1.01.05	Low Intensity Pulsed Ultrasound Fracture Healing Device		
Original Policy Date:	June 5, 1996	**Effective Date:**	May 1, 2024
Section:	1.0 Durable Medical Equipment	**Page:**	Page 1 of 23

Policy Statement

I. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound is considered **investigational** as a treatment for **any** of the following:
   A. Fresh fractures (surgically managed or nonsurgically managed)
   B. Fracture nonunion and delayed union fractures
   C. Stress fractures, osteotomy, and distraction osteogenesis

NOTE: Refer to Appendix A to see the policy statement changes (if any) from the previous version.

Policy Guidelines

Fresh (Acute) Fracture

There is no standard definition for a "fresh" fracture. A fracture is most commonly defined as fresh for 7 days after the fracture occurs, but there is definitional variability. For example, one study defined fresh as less than 5 days after fracture, while another defined fresh as up to 10 days post-fracture. Most fresh closed fractures heal without complications using standard fracture care (i.e., closed reduction and cast immobilization).

Nonunion

There is no consensus on the definition of nonunion. One definition is a failure of progression of fracture healing for at least 3 consecutive months (and at least 6 months post-fracture) accompanied by clinical symptoms of delayed/nonunion (pain, difficulty weight-bearing).

The definition of nonunion used in U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) labeling suggests that nonunion is considered established when the fracture site shows no visibly progressive signs of healing, without providing guidance on the timeframe of observation. The following selection criteria are consistent with those proposed for electrical stimulation as a treatment of nonunions (see evidence review Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Electrical Bone Growth Stimulation of the Appendicular Skeleton):

- at least 3 months have passed since the date of the fracture, and
- serial radiographs have confirmed that no progressive signs of healing have occurred, and
- the fracture gap is 1 cm or less, and
- the individual can be adequately immobilized and, based on age, is likely to comply with non-weight bearing.

Delayed Union

Delayed union is defined as a decelerating healing process as determined by serial radiographs, together with a lack of clinical and radiologic evidence of union, bony continuity, or bone reaction at the fracture site for no less than 3 months from the index injury or the most recent intervention.

Coding

See the Codes table for details.

Description

Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound has been investigated as a technique to accelerate healing of fresh fractures, surgically treated closed fractures, delayed unions, nonunions, stress fractures, osteotomy

sites, and distraction osteogenesis. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound is administered using a transducer applied to the skin surface overlying the fracture site.

Related Policies

- Bone Morphogenetic Protein
- Electrical Bone Growth Stimulation of the Appendicular Skeleton
- Electrical Stimulation of the Spine as an Adjunct to Spinal Fusion Procedures

Benefit Application

Benefit determinations should be based in all cases on the applicable contract language. To the extent there are any conflicts between these guidelines and the contract language, the contract language will control. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Some state or federal mandates (e.g., Federal Employee Program [FEP]) prohibits plans from denying Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved technologies as investigational. In these instances, plans may have to consider the coverage eligibility of FDA-approved technologies on the basis of medical necessity alone.

Regulatory Status

In 1994, the Sonic Accelerated Fracture Healing System (SAFHS®; renamed Exogen 2000® and Exogen 4000+, now Exogen® Ultrasound Bone Healing System; Bioventus) was approved by the FDA through the premarket approval process for treatment of fresh, closed, posteriorly displaced distal radius (Colles) fractures and fresh, closed, or grade 1 open tibial diaphysis fractures in skeletally mature individuals when these fractures are orthopedically managed by closed reduction and cast immobilization. In February 2000, the labeled indication was expanded to include the treatment of established nonunions, excluding skull and vertebra. The AccelStim™ Bone Growth Stimulator (Orthofix US) was FDA approved in 2022 for accelerating time to healed fracture for fresh, closed, posteriorly displaced distal radius fractures and fresh, closed, or Grade I open tibial diaphysis fractures and for established non-unions in skeletally mature adults. FDA product code: LOF.

Rationale

Background

Bone Fractures

An estimated 178 million new fractures were reported worldwide in 2019.[1,] Most bone fractures heal spontaneously over several months following standard fracture care (closed reduction if necessary, followed by immobilization with casting or splinting). However, approximately 5% to 10% of all fractures have delayed healing, resulting in continued morbidity and increased utilization of health care services.[2,] Factors contributing to a nonunion include which bone is fractured, fracture site, the degree of bone loss, time since injury, the extent of soft tissue injury, and patient factors (e.g., smoking, diabetes, systemic disease).[2,]

Fracture Nonunion

There is no standard definition of a fracture nonunion.[3,] The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has defined nonunion as when "a minimum of 9 months has elapsed since injury, and the fracture site shows no visibly progressive signs of healing for a minimum of 3 months." Other definitions cite 3 to 6 months of time from the original injury, or simply when serial radiographs fail to show any further healing. These definitions do not reflect the underlying conditions in fractures that affect healing,

such as the degree of soft tissue damage, alignment of the bone fragments, vascularity, and quality of the underlying bone stock.

Delayed Union

Delayed union is generally considered a failure to heal between 3 and 9 months post-fracture, after which the fracture site would be considered a nonunion. The delayed union may also be defined as a decelerating bone healing process, as identified in serial radiographs. (In contrast, nonunion serial radiographs show no evidence of healing.) It is important to include both radiographic and clinical criteria to determine fracture healing status. Clinical criteria include the lack of ability to bear weight, fracture pain, and tenderness on palpation.

Treatment

Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound has been proposed to accelerate healing of fractures. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound is believed to alter the molecular and cellular mechanisms involved in each stage of the healing process (inflammation, soft callus formation, hard callus formation, and bone remodeling). The mechanism of action at the cellular level is not precisely known, but it is theorized that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound may stimulate the production or the activities of the following compounds that contribute to the bone healing process: cyclooxygenase-2, collagenase, integrin proteins, calcium, chondroblasts, mesenchymal cells, fibroblasts, and osteoblasts.

Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound treatment is self-administered, once daily for 20 minutes, until the fracture has healed.

Literature Review

Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are the length of life, quality of life, and ability to function including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance, and quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent 1 or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. Randomized controlled trials are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

Promotion of greater diversity and inclusion in clinical research of historically marginalized groups (e.g., People of Color [African-American, Asian, Black, Latino and Native American]; LGBTQIA (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual); Women; and People with Disabilities [Physical and Invisible]) allows policy populations to be more reflective of and findings more applicable to our diverse members. While we also strive to use inclusive language related to these groups in our policies, use of gender-specific nouns (e.g., women, men, sisters, etc.) will continue when reflective of language used in publications describing study populations.

