



**Kaiser Foundation Health Plan
of Washington**

**Clinical Review Criteria
Wound Care Treatments**

- Electrical Stimulation and Electromagnetic Therapy
- Low Frequency, Noncontact, Nonthermal Ultrasound Wound Therapy
- Maggot Debridement Therapy (MDT)
- Noncontact Normothermic Wound Therapy
- OASIS Wound Dressing
- Tissue Engineered Skin Substitutes

A Separate Criteria Document Exists for the Following:

- [Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Pumps \(NPWT\)](#)**
- [Platelet Rich Plasma](#)**

NOTICE: Kaiser Foundation Health Plan of Washington and Kaiser Foundation Health Plan of Washington Options, Inc. (Kaiser Permanente) provide these Clinical Review Criteria for internal use by their members and health care providers. The Clinical Review Criteria only apply to Kaiser Foundation Health Plan of Washington and Kaiser Foundation Health Plan of Washington Options, Inc. Use of the Clinical Review Criteria or any Kaiser Permanente entity name, logo, trade name, trademark, or service mark for marketing or publicity purposes, including on any website, or in any press release or promotional material, is strictly prohibited.

Kaiser Permanente Clinical Review Criteria are developed to assist in administering plan benefits. These criteria neither offer medical advice nor guarantee coverage. Kaiser Permanente reserves the exclusive right to modify, revoke, suspend or change any or all of these Clinical Review Criteria, at Kaiser Permanente's sole discretion, at any time, with or without notice. **Member contracts differ in health plan benefits. Always consult the patient's Evidence of Coverage or call Kaiser Permanente Member Services at 1-888-901-4636 (TTY 711), Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. to determine coverage for a specific medical service.**

Criteria

For Medicare Members

Source	Policy
CMS Coverage Manuals	Medicare Manual, Chapter 1, Part 4, Section 270
National Coverage Determinations (NCD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical Stimulation (ES) and Electromagnetic Therapy for the Treatment of Wounds (270.1) • Non-Contact Normothermic Wound Therapy (NNWT) (270.2)* <i>*This service is not covered per Medicare criteria</i> • Treatment of Decubitus Ulcers (270.4) • Porcine Skin and Gradient Pressure Dressings (270.5) • Infrared Therapy Devices (270.6)* <i>*This service is not covered per Medicare criteria</i>
Local Coverage Determinations (LCD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wound and Ulcer Care (L38904) • Surgical Dressings (L33831)
Local Coverage Article	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Billing and Coding: Wound and Ulcer Care (A58567) • Surgical Dressings – (A54563) • Billing and Coding: Wound Care and Debridement - Provided by a Therapist, Physician, NPP, or as Incident-to Services (A53046) • Use of Amniotic Membrane Derived Skin Substitutes (A56156) <p>RETIRED</p>
Kaiser Permanente Medical Policy – Skin Substitutes	Due to the absence of an NCD or LCD, Kaiser Permanente has chosen to use their own Clinical Review Criteria for Skin Substitutes for medical necessity determinations when these products are used in the outpatient hospital or office setting. Refer to the Non-Medicare Skin Substitutes criteria below.

MLN Matters Article	<p align="center">January 2020 Update of the Ambulatory Surgical Center (ASC) Payment System</p> <p>Section 4: Skin Substitutes (pp. 5-8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the Ambulatory Surgery Care Setting - Medicare considers skin substitutes for wound care to be dressings applied in the Ambulatory Surgery Center (ASC). These are not separately billable and do not need to go for Medical Review. ▪ In the outpatient hospital or clinic setting - Medicare considers skin substitutes billable. Refer to the Non-Medicare Skin Substitutes criteria below for medical necessity determinations.
---------------------	--

For Non-Medicare Members

Treatment	Criteria Used
Noncontact Normothermic Wound Therapy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warm-Up Wound Therapy 	MCG* A-0351 This service is not medically necessary per MCG* For access to the MCG Clinical Guidelines criteria, please see the MCG Guideline Index through the provider portal under Quick Access. If requesting this service, please send the following documentation to support medical necessity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last 6 months of clinical notes from requesting provider &/or specialist
Electrical Stimulation and Electromagnetic Therapy	MCG* A-0242 This service is not medically necessary per MCG* For access to the MCG Clinical Guidelines criteria, please see the MCG Guideline Index through the provider portal under Quick Access. If requesting this service, please send the following documentation to support medical necessity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last 6 months of clinical notes from requesting provider &/or specialist
Low Frequency, Noncontact, Non-Thermal Ultrasound Wound Therapy	There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to show that this service/therapy is as safe as standard services/therapies and/or provides better long-term outcomes than current standard services/therapies.
Maggot Debridement Therapy (MDT)	No medical necessity review required for this service.

Skin Substitutes

<p>Tissue-engineered skin substitute may be indicated for ONE or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diabetic foot ulcers, as indicated by ALL of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Treated foot has adequate blood supply as evidenced by either the presence of a palpable pedal pulse or an ankle-brachial index (ABI) of ≥ 0.70) ▪ Receiving conventional wound care and optimal glycemic management to continue during treatment ▪ Diabetes mellitus (type 1 or type 2) ▪ Other causes of neuropathy may be approved on a case by case bases by a medical director ▪ Full-thickness foot ulcer with location on plantar, medial, or lateral area, and no exposure of tendon, muscle, capsule, or bone (Full thickness ulcer extends thru dermis and epidermal layers. Subcutaneous fat may be visible, but bone, tendon or muscle are not exposed.) ▪ No allergy to bovine products ▪ No response to four weeks of consistent conventional therapy, including ALL of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No weight-bearing (off loading, so there is no pressure on the wound) ○ Optimal glycemic management ○ Dressing that promote moist wound healing
--

Skin Substitutes

- Serial debridement as clinically indicated
- No wound infection defined as less than or equal to 3+ growth on semi-quantitative wound culture
- No slough or eschar in the wound bed

Only the following products are approved for treatment of diabetic ulcers

Biological skin substitutes: Use Integra/Musculoskeletal Transplant Foundation (MTF)

Synthetic skin substitutes: Use Integra/Smith & Nephew

Integra Biological products: AmnioExcell amniotic allograft, AmnioMatrix amniotic allograft, AmnioExcell plus placental allograft

MTF Biological products: AlloPatch Pliable Allograft Dermal Matrix, AmnioBand Membrane Allograft Placental Matrix, AmnioBand Particulate Allograft Placental Matrix, AmnioBand Viable Allograft Placental Matrix

Smith and Nephew Synthetic products: Oasis Ultra tri-layer Matrix, Oasis Wound Matrix Fenestrated

Integra Synthetic products: Integra Wound Matrix, PriMatrix, PriMatrix Fenestrated, PriMatrix Meshed, PriMatrix Ag, Integra Meshed Dermal Regeneration, Integra Meshed Bilayer Wound Matrix

2. Venous insufficiency ulcers, as indicated by **ALL of the following**:
 - Treated foot has adequate blood supply as evidenced by either the presence of a palpable pedal pulse or an ankle-brachial index (ABI) of ≥ 0.70
 - Receiving concurrent conventional wound care for a minimum of four weeks, to include compression of extremity (e.g. compression stocking, ace bandage, lymphedema pump – if meets criteria) Receiving concurrent optimal glycemic management, if patient is also diabetic
 - Full-thickness ulcer due to venous insufficiency
 - No allergy to bovine products, porcine and/or ovine products
 - No response to conventional therapy, including ALL of the following:
 - Dressing that promote moist wound healing
 - Serial debridement as clinically indicated
 - No wound infection defined as less than or equal to 3+ growth on semi-quantitative wound culture
 - Compression
 - No slough or eschar in the wound bed

