


MEDICAL POLICY	Prolotherapy
<p>Effective Date: 7/1/2021</p>  <p style="text-align: right;">7/1/2021</p>	<p>Medical Policy Number: 200</p>
<p>Medical Officer Date</p>	<p>Medical Policy Committee Approved Date: 3/17; 3/18; 11/18; 12/19; 6/2020; 6/2021</p>

See Policy CPT/HCPCS CODE section below for any prior authorization requirements

SCOPE:

Providence Health Plan, Providence Health Assurance, Providence Plan Partners, and Ayin Health Solutions as applicable (referred to individually as “Company” and collectively as “Companies”).

APPLIES TO:

All lines of business

BENEFIT APPLICATION

Medicaid Members

Oregon: Services requested for Oregon Health Plan (OHP) members follow the OHP Prioritized List and Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) as the primary resource for coverage determinations. Medical policy criteria below may be applied when there are no criteria available in the OARs and the OHP Prioritized List.

POLICY CRITERIA

Note: This policy does not address stem cell therapy for orthopedic applications. Please see [Cross References](#) section below.

- I. Prolotherapy is considered **investigational and is not covered** for the treatment of any indication, including, but not limited to the following (A.-D.):
 - A. Osteoarthritis, including but limited to the following (1.-3.):
 1. Osteoarthritis of the first carpometacarpal joint
 2. Osteoarthritis of the knee
 3. Osteoarthritis of the thumb and finger
 - B. Myofascial Pain Syndrome
 - C. Spinal and Pelvic Pain, including but limited to the following (1.-7.):
 1. Discogenic leg pain
 2. Coccygodynia

MEDICAL POLICY	Prolotherapy
-----------------------	---------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Sacroiliac joint pain 4. Iliac crest pain syndrome 5. Cervical, thoracic or lumbar pain 6. Neck pain 7. Low back and pelvic pain D. Tendinopathies, including but limited to the following (1.-8.): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Achilles tendinopathy or tendinosis 2. Groin pain (e.g., osteitis pubis, abdominal or adductor tendinopathy) 3. Lateral epicondylitis 4. Osgood–Schlatter disease 5. Patellar tendinopathy 6. Plantar fasciitis 7. Shoulder pain (e.g., rotator cuff disease or tendinopathy, supraspinatus tendinosis/tear) 8. Temporomandibular joint hypermobility (TMJ) <p>Link to Policy Summary</p>
--

BILLING GUIDELINES

- Prolotherapy may only be billed using M0076 or an unlisted code, including but not limited to 20999 or 22899.
- Note: The following codes may not be used to report prolotherapy services, as they are considered inappropriate:
 - 20550-20553
 - 20600-20611
 - 62281
 - 62292
 - 62310-62311
 - 0231T-0218T

CPT/HCPCS CODES

All Lines of Business	
Not Covered	
M0076	Prolotherapy
Unlisted Codes	
All unlisted codes will be reviewed for medical necessity, correct coding, and pricing at the claim level. If an unlisted code is billed related to services addressed in this policy then it will be denied as not covered .	
20999	Unlisted procedure, musculoskeletal system, general
22899	Unlisted procedure, spine

DESCRIPTION

According to the American Academy of Orthopaedic Medicine (AAOM):¹

Prolotherapy (also known as regenerative injection therapy, sclerotherapy, proliferative therapy, ligament reconstruction therapy, and fibro-osseous injection therapy) is the injection of a substance directly on the site of an injury, typically a torn or stretched ligament or tendon. Prolotherapy injections contain anesthetic agents and/or additional substances that are thought act as mild irritants that may stimulate the healing response. The primary agent is dextrose, but providers may tailor the selection of substances according to the patients' needs. Other substances used are:

1. **Growth Factors:** Injection of a growth factor that specifically initiates growth of a certain cell line (e.g., erythropoietin). This type of prolotherapy is in early stages of study for arthritis (growing cartilage cells) and sprain and strain (growing fibroblasts).
2. **Non-Inflammatory Agents:** Injection of a non-inflammatory substance that may cause the body to produce growth factors (e.g., 5-10% dextrose solution).
3. **Inflammatory Agents:** Injection of a substance that causes activation of the inflammatory cascade to produce growth factors. These solutions often include 12.5%-25% dextrose, phenol-containing-solutions, and sodium-morrhuate-containing sclerosing agents.