Low-Intensity Pulsed Ultrasound

Systematic Reviews

Numerous systematic reviews have evaluated the use of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound for various types of fracture including those with nonunion or delayed union. Select systematic reviews are

summarized in Tables 1 and 2. A systematic review by Schandelmaier et al (2017) provides the most comprehensive and rigorous overview and analysis of the existing evidence, including 26 RCTs that used low-intensity pulsed ultrasound for bone healing.[4,] However, because there is a substantial degree of overlap in the studies included in these reports (Table 2), we will primarily focus on the findings of Schandelmaier et al (2017), which include analyses that highlight the results of RCTs identified as of higher quality. The meta-analysis by Seger et al (2017) analyzed healing index and average time to union following use of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound in cases of scaphoid nonunion, but it did not report control group comparisons.[5,] The systematic review by Lou et al (2017)[6,] focused on fresh fractures and the review by Leighton et al (2017)[7,] focused on nonunions. Leighton et al (2021) conducted an additional systematic review/meta-analysis looking at non-union in the specific populations of those with instrumented, infected, or fragility-related non-unions.[8,] All systematic reviewers acknowledged that the evidence for the use of the positions on low-intensity pulsed ultrasound has methodologic limitations (Table 1).

Table 1. Systematic Reviews Assessing Use of Low-Intensity Pulsed Ultrasound to Treat Fractures

Study	No. of Studies	Study Designs	No. of Subjects	Types of Fractures	Main Conclusions on Low-intensity Pulsed Ultrasound
Searle et al (2023)[9,]	21	RCT; Quasi-RCT	1517	Multiple types	Uncertain effectiveness, but it is possible that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound makes little to no difference
Leighton et al (2021)[8,]	29 (20 included in quantitative analysis)	CS, cohort, RCT, case report	NR	Instrumented non-unions, fragility fracture non-union, infected non-union	Healing rates of patients with instrumented, infected, or fragility non-unions is similar to the general non-union population
Schandelmaier et al (2017)[4,]	26	RCT	1593	Multiple types	Based on moderate- to high-quality evidence in fresh fracture, low-intensity pulsed ultrasound does not improve outcomes important to patients and is unlikely to affect radiographic bone healing
Seger et al (2017)[5,]	5	CS Registry	166	Nonunion	Encouraging results for consideration as nonoperative alternative in select cases
Lou et al (2017)[6,]	12	RCT; Quasi-RCT	1099	Fresh fracture	Positive results though strength of the evidence is limited
Leighton et al (2017)[7,]	13	RCT; CS Cohort Registry	1441	Nonunion	Potential benefit of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound; however, no evidence that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound can be used instead of surgery. May be useful in patients for whom surgery is high-risk.
Busse et al (2009)[10,]	13	RCT	563	Multiple types	Promising results but moderate- to low-quality evidence

CS: case series; NR: not reported; RCT: randomized controlled trial.

The study populations in RCTs included by Schandelmaier et al (2017) examined multiple types of fractures including fresh fractures surgically managed (n=7), fresh fractures not surgically managed (n=6), distraction osteogenesis (n=5), nonunion fractures (n=3), osteotomy (n=3), and stress fractures (n=2). The RCTs had a median population size of 30 patients (range, 8 to 501 patients).[4,] The outcomes examined by this systematic review emphasized those reported by patients to be most important: functional recovery (e.g., time to return to work, time to full weight-bearing); pain reduction; and number of subsequent operations. Additional outcomes included time to radiographic

healing, because this may be used by physicians to influence clinical decision making and adverse events associated with low-intensity pulsed ultrasound.
In this systematic review, 2 reviewers independently assessed the quality of selected RCTs, using Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE), a modified Cochrane risk of bias tool.[4,] Generation of randomization sequence, concealment of allocation, and blinding of patients, caregivers, and outcome reporting were evaluated in each trial. Each outcome within each trial was assessed for blinding of outcome assessors, loss to follow-up, and additional limitations. Trial authors were contacted if there was uncertainty in the quality assessment. Of the 26 included trials, 6 were considered to have a low-risk of bias, with the remaining 20 trials considered to have a high-risk of bias. Reasons for a high-risk of bias designation included failure to report a method for allocation concealment (15 trials), high or unclear numbers of patients excluded from the analysis (13 trials), unblinded patients (10 trials), and unblinded caregivers or outcome assessors (10 trials). Of the 6 trials rated to be at low-risk of bias, 4 were conducted in individuals with fresh fracture, 3 of which were operatively managed tibial fractures.[11,12,]

Schandelmaier et al (2017) acknowledged that their findings could be less applicable to underrepresented clinical subgroups.[4,] However, they noted that in subgroup analyses, the effect of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound on days to radiographic healing did not differ significantly across clinical subgroups (interaction p=.13) or between high and moderate compliance with treatment (interaction p=.99). They also noted that qualitative subgroup effects (such as no benefit in 1 subgroup and important benefit in another) are unusual.

Table 2. Studies Included in Systematic Reviews

			Systematic Reviews by Fracture Type[a]					
Studies	**N**	**Study Design**	**Searle et al (2023),[9,]Multiple**	**Schandelmaier et al (2017),[4,]Multiple**	**Seger et al (2017),[5,]Nonunion**	**Lou et al (2017),[6,]Fresh**	**Leighton et al (2017),[7,]Nonunion**	**Busse et al (2009),[10,]Multiple**
Busse et al (2016)	501	RCT						

	Systematic Reviews by Fracture Type[a]	
Hemery et al (2010)	14	CS

		Systematic Reviews by Fracture Type[a]	
Watanabe et al (2013)	151	Cohort	

Fresh Fractures

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound in individuals who have fresh fractures (either surgically managed or non-surgically managed) is to provide an adjunctive treatment option to standard of care.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations

The relevant population of interest is patients with fresh fractures (either surgically or non-surgically managed). A fracture is most commonly defined as fresh for 7 days after the fracture occurs.

Interventions

The therapy being considered is low-intensity pulsed ultrasound. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound is believed to alter the molecular and cellular mechanisms involved in each stage of the healing process (inflammation, soft callus formation, hard callus formation, and bone remodeling). The mechanism of action at the cellular level is not precisely known, but it is theorized that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound may stimulate the production or the activities of the following compounds that contribute to the bone healing process: cyclooxygenase-2, collagenase, integrin proteins, calcium, chondroblasts, mesenchymal cells, fibroblasts, and osteoblasts. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound would be an adjunctive therapy following setting and immobilizing the bone. The patient takes the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound device home and self-administers the treatment. Recommended time of treatment administration is 20 minutes/day.

Comparators

The comparator is standard fresh fracture management without low-intensity pulsed ultrasound as an adjunctive therapy.