Only the following products are approved for treatment of venous insufficiency ulcers

Biological skin substitutes: Use Integra/Musculoskeletal Transplant Foundation (MTF)

Synthetic skin substitutes: Use Integra/Smith & Nephew

Integra Biological products: AmnioExcell amniotic allograft, AmnioMatrix amniotic allograft, AmnioExcell plus placental allograft

MTF Biological products: AlloPatch Pliable Allograft Dermal Matrix, AmnioBand Membrane Allograft Placental Matrix, AmnioBand Particulate Allograft Placental Matrix, AmnioBand Viable Allograft Placental Matrix

Smith and Nephew Synthetic products: Oasis Ultra tri-layer Matrix, Oasis Wound Matrix Fenestrated

Integra Synthetic products: Integra Wound Matrix, PriMatrix, PriMatrix Fenestrated, PriMatrix Meshed, PriMatrix Ag, Integra Meshed Dermal Regeneration, Integra Meshed Bilayer Wound Matrix

***MCG Manuals are proprietary and cannot be published and/or distributed.** However, on an individual member basis, Kaiser Permanente can share a copy of the specific criteria document used to make a utilization management decision. If one of your patients is being reviewed using these criteria, you may request a copy of the criteria by calling the Kaiser Permanente Clinical Review staff at 1-800-289-1363.

The following information was used in the development of this document and is provided as background only. It is provided for historical purposes and does not necessarily reflect the most current published literature. When significant new articles are published that impact treatment option, Kaiser Permanente will review as needed. This information is not to be used as coverage criteria. Please only refer to the criteria listed above for coverage determinations.

Background

Chronic wounds, wounds with long healing time, and wounds with frequent recurrence are a major health problem. They are a problem for the patient who suffers from them, the clinician who treats them, and the health care system that is overburdened by their cost. It is estimated that chronic wounds affect approximately 2% of the American

population at an estimated cost of US \$20 billion per year. Many factors can impede wound healing, including chronic disease, venous insufficiency, arterial insufficiency, neuropathy, nutritional deficiencies and local features such as pressure, edema, and infection (Fonder, 2008, Rizzi 2010).

No single regimen is universally accepted as the best modality for treating chronic wounds. They are managed through conventional wound care procedures performed by primary care providers, community nurses, pharmacists, and others. In the early 2000s, the concept of wound bed preparation has been proposed as a means of providing a structured and systemic approach to the management of chronic wounds. It is believed to accelerate endogenous healing and/or facilitate the effectiveness of other therapeutic measures. Wound bed preparation involves ongoing wound debridement, management of exudates, and resolution of bacterial imbalance (Schulz 2003, Ramundo 2008).

Wound debridement is defined as the removal of devitalized or contaminated tissue as well as foreign material from the wound bed until healthy tissue is exposed. Efficient debridement reduces the necrotic burden, achieves healthy granulation tissue, and reduces wound contamination and tissue destruction. This can be performed by different enzymatic, autolytic, sharp/surgical, biological, and mechanical techniques. Each has its own advantages and limitations, and the methods that are most efficient at removal of debris, may at the same time be the most detrimental to fragile new growth (Schulz 2003, Beitz, 2005, Ramundo 2008).

Tissue-engineered skin substitutes (i.e., human skin equivalents [HSE]), also referred to as artificial skin, are bioengineered skin products and may be either acellular or cellular. Acellular (i.e., cadaveric human dermis with cellular material removed) products contain a matrix or scaffold composed of materials such as collagen, hyaluronic acid, and fibronectin. The construction of the matrix allows easy access by host cells during the healing process. Cellular products contain living cells such as fibroblasts and keratinocytes within a matrix. The cells contained within a matrix may be allogeneic (i.e., obtained from another individual) or autologous (i.e., obtained from the same individual). Some products are derived from other species (e.g., bovine, porcine) and are referred to as a xenograft. Skin substitutes are generally comprised of epidermal cells, dermal cells or may be composites (i.e., a combination of dermal and epidermal). The substitutes can be used as either temporary or permanent wound coverings. Grafting techniques utilized to apply skin substitutes include autografting (i.e., tissue transplanted from one part of the body to another), allografting (i.e., transplant from one individual to another of the same species), and xenografting (i.e., a graft from one species to another unlike species). Skin substitutes have been proposed for the treatment of multiple conditions including breast reconstruction and chronic wounds nonresponsive to standard therapy.

During breast reconstruction, acellular dermal skin substitutes (i.e., AlloDerm, AlloMax) are primarily used in the setting of tissue expander and breast implant reconstruction. Patients should be in overall good health and have no underlying condition that would restrict blood flow or interfere with the normal healing process (e.g., uncontrolled diabetes, hypertension, previous surgery). These matrixes may be indicated when there is insufficient tissue expander or implant coverage by the pectoralis major muscle and additional coverage is required, as may be the case in a very thin patient; if there is viable but compromised or thin post-mastectomy skin flaps that are at risk of dehiscence or necrosis; or if there is a need to re-establish the inframammary fold and lateral mammary fold landmarks. When used in appropriate candidates, these skin substitutes are proposed to improve control over placement of the inframammary fold and final breast contour, enhance use of available mastectomy skin, reduce the number of expander fills necessary, reduce time to complete expansion and eventual implant exchange, potential improved management of a threatened implant, reduce the need for explanation and the potential for reduction in the incidence of capsular contracture. However, there are ongoing concerns regarding the increased risk of seroma and infection, a higher risk of an implant having to be removed, and tissue flap death.

Evidence and Source Documents

[Bilaminar Skin Substitutes](#)

[Electrical Stimulation and Electromagnetic Therapy](#)

[Low Frequency, Noncontact, Nonthermal Ultrasound Wound Therapy](#)

[Maggot Debridement Therapy \(MDT\)](#)

[Medihoney Dressing for Wound Management OASIS](#)

[Wound Dressing](#)

[Warm-Up Wound Therapy](#)

Medical Technology Assessment Committee

Bilaminar Skin Substitutes

BACKGROUND

Venous ulcers are a chronic recurring condition associated with long-standing venous hypertension of the lower extremities. They occur in approximately 1-3 patients per thousand in the general population with the incidence rising to 20 per thousand in individuals over 80 years old. The chronicity of care required to treat this condition involves significant time and resources and often treatment is unsuccessful in producing complete venous ulcer healing. Typical treatments include frequent dressing changes, compression bandages, antibiotic and antiseptic use, and mechanical debridement. One proposed treatment of chronic venous ulcers involves covering the ulcer with a natural bilayer skin substitute that is hypothesized to protect the wound and promote healing.

08/11/1999: MTAC REVIEW

Bilaminar Skin Substitutes

Evidence Conclusion: The best, published article reporting original data on the effect of using Apligraf on non-healing venous ulcers is a randomized controlled trial of 309 patients recruited from 5 wound treatment centers. The results of this randomized controlled trial indicate that venous ulcers resolve more quickly when treated with compression and human skin equivalent than when treated with compression alone. The results also suggest that patients treated with compression/human skin equivalent are more likely to have complete healing of a venous ulcer than those who are treated only with compression. The bias introduced by the failure to perform an intention-to-treat analysis could explain some of the differences between treatment groups. The results cannot be generalized to patients with conditions that are associated with poor wound healing or to patients with large venous ulcers. Additionally, the probability of ulcer recurrence after 12 months for patients treated with compression/human skin equivalent relative to that of patients treated only with compression remains unknown. This study has not defined the risk of clinically relevant immunologic rejection of human skin equivalent for patients with venous ulcers.