Proposed Mechanism of Action: Prolotherapy is thought to create a mild, controlled injury that stimulates the body's natural healing processes to strengthen joints weakened by traumatic or over-use injury. The mild inflammatory response that is created by the injection may encourage growth of new ligament or tendon fibers on the weakened structure.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Due to the volume of literature on prolotherapy as a treatment for a wide variety of conditions, the evidence review below is focused on recent systematic reviews. A review of the ECRI, Hayes, Cochrane, and PubMed databases was conducted regarding the use of prolotherapy as a treatment for all indications, including but not limited to musculoskeletal pain. Below is a summary of the available evidence identified through April 2021.

The use of prolotherapy has been evaluated and reported by systematic reviews for the following orthopedic/musculoskeletal indications:

- Osteoarthritis:
 - Osteoarthritis of the first carpometacarpal joint^{2,3}
 - Osteoarthritis of the knee²⁻⁵
 - Osteoarthritis of the thumb and finger^{2,3,6}
- Myofascial Pain Syndrome⁶
- Spinal and Pelvic Pain:⁶
 - Discogenic leg pain
 - Coccygodynia

MEDICAL POLICY	Prolotherapy
----------------	--------------

- Sacroiliac joint pain
- Iliac crest pain syndrome
- Cervical, thoracic or lumbar pain
- Neck pain
- Low back and pelvic pain
- Tendinopathies:^{7,8}
 - Achilles tendinopathy or tendinosis^{6,9-12}
 - Groin pain (e.g., osteitis pubis, abdominal or adductor tendinopathy)⁶
 - Lateral epicondylitis^{6,13-15}
 - Osgood–Schlatter disease^{6,11}
 - Patellar tendinopathy^{6,16}
 - Plantar fasciitis^{6,11}
 - Shoulder pain (e.g., rotator cuff disease or tendinopathy, supraspinatus tendinosis/tear)^{6,17-19}
 - Temporomandibular joint hypermobility (TMJ)^{6,20}

Systematic reviews were heterogeneous in the methods used to examine primary studies evaluating prolotherapy. Many reviews included or focused entirely on nonrandomized studies, and many included more than one indication. However, in general, the reviews reported heterogeneity in prolotherapy protocols and severity of the condition being evaluated among included studies. Reviews published on the same indication often had partial or complete overlap of the studies that were included. All reviews mentioned the need for larger, better-quality studies with longer-term follow-up. The majority of recent reviews were unable to draw definitive conclusions regarding the efficacy of prolotherapy as a treatment for any indication.

Overall, the body of evidence for any given indication suffers from one or more of the following limitations:

- extremely limited number of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) reporting outcomes for any given indication
- for indications where RCTs have been published, these trials are of low-quality of due to methodological limitations including:
 - small sample size (almost all under 100 patients)
 - primary outcomes reported consisted entirely of subjective, patient-reported outcomes
 - use of co-interventions in the prolotherapy groups
 - heterogeneity of :
 - comparator treatment
 - primary outcomes reported
 - use of different scales for self-reporting of subjective pain, stiffness and function
 - treatment protocol, including variability in agent(s) used, concentrations used and number of injections administered
 - in trials using a non-prolotherapy injection comparator, confounding effects of needle-to-bone contact and pressure exerted by the injected volume of solution were noted
- inconsistent data reporting
- risk of publication and/or selection bias
- conflicting or no evidence of short-term improvements in pain and/or function (first few months following treatment) when compared to placebo, exercise or non-prolotherapy injection treatments

- conflicting or no evidence of long-term benefit on function or pain outcomes

CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS)

The AAOS published evidence-based clinical practice guidelines on the management of osteoarthritis of the hip (2017) and the knee (2013).^{21,22} The association conducted evidence reviews of prolotherapy versus other comparators for these indications, but did not identify enough high-quality evidence to formally address the treatment in their recommendations.