Outcomes

The general outcome of interest is time to healing, which may be measured radiologically and assessed by an orthopedic surgeon. Clinically meaningful measures for healing would involve functional outcomes such as assessment of pain, use of analgesics, the need for secondary procedures, and ability to return to activities of daily living.

Follow-up should extend for months, the duration of time required for fracture healing.

Study Selection Criteria

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies;
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

Review of Evidence

Systematic Reviews

Lou et al (2017) conducted a meta-analysis focusing on fresh fractures.[6,] The literature search, conducted through November 2016, included 12 studies, all of which were included in the Schandelmaier et al (2017) meta-analysis, except for a small study (n=20) by Strauss et al (1999), which only appeared in a conference abstract.[13,] Studies included patients that had been surgically and conservatively managed. Results from the Lou et al (2017) meta-analysis showed that time to fracture union was significantly lower in patients receiving low-intensity pulsed ultrasound than in

patients not receiving low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (standard mean difference, -0.65; 95% confidence interval [CI], -1.13 to -0.17). However, subgroup analysis showed that this significant reduction in healing time with low-intensity pulsed ultrasound was seen only among patients conservatively managed, while there was no difference in healing time among patients surgically managed. Reviewers concluded that patients with fresh fractures might benefit from the use of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound but warned that there were methodologic limitations in the trials. Separate analyses using only low-risk of bias trials were not conducted in the Lou et al (2017) meta-analyses.

Surgically Managed - Randomized Controlled Trials

Busse et al (2016) reported on results from a concealed, blinded, sham-controlled, randomized Trial to Re-evaluate Ultrasound in the Treatment of Tibial Fractures (TRUST) evaluating low-intensity pulsed ultrasound for the treatment of patients who underwent intramedullary nailing for fresh tibial fractures.[14,] This is the largest RCT to date, enrolling 501 patients; 250 received a low-intensity pulsed ultrasound device, and 251 received a sham device. Treatment was self-administered for 20 minutes a day until there was radiographic evidence of healing. Coprimary endpoints were radiographic healing and return to function (as measured by the 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey [SF-36] Physical Component Summary score). Both radiographic and functional assessments had to show a clinically important effect for the results to be considered positive. All patients, clinicians, investigators, data analysts, and the industry sponsor were blinded to allocation until data analysis was complete. Patient compliance was considered moderate, with 73% of patients administering over half of all recommended treatments. There was no difference in time to radiographic healing between the treatment groups (hazard ratio, 1.07; 95% CI, 0.86 to 1.34; p=.55). Additionally, there was no difference in the SF-36 Physical Component Summary scores (mean difference, 0.55; 95% CI, -0.75 to 1.84; p=.41). A previously conducted pilot, double-blind, RCT by Busse et al (2014), including 51 subjects not assessed in the 2016 study, also did not find any statistically significant differences in pain reduction, number of subsequent operations, or radiographic healing time.[14,]

Tarride et al (2017) provided additional analyses using data from the TRUST trial, comparing health care resource use among patients using low-intensity pulsed ultrasound with patients using the sham device.[15,] There were no significant differences between groups (11% in patients receiving low-intensity pulsed ultrasound vs. 10% in patients receiving sham) in need for secondary procedures (e.g., removal of lock screw, implant exchange or removal). There were also no statistically significant differences in use of physical therapy (44% vs. 46%), use of anticoagulants (42% vs. 36%), or use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (28% vs. 35%) among patients receiving low-intensity pulsed ultrasound compared with patients receiving sham, respectively.

Emami et al (1999) conducted a double-blind, sham-controlled trial that randomized 32 patients who had a fresh tibial fracture fixed with an intramedullary rod to additional treatment with an active (n=15) or inactive (n=17) low-intensity pulsed ultrasound device.[16,] Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound treatment began within 3 days of surgery (1 patient began treatment within 7 days of injury) and was self-administered for 20 minutes a day for 75 days. Radiographs were taken every third week until healing. Results showed that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound did not shorten healing time based on any of the following measures: time to first visible callus (mean, 40 days for low-intensity pulsed ultrasound vs. 37 days for sham; p=.44); time to radiographic healing assessed by radiologist (mean, 155 days [median, 113 days] for low-intensity pulsed ultrasound vs. mean, 125 days [median, 112 days] for sham; p=.76); and time to radiographic healing assessed by orthopedic surgeon (mean, 128 days, for low-intensity pulsed ultrasound vs. mean, 114 days for sham; p=.40).

Gopalan et al (2020) conducted a single-blind RCT of low intensity pulsed ultrasound plus open reduction and internal fixation compared to surgery alone in 40 patients with mandibular fracture at a single surgical center in India.[17,] Patients who were randomized to the intervention group received low intensity pulsed ultrasound therapy at 4, 8, 14, and 20 days postoperatively, for 20 minutes daily.

Postoperative examinations were performed at 5, 9, 15, and 21 days to assess wound healing, pain, and teeth mobility. Assessment of orthopantomograms and ultrasound scans were blinded. Patients were not blinded, and it is unclear whether pain assessments were conducted by blinded outcome assessors. Pain scores were significantly lower in the treatment group compared to the control group at all assessment time points. Ultrasound assessments of fracture healing were significantly better in the treatment group at weeks 4, 8, and 12, but radiographic assessments of fracture healing did not differ between groups at any time point. Wound healing was significantly greater in the intervention group on postoperative days 5 and 9, but the difference was not significant on day 21. This study was limited by its small sample size, single center design, and lack of blinding of patients.

Nonsurgically Managed - Randomized Controlled Trial

Lubbert et al (2008) performed a multicenter, double-blind RCT (N =101) of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound treatment of fresh (<5 days) clavicle shaft fractures.[18,] Patients used the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound devices for 20 minutes once daily for 28 days and recorded their subjective feeling as to whether the fracture healed (the primary outcome measure), pain on a visual analog scale (VAS), level of daily activities (hours of work, household work, sport), and analgesic use. Patient perception of the day the fracture healed was determined in 92 patients (47 active, 45 placebo); mean time to heal was 26.77 days in the active group and 27.09 days in the placebo group (p=.91). Between-group differences regarding analgesic use and mean VAS scores for pain also did not differ significantly.

Section Summary: Fresh Fractures

Evidence for the use of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound following fresh fracture includes 4 RCTs that evaluated patients that were surgically managed and 1 RCT that evaluated patients that were nonsurgically managed. One RCT of 40 patients with mandibular fractures reported better wound healing and pain scores in patients who received low intensity pulsed ultrasound following surgical fixation compared to those who received surgery alone. This study was limited by a lack of blinding of patients and its small sample size. The other RCTs reported no statistically significant differences in radiographic healing, physical component score of the SF-36, use of physical therapy, need for secondary procedures, use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, and time to first visible callus.