Articles: Falanga, V et al, *Arch. Dermatol.* 1998;134:292-300 See [Evidence Table](#).

The use of Apligraf human skin equivalent for the treatment of non-healing venous ulcers has been approved by the FDA and therefore meets GHC criteria 1. There is sufficient scientific evidence that Apligraf is medically effective and therefore *Kaiser Permanente Medical Technology Assessment Criteria*.

Electrical Stimulation and Electromagnetic Therapy

BACKGROUND

Chronic wounds have been traditionally known as wounds that take prolonged time to heal, do not heal completely, or recur frequently. There is no agreed upon definition for chronic wounds; Lazarus et al (1994) defined them as wounds of at least 8 weeks in duration that have failed to proceed through an orderly and timely process that produces anatomic and functional integrity. Troxler et al (2006) defined them as wounds that fail to heal with 'standard therapy' in an orderly and timely manner. More recently Fonder and colleagues (2008) defined chronic skin wounds as break in the skin of long duration (>6 weeks), or frequent recurrence. Generally, the process of normal healing takes few days to 2 weeks and involves three phases that may overlap in time: 1. inflammatory phase, 2. proliferative phase, and 3. remodeling phase. If any of these phases is compromised, healing will be delayed. Chronic wounds are predominantly due to chronic venous insufficiency, atherosclerosis, pressure sores, or peripheral neuropathy. Chronic ulceration can affect any anatomic region of the body, but the majority is seen in the lower limbs. Pressure sores also known as pressure ulcers are the most common of all chronic wounds, and venous ulcers account for the majority of leg ulcers (70-85%). Diabetic foot ulcers and ischemic ulcers contribute to a significant proportion of the rest (Eaglestein 1997, Simon 2004, Jones 2007, Fonder 2008). Management of chronic wounds has challenged health care providers for generations, and various strategies have been used to accelerate the healing process. Standard care includes debridement of necrotic or infected tissue, maintenance of a moist wound environment, control of infection, wound dressing, nutritional support, and treatment of concurrent conditions that may delay healing. Adjuncts to wound care include several established or emerging therapies. These include compression therapy, pressure relieving beds or cushions, hyperbaric oxygen therapy, topical negative pressure devices, growth factors, skin substitutes, and topical or systemic medications. Selection of therapy is based on the individual patient's clinical condition, and type and cause of wound. A whole range of other adjunctive treatment modalities, such as laser, ultrasound, and electricity have also been applied to chronic wounds (Cullum 2000, de Araujo 2003, Fonder 2008). Electrical stimulation (ES) or electrotherapy for wound healing is defined as the application of electrical current from electrodes placed directly within a wound or on skin in a close proximity to it. ES has been a topic for research for decades and is often used by physical therapists to promote healing. There are four basic treatment regimens for ES therapy: low intensity direct current (LIDC), high voltage pulsed current (HVPC), alternating current (AC), and transcutaneous

electrical nerve stimulation (TENS). Electromagnetic therapy is a related therapy but is distinct from other forms of electrotherapy in that it uses an electromagnet to generate the electric current. It has a field effect not a direct effect or a form of irradiation. It covers a wide range of wavelengths including radio-waves and X-rays. Short wave diathermy (SWD) is a non-ionizing radiation present in the radio-waves portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. The frequency of the short- wavelength radio-waves ranges from 10 to 100 MHz. The radiofrequency wave band of 27.12 MHz is used for therapeutic effect in continuous SWD. Electromagnetic therapy can also be delivered in short bursts of energies called Pulsed Short-Wave Diathermy or PSWD (gardener 1999, Ojingwa 2002, Stiller 1992, Olyaei 2006, Callaghan 2008). In vitro and animal studies have showed that electrical stimulation can increase the DNA and collagen synthesis, direct epithelial, fibroblast, and endothelial cell migration into wound sites, inhibit growth of some wound pathogens, and increase tensile strength of wound scar (Bassett 1974, Gordon 2007). Several devices have been used off-label to deliver ES or electromagnetic therapy to cutaneous wounds. The FDA approved electric stimulators as Class III devices for deep brain and bone stimulation and cleared them as class II devices for muscle stimulation. Electromagnetic devices were also FDA cleared for the treatment of selected medical conditions including relief of pain, muscle contracture, joint contractures, and others. None of the ES or electromagnetic devices has been cleared by the FDA, to date, for the treatment of wounds. The objective of this review is to determine whether electric stimulation and /or electromagnetic therapies are effective adjunctive treatments for chronic skin wounds. The technology has not been previously reviewed by MTAC for this indication.

04/09/2008: MTAC REVIEW

Electrical Stimulation and Electromagnetic Therapy

Evidence Conclusion: There is limited evidence on the effect of electric stimulation (ES) or electromagnetic (EM) therapy on the healing of chronic wounds. The body of evidence on ES therapy mainly consists of small randomized and nonrandomized controlled trials that used the therapy off-label to treat chronic wounds, as well as a meta-analysis that pooled the results of 15 randomized and nonrandomized studies. The literature on EM therapy was more limited. There were very few small trials that also used the therapy off-label. Due to this limited number of studies, the authors of the Cochrane reviews were unable pool the results in a meta-analysis. Although a number of the published RCTs were randomized, controlled, blinded, and had clinical outcomes, all had their limitations: they were too small, with short follow-up durations, and with no standardized dose, frequency, or duration for the electric stimulation (ES) or electromagnetic (EM) therapy. Moreover, several studies used the change in ulcer size rather than incidence of /or time to complete healing as their outcome. No adjustments were made for potential confounding factors, and analyses were not based on intention to treat. The results of these trials suggest that electrotherapy might be associated with improved healing, but the evidence is insufficient to draw any conclusions on the benefits of therapy on complete healing or health outcomes. Gardener and colleagues' (1999) pooled the results of nine small RCTs to quantify the effect of ES on chronic wound healing.

They showed a healing rate of 22% per week among patients treated with ES therapy compared to 9% healing rate per week among the controls. There were several differences among the studies included in the patients' characteristics, types of wounds, and devices used to deliver the ES therapy, as well as dose, frequency and duration of therapy. The two Cochrane reviews on EM therapy (Ravaghi 2006, and Manesh 2006) on venous leg ulcers, and pressure ulcers respectively, could not pool the results due to the limited number of included trials. In conclusion, there is insufficient evidence to determine whether the use of ES or EM therapy as adjunctive treatments would lead to healing of chronic wounds or improve the patients' health outcomes.

Articles: The literature search revealed over 90 articles. Several were reviews or non-related to the current report. There was a meta-analysis of randomized and non-randomized controlled studies on ES therapy for chronic wounds, and two small RCTs that were not included in the meta-analysis. There were also two Cochrane reviews on electromagnetic therapy for treating pressure ulcers and venous leg ulcers. The reviews however did not pool the results in meta-analyses due to the limited number of studies. A review by TEC of Blue Cross Blue Shield on electric stimulation and electromagnetic therapy for chronic skin ulcers (2005), and an ECRI report (1996) on electrical stimulation for the treatment of chronic wounds were also identified by the search. The meta-analysis and the two more recent RCTs on ES, as well as the two Cochrane reviews on electromagnetic therapy were critically appraised. Gardener SE, Frantz R, Schmidt FL. Effect of electrical stimulation on chronic wound healing: a meta-analysis. *Wound Rep Reg* 1999; 7:495-503. See [Evidence Table](#). Ravaghi H, Flemming K, Cullum NA, et al. Electromagnetic therapy for treating venous leg ulcers. (Review). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2006, Issue 2. Art. No.:CD002933. DOI:10.1002/14651858. CD002933.pub3. See [Evidence Table](#). Manesh O, Flemming K, Cullum NA, et al. Electromagnetic therapy for treating pressure ulcers. (Review). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2006, Issue 2. Art. No.:CD002930. DOI:10.1002/14651858. CD002930.pub3. See [Evidence Table](#). Peters EJ, Lavery LA, Armstrong DG, et al. Electrical stimulation as an adjunct to heal diabetic foot ulcers: a randomized clinical trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2001;82:721-725, See [Evidence Table](#). Houghton PE, Kinacaid CB, Lovell M, et al. Effect of electrical stimulation on chronic leg ulcer size and appearance. *Phys Ther* 2003;83:17-28 See [Evidence Table](#).

