENS relieves acute posttraumatic hip pain during emergency transport. *J Trauma*. Jan 2007; 62(1): 184-8; discussion 188. PMID 17215752
61. Zhu Y, Feng Y, Peng L. Effect of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for pain control after total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Rehabil Med*. Nov 21 2017; 49(9): 700-704. PMID 28933513
62. Rakei BA, Zimmerman MB, Geasland K, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for the control of pain during rehabilitation after total knee arthroplasty: A randomized, blinded, placebo-controlled trial. *Pain*. Dec 2014; 155(12): 2599-611. PMID 25270585
63. Ramanathan D, Saleh A, Klika AK, et al. The Use of Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation After Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial. *Surg Technol Int*. Jul 25 2017; 30: 425-434. PMID 28537354
64. Oztas B, Iyigun E. The effects of two different electrical stimulation methods on the pain intensity of the patients who had undergone abdominal surgery with a midline incision: Randomized controlled clinical trial. *Contemp Nurse*. Apr 2019; 55(2-3): 122-138. PMID 31169066
65. Galli TT, Chiavegato LD, Liebano RE. Effects of TENS in living kidney donors submitted to open nephrectomy: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Eur J Pain*. Jan 2015; 19(1): 67-76. PMID 24831862
66. Tokuda M, Tabira K, Masuda T, et al. Effect of modulated-frequency and modulated-intensity transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation after abdominal surgery: a randomized controlled trial. *Clin J Pain*. Jul 2014; 30(7): 565-70. PMID 24901753
67. Silva MB, de Melo PR, de Oliveira NM, et al. Analgesic effect of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation after laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. Aug 2012; 91(8): 652-7. PMID 22311059
68. DeSantana JM, Walsh DM, Vance C, et al. Effectiveness of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for treatment of hyperalgesia and pain. *Curr Rheumatol Rep*. Dec 2008; 10(6): 492-9. PMID 19007541
69. Forogh B, Aslanpour H, Fallah E, et al. Adding high-frequency transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation to the first phase of post anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction rehabilitation does not improve pain and function in young male athletes more than exercise alone: a randomized single-blind clinical trial. *Disabil Rehabil*. Mar 2019; 41(5): 514-522. PMID 29117738
70. Tucker DL, Rockett M, Hasan M, et al. Does transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) alleviate the pain experienced during bone marrow sampling in addition to standard techniques? A randomised, double-blinded, controlled trial. *J Clin Pathol*. Jun 2015; 68(6): 479-83. PMID 25759407
71. Binny J, Joshua Wong NL, Garga S, et al. Transcutaneous electric nerve stimulation (TENS) for acute low back pain: systematic review. *Scand J Pain*. Apr 24 2019; 19(2): 225-233. PMID 30849052
72. Arik MI, Kiloatar H, Aslan B, et al. The effect of tens for pain relief in women with primary dysmenorrhea: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Explore (NY)*. Aug 29 2020; 2541. PMID 32917532

---

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.