Fracture Nonunion or Delayed Union Fracture

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound in individuals who have fracture nonunion or delayed union fracture is to provide an adjunctive treatment option to standard of care.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations

The relevant population of interest is patients with fracture nonunion or delayed union fracture. There is not a consensus definition of nonunion or delayed union. In general, these conditions are considered if serial radiographs either do not show progressive healing or show a decelerating healing process after 3 months since the fracture occurrence.

Interventions

The therapy being considered is low-intensity pulsed ultrasound. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound is believed to alter the molecular and cellular mechanisms involved in each stage of the healing process (inflammation, soft callus formation, hard callus formation, and bone remodeling). The mechanism of action at the cellular level is not precisely known, but it is theorized that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound may stimulate the production or the activities of the following compounds that contribute to the bone healing process: cyclooxygenase-2, collagenase, integrin proteins, calcium, chondroblasts, mesenchymal cells, fibroblasts, and osteoblasts. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound would be an adjunctive therapy following setting and immobilizing the bone. The patient takes the

low-intensity pulsed ultrasound device home and self-administers the treatment. Recommended time of treatment administration is 20 minutes/day.

Comparators
The comparator is standard nonunion or delayed union fracture management without low-intensity pulsed ultrasound as an adjunctive therapy.

Outcomes
The general outcome of interest is time to healing, which may be measured radiologically and assessed by an orthopedic surgeon. Clinically meaningful measures for healing would involve functional outcomes such as assessment of pain, use of analgesics, the need for secondary procedures, and ability to return to activities of daily living.

Follow-up should extend for months, the duration of time required for fracture healing.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies;
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

Review of Evidence
Systematic Reviews
The meta-analysis by Seger et al (2017) included 5 studies focused on scaphoid nonunions and analyzed healing index and average time to union following low-intensity pulsed ultrasound.[5,] Among 166 cases in the analysis, 78.6% (range, 33% to 100%) were reported to show healing following low-intensity pulsed ultrasound, with an average time to union of 4.2 months (range, 2.3 to 5.6 months). Comparative results were not conducted.

The meta-analysis by Leighton et al (2017) included 13 studies, one of which was an RCT.[7,] The date of the literature search was not provided. Quality of the studies was assessed using the Methodological Index for Non-Randomized Studies. Quality scores ranged from 5 to 12 (an "ideal" is 16 for nonrandomized trials). While the pooled estimate of effect size for the healing rate was 82% (95% CI, 77% to 87%), significant heterogeneity was detected (I^2=62). A separate analysis, excluding studies with quality scores of 6 or lower, resulted in a comparable heal rate of 80% (95% CI, 74% to 85%).

The systematic review by Schandelmaier et al (2017) included 3 RCTs of nonunion fractures operatively managed. Because all the RCTs were rated at high-risk of bias, the authors could not adequately assess the efficacy of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound for nonunion fractures.[4,] Two of the RCTs are discussed below; one is not discussed below because it was published only as a thesis.

Leighton et al (2021) included patients with instrumented, infected, or fragility-related non-union in a systematic review of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound.[8,] The study found non-union healing rates of 82% in patients with instrumentation or infection and 91% in patients with fragility fractures. Although the authors concluded the healing rates were comparable to a standard population of patients with non-union, the analysis consisted primarily of small case series limiting its role in the overall body of evidence.

Randomized Controlled Trials
Schofer et al (2010), reported on a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled trial of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound in 101 patients with delayed union of the tibia (Table 5).[19,] Delayed union was defined as a lack of clinical and radiologic evidence of union, bony continuity, or bone

reaction at the fracture site for no less than 16 weeks from the index injury or the most recent intervention. Roughly one-third of patients had an open fracture. Patients were randomized to low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (n=51) or to an inactive sham device (n=50), to be administered 20 minutes a day for 16 weeks. The primary outcome was change in bone mineral density assessed by computed tomography attenuation coefficients. Gap area was a secondary outcome. Intention-to-treat analysis showed that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound improved mean bone mineral density by 34% (90% CI, 14% to 57%) compared with sham treatment. The mean reduction in bone gap area was -0.13 mm^2 in the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound group and -0.10 mm^2 in the sham group (effect size, -0.47; 95% CI, -0.91 to -0.03 mm^2). At the end of 16 weeks, physicians judged that 65% of patients in the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound group were healed and 46% of the patients in the sham group were healed (p=.07) (Table 6). This trial did not report functional outcomes or pain assessment, limiting the utility of results.

Ricardo (2006) published a blinded RCT evaluating 21 subjects with scaphoid nonunion who were treated with low-intensity pulsed ultrasound or a sham device following a pedicled vascularized bone graft (Table 5).[20,] Time to healing was defined as the number of days from the operation to healing both clinically (solid and not causing tenderness or pain) and radiographically (bridging cortices). Additional outcomes included pain, wrist range of motion, radiographic evidence of union, carpal height index, and scapholunate-capitolunate angles; however, the authors did not report these outcomes by treatment arm. The authors reported a statistically significant reduction in time to radiographic healing (-40.4%; 95% CI, -48.7% to -30.8%) with low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (Table 6).

Table 5. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics

Study	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	*Comparator*
Schofer et al (2010)[19,]	Germany	6	2002 to 2005	Patients with tibial delayed unions	Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (n=51)	Sham device (n=50)
Ricardo (2006)[20,]	Cuba	1	1999 to 2004	Patients with scaphoid nonunion fractures treated with pedicled vascularized bone grafts from the distal radius	Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (n=10)	Sham device (n=11)

RCT: randomized controlled trial.

Table 6. Summary of Key RCT Results

Study	Healing		p-value
	Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound	*Sham device*	
Schofer et al (2010)[19,]	physician assessed 65% healed	physician assessed 46% healed	.07
Ricardo (2006)[20,]	56 + 3 days	94 + 5 days	<.0001

RCT: randomized controlled trial.

The purpose of the limitations tables (Tables 7 and 8) is to display notable limitations identified in each study. This information is synthesized as a summary of the body of evidence following each table and provides the conclusions on the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the position statement.