The use of Electrical stimulation and electromagnetic therapy in the treatment of chronic skin wounds does not meet the *Kaiser Permanente Medical Technology Assessment Criteria*.

Low Frequency, Noncontact, Nonthermal Ultrasound Wound Therapy

BACKGROUND

Chronic wounds, wounds with long healing time, and wounds with frequent recurrence are a major health problem. They are a problem for the patient who suffers from them, the clinician who treats them, and the health care system that is overburdened by their cost. It is estimated that chronic wounds affect approximately 2% of the American population at an estimated cost of US \$20 billion per year. Many factors can impede wound healing, including chronic disease, venous insufficiency, arterial insufficiency, neuropathy, nutritional deficiencies and local features such as pressure, edema, and infection (Fonder, 2008, Rizzi 2010). No single regimen is universally accepted as the best modality for treating chronic wounds. They are managed through conventional wound care procedures performed by primary care providers, community nurses, pharmacists, and others. In the early 2000s, the concept of wound bed preparation has been proposed as a means of providing a structured and systemic approach to the management of chronic wounds. It is believed to accelerate endogenous healing and/or facilitate the effectiveness of other therapeutic measures. Wound bed preparation involves ongoing wound debridement, management of exudates, and resolution of bacterial imbalance (Schulz 2003, Ramundo 2008). Wound debridement is defined as the removal of devitalized or contaminated tissue as well as foreign material from the wound bed until healthy tissue is exposed. Efficient debridement reduces the necrotic burden, achieves healthy granulation tissue, and reduces wound contamination and tissue destruction. This can be performed by different enzymatic, autolytic, sharp/surgical, biological, and mechanical techniques. Each has its own advantages and limitations, and the methods that are most efficient at removal of debris, may at the same time be the most detrimental to fragile new growth (Schulz 2003, Beitz, 2005, Ramundo 2008). Noncontact, low frequency ultrasound therapy was recently introduced as a modality for promoting wound healing through wound cleansing and maintenance debridement. The therapy is thought to produce a number of biophysical effects that are associated with wound healing. These include increased protein and collagen synthesis, angiogenesis, production of growth hormone by macrophages, endothelial production of nitric oxide synthesis; and leukocyte adhesion. One of the main mechanisms of action for ultrasound therapy, as shown by in vitro studies, is achieved through the process of cavitation. This involves the production and vibration of micron-sized bubbles within the coupling medium and fluids in the tissues. As the bubbles collect and condense, they are compressed before moving to the next area. This movement and compression can potentially cause changes in the cellular activities of the tissues subjected to the ultrasound. Acoustic streaming is another mechanism by which ultrasound generates biologic activity producing a unidirectional movement of fluid along and around cell membranes. A more recent hypothesis known as the frequency resonance theory uses the above concepts at the protein and genetic level and result in a broad range of cellular effects that promote healing. Ultrasound energy is also believed to have a direct bactericidal action caused by the cavitation effects produced by the ultrasound waves (Ennis 2005 Ramundo 2008). The sound waves generated by the therapeutic ultrasound devices have lower frequencies than those generated by diagnostic devices (25-40 kHz vs. 200,000-400,000 kHz respectively). Ultrasound MIST therapy devices use saline to couple the ultrasound energy to tissue within the wound bed. This is accomplished by the noncontact non-thermal application of a fine oxygenated fluid (sterile saline) stream spray to the wound bed through which the ultrasound energy is transmitted from the applicator tip to the wound tissue. This noncontact ultrasound is believed to provide cellular stimulation, increase blood flow, and reduce bioburden with much less pain or thermal effect than other direct contact devices. It is usually applied three times a week for a duration dependent on the wound dimensions. The therapy should be performed in a closed environment area to avoid spread of microbes, and the clinician delivering the therapy should wear protective gear (Ramundo 2008, FDA webpage). Ultrasound MIST therapy (Celleration, Inc, Eden Prairie, MN), was cleared by the FDA in 2004 to promote healing of wounds through wound cleansing and maintenance debridement by the removal of yellow slough, fibrin, tissue exudates and bacteria. Its use is contraindicated for malignant wounds, radiation wounds, for tissue previously treated with radiation, and for patients with bleeding disorders, or thrombophlebitis.

02/01/2010: MTAC REVIEW

Low Frequency, Noncontact, Nonthermal Ultrasound Wound Therapy

Evidence Conclusion: The literature search revealed two published RCTs on the low frequency noncontact ultrasound therapy for the treatment of wounds. The two trials were funded by the manufacturer. In one trial, Ennis and colleagues, 2005, compared the ultrasound therapy to a sham device for the treatment of patients with diabetic foot ulcers. Patients in the two treatment groups also received wound conventional therapy. The trial was randomized and controlled and had clinically important outcome. However, it had several methodological flaws which limit generalization of its results. The study had a very low completion rate (41%) due to dropouts or violations of the protocol, and the ulcers in the sham treatment group were significantly larger in size and with a

longer duration than those in the investigational group, which are potential sources of bias and confounding. The results show significant difference in the wound closure favoring the ultrasound therapy group when the analysis included only those who completed the trials, but no significant differences were observed when the analysis was based on intention to treat. Kavros and colleagues, 2007, compared the effects of the ultrasound therapy plus standard wound care to standard wound care alone in 70 patients with non-healing ischemic lower-extremity wounds. The trial was also randomized and controlled, but was not blinded, and the outcomes were mainly based on measurements which are subject to potential error, and observational bias. Moreover, the authors did not discuss if there were any dropouts, rate of compliance, or adverse events associated with the intervention. Overall, the results of the trial show that patients managed with MIST therapy in addition to standard treatment, achieved a significantly higher >50% wound closure rate in 12 weeks than those managed with standard therapy alone. A secondary analysis of the trial showed that patients with critical limb ischemia with baseline TcPO₂ <20 with dependency were significantly less likely to achieve >50% healing by week 12, using standard treatment with or without MIST therapy. In conclusion, the published literature does not provide sufficient evidence to determine that non-thermal, noncontact, low frequency ultrasound therapy “Mist therapy” is safe to use, or that it has similar or better outcomes than those achieved by other debridement methods or standard wound care management procedures.

Articles: The literature search yielded two RCTs, on the low frequency ultrasound therapy using the MIST therapy system for the treatment of chronic wounds, one non-randomized retrospective comparative study and prospective case series. The two RCTs were critically appraised. Ennis WJ, Formann P, Mozen N, et al. Ultrasound therapy for recalcitrant diabetic foot ulcers: Results of a randomized, double-blind, controlled, multicenter study. *Ostomy Wound Management*.2005;51:24-39. See [Evidence Table](#). Kavros SJ, Miller JL, Hanna SW. Treatment of ischemic wounds with noncontact, low-frequency ultrasound The Mayo Clinic experience, 2004-2006. *Adv skin Wound Care* 2007; 20:221-226. See [Evidence Table](#).