CENTERS FOR MEDICARE & MEDICAID

As of 4/30/2021, the following Centers for Medicare & Medicaid (CMS) non-coverage guidance documents for prolotherapy were identified.

1. The National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Prolotherapy, Joint Sclerotherapy, and Ligamentous Injections with Sclerosing Agents (150.7) states that:²³

“The medical effectiveness of the above therapies has not been verified by scientifically controlled studies. Accordingly, reimbursement for these modalities should be denied on the ground that they are not reasonable and necessary as required by §1862(a)(1) of the Act.”

2. The Local Coverage Determination (LCD): Trigger Point Injections (L36859) states that:²⁴

“Prolotherapy, the injection into a damaged tissue of an irritant to induce inflammation, is not covered by Medicare. Billing this under the trigger point injection codes (20552 or 20553) is misrepresentation.”

POLICY SUMMARY

There is insufficient evidence that the use of prolotherapy is effective and consistently improves health outcomes for any indication, including but not limited to osteoarthritis, myofascial pain syndrome, spinal and pelvic pain, or tendinopathies. Due to heterogeneity in prolotherapy treatment protocol, including variability in agent(s) used, concentrations used and number of injections administered; interpreting results and drawing conclusions about treatment efficacy is difficult. This limitation is consistently reported for the use of prolotherapy for all indications. Other major limitations of prolotherapy observed across all indications include a lack of large, well-designed randomized controlled trials, and inconsistency in terms of whether or not prolotherapy has a beneficial effect. In addition, no clinical practice guidelines were identified that support the use of prolotherapy as a treatment for any indication. Therefore, prolotherapy is considered investigational as a treatment for any indication.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

Company Medical Policies serve as guidance for the administration of plan benefits. Medical policies do not constitute medical advice nor a guarantee of coverage. Company Medical Policies are reviewed annually and are based upon published, peer-reviewed scientific evidence and evidence-based clinical practice guidelines that are available as of the last policy update. The Companies reserve the right to determine the application of Medical Policies and make revisions to Medical Policies at any time. Providers will be given at least 60-days notice of policy changes that are restrictive in nature.

The scope and availability of all plan benefits are determined in accordance with the applicable coverage agreement. Any conflict or variance between the terms of the coverage agreement and Company Medical Policy will be resolved in favor of the coverage agreement.

REGULATORY STATUS

Mental Health Parity Statement

Coverage decisions are made on the basis of individualized determinations of medical necessity and the experimental or investigational character of the treatment in the individual case. In cases where medical necessity is not established by policy for specific treatment modalities, evidence not previously considered regarding the efficacy of the modality that is presented shall be given consideration to determine if the policy represents current standards of care.

MEDICAL POLICY CROSS REFERENCES

- Stem Cell Therapy for Orthopedic Applications

REFERENCES

1. American Academy of Orthopaedic Medicine. Prolotherapy. <http://www.aaomed.org/prolotherapy>. Published 2020. Accessed 4/30/2021.
2. Hung CY, Hsiao MY, Chang KV, Han DS, Wang TG. Comparative effectiveness of dextrose prolotherapy versus control injections and exercise in the management of osteoarthritis pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Pain Res.* 2016;9:847-857. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27799816>
3. Krsticevic M, Jeric M, Dosenovic S, Jelacic Kadic A, Puljak L. Proliferative injection therapy for osteoarthritis: a systematic review. *Int Orthop.* 2017;41(4):671-679. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28190092>
4. Hassan F, Trebinjac S, Murrell WD, Maffulli N. The effectiveness of prolotherapy in treating knee osteoarthritis in adults: a systematic review. *Br Med Bull.* 2017;122(1):91-108. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28334196>
5. Sit RW, Chung V, Reeves KD, et al. Hypertonic dextrose injections (prolotherapy) in the treatment of symptomatic knee osteoarthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci Rep.* 2016;6:25247. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27146849>