Table 7. Study Relevance Limitations

Study	Population[a]	Intervention[b]	Comparator[c]	Outcomes[d]	Follow-Up[e]
Schofer et al (2010)[19,]				2. Primary outcome was bone mineral density and	

Study	Population[a]	Intervention[b]	Comparator[c]	Outcomes[d]	Follow-Up[e]
				secondary outcome was gap area. Physicians judged patients as healed/not healed, but no description of criteria used by physician	
Ricardo (2006)[20],					

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
[a] Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Study population is unclear; 3. Study population not representative of intended use; 4, Enrolled populations do not reflect relevant diversity; 5. Other.
[b] Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest (e.g., proposed as an adjunct but not tested as such); 5: Other.
[c] Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively; 5. Other.
[d] Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. Incomplete reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinically significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinically significant difference not supported; 7. Other.
[e] Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms; 3. Other.

Table 8. Study Design and Conduct Limitations

Study	Allocation[a]	Blinding[b]	Selective Reporting[c]	Data Completeness[d]	Power[e]	Statistical[f]
Schofer et al (2010)[19],				1. Drop out rate for low-intensity pulsed ultrasound group was 10% and drop out rate for sham device was 24%		
Ricardo (2006)[20],	No description of randomization procedure				1. Power calculations not reported and sample size is small (N=21)	4. Only time to healing was compared statistically; additional outcomes (pain, return to activities) were not reported by treatment group

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
[a] Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias; 5. Other.
[b] Blinding key: 1. Participants or study staff not blinded; 2. Outcome assessors not blinded; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician; 4. Other.
[c] Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication; 4. Other.
[d] Data Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials); 7. Other.
[e] Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based

on clinically important difference; 4. Other.
[f] Statistical key: 1. Analysis is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Analysis is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated; 5. Other.

Observational Study

Nolte et al (2016) conducted a retrospective comparison of patients with metatarsal fractures treated by low-intensity pulsed ultrasound and by surgical techniques.[21,] For the comparative analysis, individuals from a U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-required low-intensity pulsed ultrasound registry (n=594) were propensity-matched 1:1 with patients treated surgically from a health claims database. The overall heal rates for all types of fractures combined were comparable for low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (97%) and surgery (95%) (p=.07). A subgroup analysis of patients with delayed or nonunion metatarsal fractures (n=226) also showed comparable rates of healing among the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound group (96%) and the surgery group (96%).

Section Summary: Fracture Nonunion or Delayed Union Fracture

The evidence for low-intensity pulsed ultrasound treatment of fracture nonunion consists only of lower quality and uncontrolled studies. There are 2 meta-analyses (2017) without controlled comparative results. A third meta-analysis, which included all types of fractures, identified 3 RCTs of patients with nonunion; however, all 3 trials were considered at high-risk of bias (one published as a thesis). One meta-analysis specific to individuals with instrumented, infection, or fragility-related non-union found few RCTs and results were largely based on case series. Of the 2 published RCTs, the larger one had primary and secondary outcomes that were physiological assessments, rather than functional measures. It is unclear how healing status was determined in this study, as the outcome was described as "physician-assessed." Limitations of the second published RCT include no description of the randomization process and small sample size.

Stress Fractures, Osteotomy Sites, or Distraction Osteogenesis

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound in individuals who have stress fractures, osteotomy sites or distraction osteogenesis, is to provide an adjunctive treatment option to standard of care.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations

The population of interest consists of patients with stress fractures, osteotomy sites, or distraction osteogenesis.

Interventions

The therapy being considered is low-intensity pulsed ultrasound. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound is believed to alter the molecular and cellular mechanisms involved in each stage of the healing process (inflammation, soft callus formation, hard callus formation, and bone remodeling). The mechanism of action at the cellular level is not precisely known, but it is theorized that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound may stimulate the production or the activities of the following compounds that contribute to the bone healing process: cyclooxygenase-2, collagenase, integrin proteins, calcium, chondroblasts, mesenchymal cells, fibroblasts, and osteoblasts. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound would be an adjunctive therapy following setting and immobilizing the bone. The patient takes the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound device home and self-administers the treatment. Recommended time of treatment administration is 20 minutes/day.

Comparators

The comparator is standard stress fracture, osteotomy sites, or distraction osteogenesis management without low-intensity pulsed ultrasound as an adjunctive therapy.

Outcomes
The general outcome of interest is time to healing, which may be measured radiologically and assessed by an orthopedic surgeon. Clinically meaningful measures for healing would involve functional outcomes such as assessment of pain, use of analgesics, the need for secondary procedures, and ability to return to activities of daily living.

Follow-up should extend for months, the duration of time required for fracture healing.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:
- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies;
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

Review of Evidence
Stress Fractures
Rue et al (2004) reported on a double-blind RCT that examined the effects of 20 minutes of daily low-intensity pulsed ultrasound on tibial stress fracture healing outcomes such as pain, function, and resumption of professional and personal activities in 26 military recruits.[22,] The delay from onset of symptoms to diagnosis was 32 days in the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound group and 28 days in the placebo group. This trial found no significant difference in healing times between low-intensity pulsed ultrasound treatment and sham, with a mean time of return to duty of 56 days for both groups. The trial was rated with a high-risk of bias in the Schandelmaier et al (2017) meta-analysis.[4,]

Osteotomy Sites
Urita et al (2013) published a small (n=27) quasi-randomized study (alternating assignment) of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound after ulnar-shortening osteotomy for ulnar impaction syndrome or radial-shortening osteotomy for Kienböck disease.[23,] Patients in the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound group received daily 20-minute treatment for at least 12 weeks postoperatively. Blinded evaluation of radiographic healing showed that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound reduced the mean time to the cortical union by 27% (57 days vs. 76 days) and endosteal union by 18% (121 days vs. 148 days) compared with sham treatment. At the time of endosteal healing, the osteotomy plus low-intensity pulsed ultrasound group and the osteotomy-only group had similar results, as measured using the Modified Mayo Wrist Score and no pain at the osteotomy site. The study was rated at high-risk of bias in the meta-analysis by Schandelmaier et al (2017).[4,]

In a retrospective study, Goshima et al (2022) compared 45 individuals treated with low-intensity pulsed ultrasound with 45 individuals who did not receive low-intensity pulsed ultrasound following open-wedge high tibial osteotomy.[24,] The study included patients treated between 2012 and 2017 at a hospital in Japan. Treatment was applied for 20 minutes daily and continued for 3 months postoperatively or as judged sufficient by the study investigator. The lateral hinge united at 6 weeks in 73.3% of knees in the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound group and 75.6% in the control group. The VAS pain scores were statistically significantly improved in the low-intensity pulsed ultrasound group compared with control at 6 weeks and 3 months, but the numerical differences were small (32.2 vs. 38.7 and 27.5 vs. 36.4 at 6 weeks and 3 months, respectively). Mean Japanese Orthopaedic Association scores were not significantly different between groups at any time point. The authors concluded that their study does not support the use of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound in patients after open-wedge high tibial osteotomy.