The use of Low frequency, noncontact, nonthermal ultrasound therapy for the treatment of wounds does not meet the *Kaiser Permanente Medical Technology Assessment Criteria*.

Maggot Debridement Therapy (MDT)

BACKGROUND

Chronic wounds, wounds with long healing time or frequent recurrence, are major health care and quality of life burdens. Approximately 1-2% of individuals in the United States are likely to be affected by leg ulceration at some time in their life. Many factors can impede wound healing, including chronic disease, vascular insufficiency, nutritional deficiencies and local features such as infection, pressure and edema (Fonder et al., 2008). Preparation of the wound bed is an important component of optimal healing. Proper preparation includes debridement of nonviable tissue, management of inflammation and infection, and establishment of proper moisture balance. Wound debridement serves several purposes. It removes necrotic tissue which can present physical barriers to healing, decreases the potential for infection, enhances the ability to assess wound depth, and helps to remove bacteria that may prevent healing (Beitz, 2005). Debridement methods include hydrogels, enzymatic agents, dextranomer polysaccharide beads or paste, adhesive zinc oxide tape, and sharp debridement. A systematic review of studies on different debridement methods concluded that there was insufficient evidence to recommend one method of debridement over another (Bradley et al., 1999). Maggot debridement therapy (MDT) is another method for wound debridement. Maggot or larval therapy has been used in some form for centuries, including treating battle wounds in Napoleon’s army in the 1550s. Dr. William Baer, often called the founder of modern maggot therapy, observed the effects of maggots on the wounds of soldiers during World War I and he later refined the technique to use sterile maggots under controlled conditions. MDT increased in popularity after WWI and, by the 1930s, was widely used in the U.S. and Europe. Its use decreased after the advent of antibiotics in the 1940s. As of the late 1990s there has been resurgence in interest due to antibiotic resistance, particularly methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) and the lack of other reliably effective methods (Gupta, 2008). Modern MDT involves the use of specially bred larvae, most commonly of the green-bottle fly *Lucilia sericata* species. Larvae 1-2 mm long hatch from eggs in 12-24 hours and, when they feed on necrotic tissue in the moist environment of wounds, they mature in 4-5 days, at which time they measure about 10mm. Larvae need to be sterile to prevent contamination and should be used within 8 hours of hatching or stored in refrigerator at 8-10o C to slow their metabolism. They require an optimal body temperature, moist environment and adequate oxygen supply. The general procedure is to introduce larvae to the wound at a density of 5-8 per cm² and cover with a containment dressing that allows oxygen to pass through. Dressings are generally changed once a day to avoid build-up of secretions, and the larvae are changed every 2-3 days. Wounds commonly require 2-6 treatment cycles for complete debridement (Gupta et al., 2008; Chan et al., 2007; FDA materials). The exact mechanisms by which maggots debride wounds are not fully understood. It is generally believed that there is a combination of: 1) Mechanical action: probing from the maggots’ pair of mandibles/hooks may facilitate debridement; 2) Enzymatic action: Three proteolytic enzymes have been identified in maggot

excretions/secretions (ES) that can degrade extracellular matrix components, including laminin and fibronectin. The ES also have antibacterial substances which appear to have an inhibitory effect on Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria including MRSA. Maggots may also secrete cytokines which aid in wound healing; 3) Digestion: Maggots appear to ingest bacteria and kill them in their alimentary tract (Chan et al., 2007). There are no reports that MDT is associated with major adverse effects or complications. Minor discomfort has been reported, and excessive pressure on the wound may kill some of the maggots, resulting in uneven healing. There is also the issue of social acceptance of larval therapy, the widely-cited “yuck” factor, for patients and providers. In 2004, FDA cleared Medical Maggots (Monarch Labs, Irvine, CA) for commercial production as a Class II medical device. The approved indication is debridement of non-healing necrotic skin and soft tissue wounds.

04/06/2009: MTAC REVIEW

Maggot Debridement Therapy (MDT)

Evidence Conclusion: There is fair evidence from one RCT that wound debridement is significantly faster with maggot debridement therapy than hydrogel, but that there is no significant difference in time to complete wound healing (Dumville et al., 2009). In the RCT, median time to healing was 236 days in the larvae therapy groups and 245 in the hydrogel group. Time to debridement was 14 days in the group receiving loose larvae, 28 days in the bagged larvae group and 72 days in the hydrogel group. The efficacy of maggot therapy for debridement is supported by the results of a retrospective cohort study, and several case series. The RCT found significantly higher reports of ulcer-related pain in the larvae therapy groups in the 24 hours before removal of the first treatment compared to hydrogel and did not report on pain during subsequent treatments. There is insufficient evidence on the efficacy of maggot therapy for MRSA eradication compared to standard wound care approaches. The number of MRSA-positive wounds in the RCT was too small to draw conclusions about eradication.

Articles: The search yielded two RCTs, one of which had a sample size of 12 patients and was excluded from further review. There was also one non-randomized comparative study and several case series. The larger RCT, cohort study and the three largest case series (n>50) were critically appraised. Citations are as follows: Dumville JC, Worthy G, Bland JM et al. Larval therapy for leg ulcers (VenUS II): randomized controlled trial. *BMJ* 2009; 338; online first. See [Evidence Table](#). Sherman RA. Maggot versus conservative debridement therapy for the treatment of pressure ulcers. *Wound Rep Reg* 2002; 10: 208-214. See [Evidence Table](#). Steenvoorde P, Jacob CE, Van Doorn L, Oskam J. Maggot debridement therapy of infected ulcers: patient and wound factors influencing outcome- a study on 101 patients with 117 wounds. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2007; 89: 596-602. See [Evidence Table](#). Wolff H, Hansson C. Larval therapy- an effective method of ulcer debridement. *Clin Exper Dermatol* 2003; 134-137. See [Evidence Table](#). Courtenay M, Church JCT, Ryan TJ. Larva therapy in wound management. *J Royal Soc Med* 2000; 93: 72-73. See [Evidence Table](#).

The use of maggot debridement therapy for the treatment of chronic and infected wounds does not meet the *Kaiser Permanente Medical Technology Assessment Criteria*.

Medihoney Dressing for Wound Management

BACKGROUND

Honey has been used in wound care for thousands of years. The ancient Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Chinese, and other early cultures used it as a remedy for wounds either alone or in combination with other ingredients. Its healing benefits were passed from generation to generation, and honey is still traditionally used in many parts of the world. Recently there has been a resurgent interest by the medical profession in using topical honey for wound treatment, mainly due to the increasing number of bacterial strains developing resistance to antibiotics. It is only in the last few decades that researchers started to investigate honey’s mechanism of action in wound healing (Molan 2008, Lay-flurrie 2008). Honey is a viscous supersaturated sugar solution derived from nectar gathered and modified by the honeybee. It contains approximately 30% glucose, 40% fructose, 5% sucrose, 20% water and many other substances as amino acids, vitamins, minerals, and enzymes. In-vitro and animal studies indicate that honey has several therapeutic potentials. Its high osmolarity due to the sugar content causes bacterial cell wall shrinkage and inhibition of growth. Many bacteria grow and multiply in a neutral pH environment (6.5-7.0) and cannot thrive in the acidic pH of honey which ranges from 3.2 to 4.2. Researchers have reported that it in addition to its antibacterial properties, honey enhances tissue growth by drawing fluid from the underlying circulation providing both a moist environment and topical nutrition to the tissues. They also found that honey leads to cytokine release, promote autolytic debridement, deodorize malodorous wounds, and stimulates anti-inflammatory activity that reduces pain, edema, and exudate, and minimizes scarring (Molan 1999, Sato 2000, White 2005, Bell 2007). There are many different types of honey but the Manuka honey, a monofloral honey derived from the leptospermum tree species known as tea trees in Australia and New Zealand, has received particular interest for wound healing. Some researchers claim that it has a broad-spectrum antibacterial activity and is exceptionally effective for several bacterial species that commonly infect surgical wounds as *Staphylococcus aureus* and