73. Platon B, Thorn SE, Mannheimer C, et al. Effects of high-frequency, high-intensity transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation versus intravenous opioids for pain relief after hysteroscopy: a randomized controlled study. *Obstet Gynecol Sci*. Sep 2020; 63(5): 660-669. PMID 32717773
74. Lison JF, Amer-Cuenca JJ, Piquer-Marti S, et al. Transcutaneous Nerve Stimulation for Pain Relief During Office Hysteroscopy: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Obstet Gynecol*. Feb 2017; 129(2): 363-370. PMID 28079781
75. Thuvarakan K, Zimmermann H, Mikkelsen MK, et al. Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation As A Pain-Relieving Approach in Labor Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Neuromodulation*. Aug 2020; 23(6): 732-746. PMID 32691942
76. Kayman-Kose S, Arioiz DT, Toktas H, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for pain control after vaginal delivery and cesarean section. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*. Oct 2014; 27(15): 1572-5. PMID 24283391
77. Baez Suarez A, Martin Castillo E, Garcia Andujar J, et al. Evaluation of the effectiveness of transcutaneous nerve stimulation during labor in breech presentation: a case series. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*. Jan 2021; 34(1): 24-30. PMID 30654675
78. Johnson MI, Paley CA, Howe TE, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for acute pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Jun 15 2015; (6): CD006142. PMID 26075732
79. Simpson PM, Fouche PF, Thomas RE, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for relieving acute pain in the prehospital setting: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized-controlled trials. *Eur J Emerg Med*. Feb 2014; 21(1): 10-7. PMID 23839103
80. Butera KA, George SZ, Borsa PA, et al. Prolonged Reduction in Shoulder Strength after Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation Treatment of Exercise-Induced Acute Muscle Pain. *Pain Pract*. Nov 2018; 18(8): 954-968. PMID 29505689
81. Hokenek NM, Erdogan MO, Hokenek UD, et al. Treatment of migraine attacks by transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation in emergency department: A randomized controlled trial. *Am J Emerg Med*. Jan 15 2020. PMID 31983598
82. Chesterton LS, Lewis AM, Sim J, et al. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation as adjunct to primary care management for tennis elbow: pragmatic randomised controlled trial (TATE trial). *BMJ*. Sep 02 2013; 347: f5160. PMID 23999980
83. Martelletti P, Jensen RH, Antal A, et al. Neuromodulation of chronic headaches: position statement from the European Headache Federation. *J Headache Pain*. Oct 21 2013; 14: 86. PMID 24144382
84. McAlindon TE, Bannuru RR, Sullivan MC, et al. OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. Mar 2014; 22(3): 363-88. PMID 24462672
85. Bannuru RR, Osani MC, Vaysbrot EE, et al. OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. Nov 2019; 27(11): 1578-1589. PMID 31278997
86. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology: Adult cancer pain. Version 1.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/pain.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/pain.pdf). Accessed October 7, 2020.
87. National Cancer Institute. Pain (PDQ)-Health Professional Version. 2019. [https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/treatment/side-effects/pain/pain-hp-pdq#\\_3](https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/treatment/side-effects/pain/pain-hp-pdq#_3). Accessed October 7, 2020.
88. North American Spine Society. Diagnosis and Treatment of Low Back Pain. 2020. <https://www.spine.org/Portals/0/assets/downloads/ResearchClinicalCare/Guidelines/LowBackPain.pdf>. Accessed October 7, 2020.
89. Bono CM, Ghiselli G, Gilbert TJ, et al. An evidence-based clinical guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of cervical radiculopathy from degenerative disorders. *Spine J*. Jan 2011; 11(1): 64-72. PMID 21168100
90. Benzon HT, Connis RT, De Leon-Casasola OA, et al. Practice guidelines for chronic pain management: an updated report by the American Society of Anesthesiologists Task Force on Chronic Pain Management and the American Society of Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine. *Anesthesiology*. Apr 2010; 112(4): 810-33. PMID 20124882
91. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Osteoarthritis: care and management [CG177]. 2014; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg177>. Accessed October 7, 2020.
92. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Low back pain and sciatica in over 16s: assessment and management [NG59]. 2016 (last updated 2020); <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/NG59>. Accessed October 7, 2020.
93. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Intrapartum care for healthy women and babies [CG190]. 2014 (last updated 2017); <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg190>. Accessed October 7, 2020.
94. American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG). Women's Health Care Physicians. 2007; <http://www.acog.org/Resources-And-Publications/>. Accessed October 7, 2020.
95. American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) Committee Opinion Number 766 on Approaches to Limit Intervention During Labor and Birth. February 2019. <https://www.acog.org/Clinical-Guidance-and-Publications/Committee-Opinions/Committee-on-Obstetric-Practice/Approaches-to-Limit-Intervention-During-Labor-and-Birth>. Accessed October 7, 2020.
96. Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, McLean RM, et al. Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. Apr 04 2017; 166(7): 514-530. PMID 28192789
97. Cruccu G, Aziz TZ, Garcia-Larrea L, et al. EFNS guidelines on neurostimulation therapy for neuropathic pain. *Eur J Neurol*. Sep 2007; 14(9): 952-70. PMID 17718686

---

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.

98. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulators (TENS) (280.13). 2012; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/search/document-id-search-results.aspx?DocID=280.13&bc=gAAAAAAAAAAAA&>. Accessed October 7, 2020.
99. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. Decision Memo for Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation for Chronic Low Back Pain (160.27). 2012; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-details.aspx?NCAId=256&DocID=CAG-00429N&NCDId=63&ncdver=2&bc=gAAAABAAAA&>. Accessed October 7, 2020.
100. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) for Acute Post-Operative Pain (280.13). 2012; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=145&ncdver=2&DocID=10.2&bc=gAAAABAAAA&>. Accessed October 8, 2020.

## **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>
September 2012	New policy	
December 2013	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review, references 22, 24, 26, 32 35, 36 & 54 added. Policy statements are unchanged.
June 2014	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review; References 1, 26-28, 3135, 45-48, 50-52 added; last policy statement revised to specifically list use of TENS in prevention of migraine headaches as not medically necessary.
June 2015	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review. References 33, 43, and 45-46 added, and references 55-56 updated; policy statements unchanged.
June 2016	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through October 12, 2015 references 33-34, 50, and 52 added. Policy statements unchanged.
March 2018	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 12, 2017; references 33, 39-40, 49, and 55 added. Policy statements unchanged except "not medically necessary" corrected to "investigational" due to 510(k) status.
March 2019	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 18, 2018; references 25, 27-28, 51, and 63 added; references 72-74 updated. Policy statements unchanged.
March 2020	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 7, 2019, references added. Policy statements unchanged.
March 2021	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through October 7, 2020, 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.