Distraction Osteogenesis
The Schandelmaier et al (2017) systematic review also included 6 trials of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound for distraction osteogenesis following surgery. Four of 6 studies were rated at high-risk of

bias.[4,] Four studies were in the tibia.[11,12,] No clinically meaningful results were reported for the mandible studies in the meta-analysis.[4,] The remaining studies in the tibia were all unblinded. No statistically significant difference was noted in subsequent operations (relative risk, 0.63; 95% CI, 0.13 to 2.99) in the meta-analysis.[4,] Four of the studies[25,26,27,28,] were included in the meta-analysis[4,] for time to radiographic healing with mixed results, 3 not reporting statistically significant results.

Lou et al (2018) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis on the use of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound for the treatment of patients with distraction osteogenesis.[29,] The literature search, conducted in May 2018, identified 7 RCTs (172 patients) for inclusion. The Cochrane risk of bias tool was used to assess trial quality. Three of the trials were considered low-risk of bias and 4 were considered to have high-risk of bias. Main limitations in the trials were related to the lack of treatment allocation details and outcome assessors' knowledge of treatment. Pooled results did not find statistically significant differences in treatment time, radiological gap fill area, histological gap fill length, or bone density.

Song et al (2019) reported on a retrospective observational study of 30 patients who underwent tibial lengthening procedures at a single institution between October 2009 and October 2015.[30,] Fifteen patients who received low intensity pulsed ultrasound during distraction osteogenesis were compared to 15 patients who underwent the same procedure but did not receive low intensity pulsed ultrasound. During the distraction phase, calluses of the low intensity pulsed ultrasound group were more cylindrical, more homogeneous, and denser than those of the control group. At the time of external fixator removal; however, there were no significant differences between the groups in callus shape and type. There were no significant differences in external fixation index between the groups. There were 6 complications in the group who received low intensity pulsed ultrasound and 5 in the control group. No complications related to the low intensity pulsed ultrasound procedure were reported.

Section Summary: Stress Fractures, Osteotomy Sites, or Distraction Osteogenesis

The evidence for low-intensity pulsed ultrasound treatment of stress fractures, osteotomy sites, or distraction osteogenesis consists only of lower quality RCTs and a retrospective comparative observational study with a high risk of bias. Results do not generally include functional outcomes and results across various outcomes, primarily including time to radiographic healing, are inconsistent. A meta-analysis of 3 trials on the use of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound for patients with distraction osteogenesis reported no statistically significant differences in treatment time, gap fill, or bone density.

Supplemental Information

The purpose of the following information is to provide reference material. Inclusion does not imply endorsement or alignment with the evidence review conclusions.

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.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

In 2013, NICE published guidance on Exogen for the treatment of long-bone fractures with nonunion and delayed fracture healing.[31,] The NICE concluded that use of the Exogen bone healing system to treat long-bone fractures with nonunion is supported by "clinical evidence" and "cost savings … through avoiding surgery." For long-bone fractures with delayed healing, defined as no radiologic evidence of healing after 3 months, there was "some radiologic evidence of improved healing." However, due to "substantial uncertainties about the rate at which bone healing progresses without

adjunctive treatment between 3 and 9 months after fracture" and need for surgery, "cost consequences" were uncertain. In 2019, the Exogen guidance was updated with a review of studies published after June 2012.[31,] The review decision stated, "Overall the additional clinical evidence identified since the guidance was published in 2013 supports the current recommendations." The reviewers did not consider the Schandelmaier et al (2017) systematic review because it pooled fresh fractures and distraction osteogenesis alongside non-unions.

In 2018, NICE published guidance on the use of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound in 3 clinical circumstances, The guidance made the following conclusions:

- To promote healing of fresh fractures at low-risk of non-healing: "Current evidence does not show efficacy. Therefore, this procedure should not be used for this indication."[32,]
- To promote healing of fresh fractures at high-risk of non-healing: "Current evidence on efficacy is very limited in quantity and quality. Therefore, this procedure should only be used in the context of research."[33,]
- To promote healing of delayed and nonunion fractures: "Current evidence on efficacy is inadequate in quality. Therefore, this procedure should only be used with special arrangements for clinical governances, consent and audit or research."[34,]

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

In 2020, the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) published updated guidelines on the treatment of distal radius fractures.[35,] Although the Academy issued a limited recommendation for the use of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound for adjuvant treatment of distal radius fractures in its prior 2009 guidelines, low-intensity pulsed ultrasound was not mentioned in the updated guidelines.

Similarly, a 2021 AAOS guideline on management of hip fracture in older adults does not mention low-intensity pulsed ultrasound.[36,]

In 2022, the AAOS published a guideline on the treatment of clavicle fractures.[36,] The guideline includes a moderately strong recommendation that low-intensity pulsed ultrasound should not be used for acute mid-shaft clavicle fracture, based on a lack of data supporting its efficacy for accelerated healing or improved non-union rates. The only randomized trial that was available at the time of guideline development showed no difference in these outcomes compared to placebo.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage

Effective 2001, ultrasonic osteogenic stimulators were covered as medically reasonable and necessary for the treatment of nonunion fractures.[37,] Nonunion fractures of the skull, vertebrae, and those that are tumor-related are excluded from coverage. Ultrasonic osteogenic stimulators may not be used concurrently with other noninvasive osteogenic devices. Ultrasonic osteogenic stimulators for fresh fractures and delayed unions are not covered.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

Some currently ongoing and unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 9.

Table 9. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
NCT02383160[a]	A Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Low-Intensity, Pulsed Ultrasound to Placebo in the Treatment of Operatively Managed Scaphoid Non-unions	154	Dec 2023
Unpublished			

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
NCT03382483[a]	A Prospective, Patient-centric, Observational, Consecutive Enrollment, Non-interventional Study of Patients At Risk for Fracture Non-union Treated with EXOGEN Compared to a National Healthcare Claims Database Control	12,387	May 2022 (unknown status)

NCT: national clinical trial.
[a] Denotes an industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

Appendix 1

Medical Advisory Panel Review

This Evidence Opinion was reviewed by the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Medical Advisory Panel on June 7, 2017.