Pseudomonas aeruginosa (Lusby 2002, Visavadia 2008). Therapeutic honey is typically raw and does not undergo heat treatment like culinary honey. It is sterilized by gamma irradiation which destroys any bacterial spores while retaining its biologic activities. Honey dressings are available in various commercial preparations such as honey gel ointment, honey-impregnated tulle dressings, honey impregnated calcium alginate dressings, and honey-based sheet hydrogel dressings (Molan 1999, Lusby 2002 Visavadia 2008, Eddy 2008, Lay-flurrie 2008). Derma Sciences Medihoney Dressing with Active Manuka Honey received FDA approval for providing a moist environment conducive to wound healing. These are tulle dressings comprised of 95% Active Manuka Honey and 5% calcium alginate, and are offered in several sizes including 0.5, 1, and 1.5 ounces. According to the FDA, Medihoney dressings are indicated for the management of light to moderately exuding wounds as: diabetic foot ulcers, venous or arterial leg ulcers, partial or full thickness pressure ulcers/sores, first and second partial thickness burns, and traumatic and surgical wounds. Honey dressings should be avoided in patients with a known history of allergy to either honey or bee venom. It was also reported (Lay-flurrie 2008) that patients with diabetes should have their blood sugar monitored as they may be at higher risk of hyperglycemia due to the sugar content of honey.

12/01/2008: MTAC REVIEW

Medihoney Dressing for Wound Management

Evidence Conclusion: To date, there are no published high-quality studies to support the use honey in wound dressings. Jull and colleagues performed a systematic review (Cochrane review) of 19 randomized and quasi-randomized trials to determine the efficacy of honey on the healing of acute and chronic wounds. The meta-analysis had generally valid methodology. However, its strength is only as good as the trials it includes, and the majority was of low methodological quality. Moreover, 11 of the 19 studies were conducted by one and the same author in a single center. There was significant clinical and statistical heterogeneity between the studies which did not enable pooling of the results in the meta-analysis. Overall, the results of subgroup meta-analyses only showed a significant benefit of honey dressings (2 trials, n=992) in reducing time to complete healing of mild to moderate partial thickness burns vs. conventional dressings. The Jull et al's RCT, 2008 compared the effect of Manuka honey dressings to usual care for the treatment of venous ulcers. It was randomized, controlled and multicenter, and analysis was based on intention to treat. However, the trial was open-label, and a range of dressings were used in the control group, which are potential sources of bias. Its results showed no statistically significant differences between the honey dressing and the usual care in rate or time to complete healing. On the other hand, honey dressings were associated with significantly higher rates of overall adverse events, ulcer pain (NNH=7), and ulcer deterioration (NNH=10). Gethin and colleagues' trial compared Manuka honey to hydrogel dressings used for the treatment of venous ulcers. The trial was unblinded, small, and did not recruit the predetermined number of patients required to provide sufficient statistical power. The results of the trial showed no statistically significant differences between the Manuka honey and hydrogel therapy in desloughing the wound (percent of wound area covered by slough), or rate of slough removal in venous ulcers at 4 weeks. There was however, a higher rate of ulcer healing in the Manuka honey group (44%) vs. the hydrogel group (33%) with a risk ratio of 1.38, and NNT =9 in 12 weeks. The authors did not discuss how they defined wound healing. Conclusion: There is insufficient good quality evidence to determine whether the use of Medihoney dressings would improve the rate of healing in acute wounds as burns and traumatic wounds. There is insufficient evidence to determine whether the use of Medihoney improves the rate of healing in chronic wounds including venous ulcers, arterial ulcers, diabetic ulcers, and pressure ulcers.

Articles: The search revealed over 120 articles on the use of honey for wound care. The number of published articles dropped to just over 20 articles when the search was limited to Manuka or Medihoney. Many were review articles or opinion pieces on the benefits of honey in wound management. There was a Cochrane review on honey as a topical treatment of wounds, and a number of RCTs on the use of honey in the treatment of acute wounds due to burns. The majority of the latter trials were conducted in one center, and by one and the same author. The literature on the use of honey for chronic ulcers was limited. There were three RCTs on honey dressings for venous ulcers, two of which were conducted by the same investigators (Gethin and colleagues 2008) among the same group of patients but reported different outcomes. No randomized controlled trials on the use of honey in diabetic foot ulcers, ischemic, or pressure ulcers were identified. There were only very small non-randomized trials, case series and case reports. The Cochrane review and the three trials on the use of honey for venous ulcers were critically appraised: Jull AB, Rodgers A, Walker N. Honey as a topical treatment for wounds Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2008, Issue4. Art No.: CD005083.DOI10.1002/14651858.CD005083pub2: 16:1085-1100. See [Evidence Table](#). Jull A, Walker N, Parag V, et al. Randomized clinical trial of honey- impregnated dressings for venous leg ulcers. *Br J Surg* 2008; 85:175-182 See [Evidence Table](#). Gethin G, Cowman S. Manuka honey vs. hydrogel –a prospective, open label, multicenter, randomized controlled trial to compare desloughing efficacy and healing outcomes in venous ulcers. *J Clin Nurs* 2008; August 23 See [Evidence Table](#). Gethin G, Cowman S. Bacteriological changes in sloughing venous leg ulcers treated with Manuka honey or hydrogel: an RCT. *J wound*

Care 2008;17:241-247 See [Evidence Table](#).

The use of Medihoney dressing in the treatment of wound management does not meet the *Kaiser Permanente Medical Technology Assessment Criteria*.

OASIS Wound Dressing

BACKGROUND

OASIS® Wound Matrix (Cook Biotech, Inc.) is a biosynthetic skin substitute that is derived from porcine small intestine submucosa. This material is approximately 0.15 mm thick and consists primarily of a collagen-based extracellular matrix. However, unlike other purified collagen wound care products, biologically important components of the extracellular matrix such as glycosaminoglycans, proteoglycans, fibronectin, basic fibroblast growth factor, and transforming growth factor β are retained in the small intestine submucosa (Barber 2008, Chern 2009, Limová 2010). OASIS® Wound Matrix has a shelf life of 24 months and is FDA approved for use in patients with various partial- and full-thickness wounds such as trauma wounds, ulcers, tunneled/undetermined wounds, draining wounds, and surgical wounds. It is not approved for use in patients with third-degree burn or with known allergies to porcine materials. According to the manufacturer's Web site, side-effects of OASIS Wound Matrix include: infection, chronic inflammation, allergic reaction, excessive redness, pain, swelling, and blistering. Additionally, the initial application of the wound dressing may be associated with transient, mild, localized inflammation (Cook Biotech, Inc 2011).

10/11/2000: MTAC REVIEW

OASIS Wound Dressing

Evidence Conclusion: Given the fact that there are no peer-reviewed articles on this topic, there is insufficient (no) evidence to determine the efficacy of this type of the Oasis Cook® wound care dressing.