MEDICAL POLICY	Prolotherapy
----------------	--------------

6. Hauser RA, Lackner JB, Steilen-Matias D, Harris DK. A Systematic Review of Dextrose Prolotherapy for Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain. *Clin Med Insights Arthritis Musculoskelet Disord*. 2016;9:139-159. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27429562>
7. Chung M-W, Hsu C-Y, Chung W-K, Lin Y-N. Effects of dextrose prolotherapy on tendinopathy, fasciopathy, and ligament injuries, fact or myth?: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2020;99(46):e23201-e23201. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7668443/>
8. Bae G, Kim S, Lee S, Lee WY, Lim Y. Prolotherapy for the patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Anesth Pain Med (Seoul)*. 2021;16(1):81-95. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7861898/>
9. Morath O, Kubosch EJ, Taeymans J, et al. The effect of sclerotherapy and prolotherapy on chronic painful Achilles tendinopathy-a systematic review including meta-analysis. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2018;28(1):4-15. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28449312>
10. Kearney RS, Parsons N, Metcalfe D, Costa ML. Injection therapies for Achilles tendinopathy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015(5):Cd010960. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26009861>
11. Sanderson LM, Bryant A. Effectiveness and safety of prolotherapy injections for management of lower limb tendinopathy and fasciopathy: a systematic review. *J Foot Ankle Res*. 2015;8:57. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26500703>
12. Gross CE, Hsu AR, Chahal J, Holmes GB, Jr. Injectable treatments for noninsertional achilles tendinosis: a systematic review. *Foot Ankle Int*. 2013;34(5):619-628. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23637232>
13. Dong W, Goost H, Lin XB, et al. Injection therapies for lateral epicondylalgia: a systematic review and Bayesian network meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2016;50(15):900-908. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26392595>
14. Sims SE, Miller K, Elfar JC, Hammert WC. Non-surgical treatment of lateral epicondylitis: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Hand (N Y)*. 2014;9(4):419-446. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25414603>
15. Krogh TP, Bartels EM, Ellingsen T, et al. Comparative effectiveness of injection therapies in lateral epicondylitis: a systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Sports Med*. 2013;41(6):1435-1446. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22972856>
16. Cairns G, Owen T, Kluzek S, et al. Therapeutic interventions in children and adolescents with patellar tendon related pain: a systematic review. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med*. 2018;4(1):e000383. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30167318>
17. Lin MT, Chiang CF, Wu CH, Huang YT, Tu YK, Wang TG. Comparative Effectiveness of Injection Therapies in Rotator Cuff Tendinopathy: A Systematic Review, Pairwise and Network Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2018. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30076801>
18. Lin MT, Chiang CF, Wu CH, Huang YT, Tu YK, Wang TG. Comparative Effectiveness of Injection Therapies in Rotator Cuff Tendinopathy: A Systematic Review, Pairwise and Network Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2019;100(2):336-349.e315.
19. Catapano M, Zhang K, Mittal N, Sangha H, Onishi K, de Sa D. Effectiveness of Dextrose Prolotherapy for Rotator Cuff Tendinopathy: A Systematic Review. *Pm r*. 2020;12(3):288-300.
20. Nagori SA, Jose A, Gopalakrishnan V, Roy ID, Chattopadhyay PK, Roychoudhury A. The efficacy of dextrose prolotherapy over placebo for temporomandibular joint hypermobility: A systematic

- review and meta-analysis. *J Oral Rehabil.* 2018.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30024045>
21. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. Management Of Osteoarthritis Of The Hip: Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guideline. https://aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/osteoarthritis-of-the-hip/oa-hip-cpg_6-11-19.pdf. Published 2017. Accessed 4/30/2021.
 22. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. Treatment of Osteoarthritis of the Knee (2nd edition)(Non-Arthroplasty): Evidence-Based Guideline. <https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/osteoarthritis-of-the-knee/osteoarthritis-of-the-knee-2nd-edition-clinical-practice-guideline.pdf>. Published 2018. Accessed 4/30/2021.
 23. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Prolotherapy, Joint Sclerotherapy, and Ligamentous Injections with Sclerosing Agents (150.7). <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=15>. Published 1999. Accessed 4/30/2021.
 24. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Local Coverage Determination (LCD): Trigger Point Injections (L36859). <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=36859>. Published 2018. Accessed 4/30/2021.