References

1. Wu AM, Bisignano C, James SL, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of bone fractures in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet Healthy Longev. Sep 2021; 2(9): e580-e592. PMID 34723233
2. Buza JA, Einhorn T. Bone healing in 2016. Clin Cases Miner Bone Metab. 2016; 13(2): 101-105. PMID 27920804
3. Bhandari M, Fong K, Sprague S, et al. Variability in the definition and perceived causes of delayed unions and nonunions: a cross-sectional, multinational survey of orthopaedic surgeons. J Bone Joint Surg Am. Aug 01 2012; 94(15): e1091-6. PMID 22854998
4. Schandelmaier S, Kaushal A, Lytvyn L, et al. Low intensity pulsed ultrasound for bone healing: systematic review of randomized controlled trials. BMJ. Feb 22 2017; 356: j656. PMID 28348110
5. Seger EW, Jauregui JJ, Horton SA, et al. Low-Intensity Pulsed Ultrasound for Nonoperative Treatment of Scaphoid Nonunions: A Meta-Analysis. Hand (N Y). May 2018; 13(3): 275-280. PMID 28391752
6. Lou S, Lv H, Li Z, et al. The effects of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound on fresh fracture: A meta-analysis. Medicine (Baltimore). Sep 2017; 96(39): e8181. PMID 28953676
7. Leighton R, Watson JT, Giannoudis P, et al. Healing of fracture nonunions treated with low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (LIPUS): A systematic review and meta-analysis. Injury. Jul 2017; 48(7): 1339-1347. PMID 28532896
8. Leighton R, Phillips M, Bhandari M, et al. Low intensity pulsed ultrasound (LIPUS) use for the management of instrumented, infected, and fragility non-unions: a systematic review and meta-analysis of healing proportions. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. Jun 11 2021; 22(1): 532. PMID 34116673
9. Searle HK, Lewis SR, Coyle C, et al. Ultrasound and shockwave therapy for acute fractures in adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Mar 03 2023; 3(3): CD008579. PMID 36866917
10. Busse JW, Kaur J, Mollon B, et al. Low intensity pulsed ultrasonography for fractures: systematic review of randomised controlled trials. BMJ. Feb 27 2009; 338: b351. PMID 19251751
11. Schortinghuis J, Bronckers AL, Stegenga B, et al. Ultrasound to stimulate early bone formation in a distraction gap: a double blind randomised clinical pilot trial in the edentulous mandible. Arch Oral Biol. Apr 2005; 50(4): 411-20. PMID 15748694
12. Schortinghuis J, Bronckers AL, Gravendeel J, et al. The effect of ultrasound on osteogenesis in the vertically distracted edentulous mandible: a double-blind trial. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. Nov 2008; 37(11): 1014-21. PMID 18757179
13. Strauss E, Ryaby JP, McCabe J. Treatment of Jones' fractures of the foot with adjunctive use of low-pulsed ultrasound stimulation. J Orthop Trauma. 1999;13(4):310. https://journals.lww.com/jorthotrauma/Citation/1999/05000/Treatment_of_Jones__fractures_of_the_foot_with.76.aspx. Accessed January 23, 2024.

14. Busse JW, Bhandari M, Einhorn TA, et al. Re-evaluation of low intensity pulsed ultrasound in treatment of tibial fractures (TRUST): randomized clinical trial. BMJ. Oct 25 2016; 355: i5351. PMID 27797787
15. Tarride JE, Hopkins RB, Blackhouse G, et al. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound for treatment of tibial fractures: an economic evaluation of the TRUST study. Bone Joint J. Nov 2017; 99-B(11): 1526-1532. PMID 29092994
16. Emami A, Petrén-Mallmin M, Larsson S. No effect of low-intensity ultrasound on healing time of intramedullary fixed tibial fractures. J Orthop Trauma. May 1999; 13(4): 252-7. PMID 10342350
17. Gopalan A, Panneerselvam E, Doss GT, et al. Evaluation of Efficacy of Low Intensity Pulsed Ultrasound in Facilitating Mandibular Fracture Healing-A Blinded Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. Jun 2020; 78(6): 997.e1-997.e7. PMID 32145206
18. Lubbert PH, van der Rijt RH, Hoorntje LE, et al. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (LIPUS) in fresh clavicle fractures: a multi-centre double blind randomised controlled trial. Injury. Dec 2008; 39(12): 1444-52. PMID 18656872
19. Schofer MD, Block JE, Aigner J, et al. Improved healing response in delayed unions of the tibia with low-intensity pulsed ultrasound: results of a randomized sham-controlled trial. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. Oct 08 2010; 11: 229. PMID 20932272
20. Ricardo M. The effect of ultrasound on the healing of muscle-pediculated bone graft in scaphoid non-union. Int Orthop. Apr 2006; 30(2): 123-7. PMID 16474939
21. Nolte P, Anderson R, Strauss E, et al. Heal rate of metatarsal fractures: A propensity-matching study of patients treated with low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (LIPUS) vs. surgical and other treatments. Injury. Nov 2016; 47(11): 2584-2590. PMID 27641221
22. Rue JP, Armstrong DW, Frassica FJ, et al. The effect of pulsed ultrasound in the treatment of tibial stress fractures. Orthopedics. Nov 2004; 27(11): 1192-5. PMID 15566133
23. Urita A, Iwasaki N, Kondo M, et al. Effect of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound on bone healing at osteotomy sites after forearm bone shortening. J Hand Surg Am. Mar 2013; 38(3): 498-503. PMID 23375786
24. Goshima K, Sawaguchi T, Horii T, et al. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound does not promote bone healing and functional recovery after open wedge high tibial osteotomy. Bone Jt Open. Nov 2022; 3(11): 885-893. PMID 36373863
25. Dudda M, Hauser J, Muhr G, et al. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound as a useful adjuvant during distraction osteogenesis: a prospective, randomized controlled trial. J Trauma. Nov 2011; 71(5): 1376-80. PMID 22071933
26. Salem KH, Schmelz A. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound shortens the treatment time in tibial distraction osteogenesis. Int Orthop. Jul 2014; 38(7): 1477-82. PMID 24390009
27. El-Mowafi H, Mohsen M. The effect of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound on callus maturation in tibial distraction osteogenesis. Int Orthop. Apr 2005; 29(2): 121-4. PMID 15685456
28. Tsumaki N, Kakiuchi M, Sasaki J, et al. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound accelerates maturation of callus in patients treated with opening-wedge high tibial osteotomy by hemicallotasis. J Bone Joint Surg Am. Nov 2004; 86(11): 2399-405. PMID 15523009
29. Lou S, Lv H, Li Z, et al. Effect of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound on distraction osteogenesis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. J Orthop Surg Res. Aug 17 2018; 13(1): 205. PMID 30119631
30. Song MH, Kim TJ, Kang SH, et al. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound enhances callus consolidation in distraction osteogenesis of the tibia by the technique of lengthening over the nail procedure. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. Mar 14 2019; 20(1): 108. PMID 30871538
31. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). EXOGEN ultrasound bone healing system for long bone fractures with non-union or delayed healing [MTG12]. 2013 (Updated 2019); https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/mtg12. Accessed January 20, 2024.
32. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound to promote healing of fresh fractures at low risk of non-healing [IPG621]. 2018; https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg621. Accessed January 23, 2024.

33. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound to promote healing of fresh fractures at high risk of non-healing [IPG622]. 2018; https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg622. Accessed January 22, 2024.
34. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound to promote healing of delayed-union and non-union fractures [IPG623]. 2018; https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg623. Accessed January 21, 2024.
35. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. Management of distal radius fractures. 2021; https://www.aaos.org/quality/quality-programs/upper-extremity-programs/distal-radius-fractures/. Accessed January 23, 2024.
36. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. Management of hip fractures in older adults. 2021; https://www.aaos.org/quality/quality-programs/lower-extremity-programs/hip-fractures-in-the-elderly/. Accessed January 22, 2024.
37. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. National Coverage Decision for Osteogenic Stimulators (150.2). 2005; https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=65&ncdver=2&DocID=150.2&bc=gAAAABAAAAAA&. Accessed January 23, 2024.

Documentation for Clinical Review

- No records required

Coding

This Policy relates only to the services or supplies described herein. Benefits may vary according to product design; therefore, contract language should be reviewed before applying the terms of the Policy.

The following codes are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Policy Statements are intended to provide member coverage information and may include the use of some codes for clarity. The Policy Guidelines section may also provide additional information for how to interpret the Policy Statements and to provide coding guidance in some cases.

Type	Code	Description
CPT®	20979	Low intensity ultrasound stimulation to aid bone healing, noninvasive (nonoperative)
HCPCS	E0760	Osteogenesis stimulator, low intensity ultrasound, noninvasive

Policy History

This section provides a chronological history of the activities, updates and changes that have occurred with this Medical Policy.

Effective Date	Action
06/05/1996	New Policy Adoption
02/23/2000	Policy Revision
11/15/2001	Policy Revision Modification based on external reviews
12/07/2006	Policy Revision - BCBSA MPP
01/11/2008	Policy Revision Defined criteria for medical necessity treatment of fresh, closed fractures, fusions, delayed unions, and nonunions of the appendicular skeleton based on peer reviewed literature research

Effective Date	Action
03/17/2008	Policy Revision Added the following: nonunions to the policy statement (as intended to be included), axial to skeleton regarding not medically necessary, axial to skeleton for investigational section, definition of axial skeleton to the definitions section, nonunions to the Policy history statement of revision
04/01/2011	Policy title change from Ultrasound Accelerated Fracture Healing Device and alignment with BCBSA policy
01/11/2013	Policy revision with position change
07/31/2015	Policy title change from Ultrasound Bone Growth Stimulation Policy revision without position change
11/01/2016	Policy revision without position change
11/01/2017	Policy revision with position change
05/01/2018	Policy revision without position change
05/01/2019	Policy revision without position change
03/01/2022	Policy reactivated. Previously archived from 05/01/2020 to 02/28/2022. Annual review. No change to policy statement. Policy guidelines and literature updated. Policy title changed from Ultrasound Accelerated Fracture Healing Device to current one.
05/01/2022	Annual review. Policy statement, guidelines and literature updated.
05/01/2023	Annual review. No change to policy statement. Policy guidelines and literature review updated.
05/01/2024	Annual review. No change to policy statement. Policy guidelines and literature review updated.

Definitions of Decision Determinations

Medically Necessary: Services that are Medically Necessary include only those which have been established as safe and effective, are furnished under generally accepted professional standards to treat illness, injury or medical condition, and which, as determined by Blue Shield, are: (a) consistent with Blue Shield medical policy; (b) consistent with the symptoms or diagnosis; (c) not furnished primarily for the convenience of the patient, the attending Physician or other provider; (d) furnished at the most appropriate level which can be provided safely and effectively to the patient; and (e) not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of the Member's illness, injury, or disease.

Investigational/Experimental: A treatment, procedure, or drug is investigational when it has not been recognized as safe and effective for use in treating the particular condition in accordance with generally accepted professional medical standards. This includes services where approval by the federal or state governmental is required prior to use, but has not yet been granted.

Split Evaluation: Blue Shield of California/Blue Shield of California Life & Health Insurance Company (Blue Shield) policy review can result in a split evaluation, where a treatment, procedure, or drug will be considered to be investigational for certain indications or conditions, but will be deemed safe and effective for other indications or conditions, and therefore potentially medically necessary in those instances.

Prior Authorization Requirements and Feedback (as applicable to your plan)

Within five days before the actual date of service, the provider must confirm with Blue Shield that the member's health plan coverage is still in effect. Blue Shield reserves the right to revoke an

authorization prior to services being rendered based on cancellation of the member's eligibility. Final determination of benefits will be made after review of the claim for limitations or exclusions.

Questions regarding the applicability of this policy should be directed to the Prior Authorization Department at (800) 541-6652, or the Transplant Case Management Department at (800) 637-2066 ext. 3507708 or visit the provider portal at www.blueshieldca.com/provider.

We are interested in receiving feedback relative to developing, adopting, and reviewing criteria for medical policy. Any licensed practitioner who is contracted with Blue Shield of California or Blue Shield of California Promise Health Plan is welcome to provide comments, suggestions, or concerns. Our internal policy committees will receive and take your comments into consideration.

For utilization and medical policy feedback, please send comments to: MedPolicy@blueshieldca.com

Disclaimer: This medical policy is a guide in evaluating the medical necessity of a particular service or treatment. Blue Shield of California may consider published peer-reviewed scientific literature, national guidelines, and local standards of practice in developing its medical policy. Federal and state law, as well as contract language, including definitions and specific contract provisions/exclusions, take precedence over medical policy and must be considered first in determining covered services. Member contracts may differ in their benefits. Blue Shield reserves the right to review and update policies as appropriate.

Appendix A

POLICY STATEMENT (No changes)	
BEFORE	**AFTER**
Low Intensity Pulsed Ultrasound Fracture Healing Device 1.01.05 **Policy Statement:** I. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound is considered **investigational** as a treatment for **any** of the following: A. Fresh fractures (surgically managed or nonsurgically managed) B. Fracture nonunion and delayed union fractures C. Stress fractures, osteotomy, and distraction osteogenesis	**Low Intensity Pulsed Ultrasound Fracture Healing Device 1.01.05** **Policy Statement:** I. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound is considered **investigational** as a treatment for **any** of the following: A. Fresh fractures (surgically managed or nonsurgically managed) B. Fracture nonunion and delayed union fractures C. Stress fractures, osteotomy, and distraction osteogenesis