Articles: Articles were selected based on study type. There were no peer-reviewed articles, so no articles were reviewed. Informational materials on the company's Web site (www.cookgroup.com) were reviewed, but no evidence tables were created.

The use of OASIS Wound Dressing in the treatment of non-healing partial thickness dermal wound does not meet the *Kaiser Permanente Medical Technology Assessment Criteria*.

06/20/2011: MTAC REVIEW

OASIS Wound Dressing

Evidence Conclusion: *OASIS® versus usual care* - The first RCT included 50 subjects and compared the efficacy and tolerability of OASIS® Wound Matrix versus petrolatum-impregnated gauze in patients with difficult to heal mixed arterial/venous or venous leg ulcers. Results from this study suggest that patients treated with OASIS® have faster healing times, were more likely to experience complete wound closure, and required fewer dressing changes compared to usual care. Additionally, after 8 weeks patients treated with OASIS® had significantly more granulation tissue compared to usual care. No adverse events were observed in either treatment group. Results from this study should be interpreted with caution as it had several methodological limitations (Romanelli 2010).

OASIS® versus Hyaloskin® - The second RCT included 54 subjects and compared the effectiveness of OASIS® Wound Matrix versus Hyaloskin® for the treatment of mixed arterial/venous leg ulcers. Results from this study suggest that patients treated with OASIS® Wound Matrix were more likely to experience wound closure compared to patients treated with Hyaloskin®. Additionally, patients treated with OASIS® Wound Matrix reported greater comfort, less pain, and required fewer dressing changes. No adverse events were observed in either treatment group. Results from this study should be interpreted with caution as it had several methodological limitations (Romanelli 2007).

OASIS® plus compression therapy versus compression therapy alone - The third RCT included 120 subjects and compared the effectiveness of OASIS® Wound Matrix plus compression versus compression therapy alone for the treatment of chronic leg ulcers. The primary outcome was complete wound closure. Results from this study suggest that subjects who received OASIS® Wound Matrix plus compression therapy were significantly more likely to experience complete wound closure compared to standard care plus compression therapy. There was no significant difference in adverse events between the two groups. The most frequently occurring complications were allergic reaction or intolerance to secondary dressing and wound infection. Results from this study should be interpreted with caution as it had several methodological limitations (Mostow 2005).

Conclusion: Evidence from three RCTs suggest that OASIS® Wound Matrix may be a safe and effective treatment for leg ulcers; however, results from these studies should be interpreted with caution as all of the trials had methodological limitations. For example, two of the trials were funded by the manufacturers of OASIS® Wound Matrix. Only one study performed an intent-to-treat analysis and assessed power and none of the studies provided confidence intervals.

Articles: The literature search revealed several RCTs that evaluated the safety and efficacy of OASIS® Wound Matrix for the treatment of various partial- and full-thickness wounds. Three recent RCTs were selected for review. Two of these studies were performed by the same investigator. Another trial was excluded because it did not have sufficient power (Niezgoda 2005). The following studies were critically appraised:

Romanelli M, Dini V, and Bertone M. Randomized comparison of OASIS® Wound Matrix versus moist wound dressing in the treatment of difficult-to-heal wounds of mixed arterial/venous etiology. *Adv Skin Wound Care* 2010; 23:34-38. See [Evidence Table](#). Romanelli M, Dini V, Bertone M, et al. OASIS® Wound Matrix versus Hyaloskin® in the treatment of difficult-to-heal wounds of mixed arterial/venous aetiology. *Int Wound J* 2007; 4:3-7. See [Evidence Table](#). Mostow EN, Hataway D, Dalsing M, et al. Effectiveness of an extracellular matrix graft (OASIS® Wound Matrix) in the treatment of chronic leg ulcers. *J Vasc Surg* 2005; 41:837-843. See [Evidence Table](#).

The use of OASIS Wound Dressing in the treatment of non-healing partial thickness dermal wound does not meet the *Kaiser Permanente Medical Technology Assessment Criteria*.

Warm-Up Wound Therapy

BACKGROUND

Noncontact normothermic wound therapy (The Warm-up therapy system) is used for the treatment of partial- and full-thickness wounds such as pressure ulcers, venous ulcers, diabetic ulcers, surgical wounds, and arterial wounds. Noncontact normothermic wound therapy is intended to speed the healing of wounds and venous ulcers by warming the wound and thereby increasing blood flow and allowing sufficient moisture in the wound to help cells grow and divide. The Warm-up therapy system consists of the following components: a noncontact wound cover, a temperature control unit with an AC adapter and a warming card. The non-contact wound cover is placed over the wound; the cover is raised so it does not touch the wound. It is designed to maintain warmth and humidity and to absorb exudate. There is space to insert the warming card into the wound cover. The temperature control unit, which is portable, controls the temperature of the warming card. The manufacturer recommends three warming sessions per day, heating the wound to 38°C (Augustine Medical Web site). Anodyne Therapy is another treatment for increasing the rate of wound healing; it is also used to treat patients with peripheral neuropathy. Treatment consists of monochromatic near-infrared photo energy (MIRE). The recommended course of treatment is 12 sessions of MIRE. For patients with peripheral neuropathy, the intention is to increase local circulation and restore sensation. MIRE has been shown to increase nitric oxide (NO) in the blood and plasma of normal adults (Horwitz, 1999). An elevation in NO may be beneficial for wound healing and increased circulation.

10/08/2003: MTAC REVIEW

Warm-Up Wound Therapy

Evidence Conclusion: *Noncontact Normothermic Therapy (Warm-up wound therapy)* - Combining the evidence from the current and previous MTAC reviews, four randomized controlled trials comparing Warm-up wound therapy to standard care were critically appraised (McCulloch and Kloth in the current review, Warwick and Price from the 2002 review). All of the studies were subject to selection bias due to the limited sample sizes (the treatment groups are likely to be dissimilar on characteristics that may affect outcome). The Price study had the strongest methodology and did not find a statistically significant difference in healing rates in an intention to treat analysis; the study may have been underpowered. The other three RCTs found statistically significant improvement in healing according to one or more outcome variables, but were subject to biases including improper randomization, lack of intention to treat analysis, potential data manipulation and funding by the manufacturer.

Articles: *Noncontact Normothermic Therapy* - The search yielded 8 articles. There were four new RCTs, sample sizes were n=16, n=20, n=36 and n=40. The two RCTs with the larger sample sizes were critically appraised: McCulloch J, Knight A. Noncontact normothermic wound therapy and offloading in the treatment of neuropathic foot ulcers in patients with diabetes. *Ostomy/Wound Management* 2002; 48: 38-44. See [Evidence Table](#). Kloth LC, Berman JE, Nett M et al. A randomized controlled clinical trial to evaluate the effects of noncontact normothermic wound therapy on chronic full-thickness pressure ulcers. *Adv SkinWound Care* 2002; 15: 270-276. See [Evidence Table](#).

The use of Warm-up Wound Therapy in the treatment of partial and full-thickness wounds does not meet the *Kaiser Permanente Medical Technology Assessment Criteria*.

04/10/2002: MTAC REVIEW

Warm-Up Wound Therapy

Evidence Conclusion: Two relatively small RCTs evaluating the efficacy of noncontact normothermic wound therapy (Warm-up® Therapy System) for accelerating the healing rate of pressure ulcers were reviewed. The

Price study, which had the stronger methodology, found no significant differences in healing rates in an intention to treat analysis. Patients receiving Warm-up wound therapy took an average of 5 fewer days for their wound to be reduced to 25% of original size. This difference was not have been statistically significant, but the study may have been under-powered. Whitney found a statistically significant improvement in the linear rate of healing using Warm-up wound therapy. However, the Whitney study had substantial threats to validity (e.g. no power analysis, substantial dropout; no intention to treat analysis). The absolute difference in healing was 0.008 cm/day. The clinical significance of this difference in healing rates needs to be considered. The two RCTs reviewed had pressure ulcers as the outcome; no conclusions can be drawn about the effectiveness of this treatment for other types of wounds.

Articles: The search yielded 6 articles on this treatment, all of which were empirical and had small sample sizes (most had sample sizes of 20 or less). There were three RCTs with clinical outcomes. One had n=13 and was not reviewed. The other two RCTs (n=40 and n=58) were critically appraised: Whitney JD, Salvadalena G, Higa L, Mich M. Treatment of pressure ulcers with noncontact normothermic wound therapy: healing and warming effects. J WOCN 2001; 28:244-52. See [Evidence Table](#). Price P, Bale S, Crook H, Harding KGH. The effect of a radiant heat dressing on pressure ulcers. J Wound Care 2000; 9:201-205. See [Evidence Table](#).

The use of Warm-up Wound Therapy in the treatment of partial and full-thickness wounds does not meet the Kaiser Permanente Medical Technology Assessment Criteria.

Applicable Codes

Skin Substitutes - Considered Medically Necessary when criteria in the applicable policy statements listed above are met:

HCPC Codes	Description
Q4102	Oasis wound matrix, per sq. cm
Q4104	Integra bilayer matrix wound dressing (BMWD), per sq. cm
Q4105	Integra dermal regeneration template (DRT) or Integra Omnigraft dermal regeneration matrix, per sq. cm
Q4108	Integra matrix, per sq. cm
Q4110	PriMatrix, per sq. cm
Q4124	OASIS ultra tri-layer wound matrix, per sq. cm
Q4128	FlexHD, AllopatchHD, or Matrix HD, per sq. cm
Q4137	AmnioExcel, AmnioExcel Plus or BioDExcel, per sq. cm
Q4139	AmnioMatrix or BioDMatrix, injectable, 1 cc
Q4151	AmnioBand or Guardian, per sq. cm
Q4168	AmnioBand, 1 mg
A2011	Supra sdrm, per square centimeter
A2012	Suprathel, per square centimeter
A2013	Innovamatrix fs, per square centimeter
A4100	Skin substitute, fda cleared as a device, not otherwise specified
Q4224	Human health factor 10 amniotic patch (hhf10-p), per square centimeter
Q4225	Amniobind, per square centimeter
Q4256	Mlg-complete, per square centimeter
Q4257	Relese, per square centimeter
Q4258	Enverse, per square centimeter

Skin Substitutes - Considered not medically necessary:

**There are many products available - this list is not all-inclusive.*

HCPC Codes	Description
A2014	Omeza Collagen Matrix, per 100 mg
A2015	Phoenix Wound Matrix, per sq cm
A2016	PermeaDerm B, per sq cm
A2017	PermeaDerm Glove, each
A2018	PermeaDerm C, per sq cm
A2019	Kerecis Omega3 MariGen Shield, per sq cm

A2020	AC5 Advanced Wound System (AC5)
A2021	NeoMatriX, per sq cm
C9358	Dermal substitute, native, nondenatured collagen, fetal bovine origin (SurgiMend Collagen Matrix), per 0.5 sq. cm
C9360	Dermal substitute, native, nondenatured collagen, neonatal bovine origin (SurgiMend Collagen Matrix), per 0.5 sq. cm
C9361	Collagen matrix nerve wrap (NeuroMend Collagen Nerve Wrap), per 0.5 cm length
C9363	Skin substitute (Integra Meshed Bilayer Wound Matrix), per sq. cm
C9364	Porcine implant, Permacol, per sq. cm
Q4100	Skin substitute, not otherwise specified
Q4101	Apligraf, per sq. cm
Q4103	Oasis burn matrix, per sq. cm
Q4106	Dermagraft, per sq. cm
Q4107	GRAFTJACKET, per sq. cm
Q4111	GammaGraft, per sq. cm
Q4112	Cymetra, injectable, 1 cc
Q4113	GRAFTJACKET XPRESS, injectable, 1 cc
Q4114	Integra flowable wound matrix, injectable, 1 cc
Q4115	AlloSkin, per sq. cm
Q4116	AlloDerm, per sq. cm
Q4117	HYALOMATRIX, per sq. cm
Q4118	MatriStem micromatrix, 1 mg
Q4121	TheraSkin, per sq. cm
Q4122	DermACELL, DermACELL AWM or DermACELL AWM Porous, per sq. cm
Q4123	AlloSkin RT, per sq. cm
Q4125	ArthroFlex, per sq. cm
Q4126	MemoDerm, DermaSpan, TranZgraft or InteguPly, per sq. cm
Q4127	Talymed, per sq. cm
Q4130	Strattice TM, per sq. cm
Q4132	Grafix Core and GrafixPL Core, per sq. cm
Q4133	Grafix PRIME, GrafixPL PRIME, Stravix and StravixPL, per sq. cm
Q4134	HMatrix, per sq. cm
Q4135	Mediskin, per sq. cm
Q4136	E-Z Derm, per sq. cm
Q4138	BioDFence DryFlex, per sq. cm
Q4140	BioDFence, per sq. cm
Q4141	AlloSkin AC, per sq. cm
Q4142	XCM biologic tissue matrix, per sq. cm
Q4143	Repriza, per sq. cm
Q4145	EpiFix, injectable, 1 mg
Q4146	Tensix, per sq. cm
Q4147	Architect, Architect PX, or Architect FX, extracellular matrix, per sq. cm
Q4148	Neox Cord 1K, Neox Cord RT, or Clarix Cord 1K, per sq. cm
Q4149	Excellagen, 0.1 cc
Q4150	AlloWrap DS or dry, per sq. cm
Q4152	DermaPure, per sq. cm
Q4153	Dermavest and Plurinvest, per sq. cm
Q4154	Biovance, per sq. cm
Q4155	Neox Flo or Clarix Flo 1 mg
Q4156	Neox 100 or Clarix 100, per sq. cm
Q4157	Revitalon, per sq. cm
Q4158	Kerecis Omega3, per sq. cm
Q4159	Affinity, per sq. cm
Q4160	Nushield, per sq. cm
Q4161	bio-ConneKt wound matrix, per sq. cm
Q4162	WoundEx Flow, BioSkin Flow, 0.5 cc
Q4163	WoundEx, BioSkin, per sq. cm

Q4164	Helicoll, per sq. cm
Q4165	Keramatrix or Kerasorb, per sq. cm
Q4166	Cytal, per sq. cm
Q4167	Truskin, per sq. cm
Q4169	Artacent wound, per sq. cm
Q4170	Cygnus, per sq. cm
Q4171	Interfyl, 1 mg
Q4173	PalinGen or PalinGen XPlus, per sq. cm
Q4174	PalinGen or ProMatrX, 0.36 mg per 0.25 cc
Q4175	Miroderm, per sq. cm
Q4176	NeoPatch, per sq. cm
Q4177	FlowerAmnioFlo, 0.1 cc
Q4178	FlowerAmnioPatch, per sq. cm
Q4179	FlowerDerm, per sq. cm
Q4180	Revita, per sq. cm
Q4181	Amnio Wound, per sq. cm
Q4182	Transcyte, per sq. cm
Q4183	Surgigraft, per sq cm
Q4184	Cellesta, per sq cm
Q4185	Cellesta Flowable Amnion (25 mg per cc); per 0.5 cc
Q4186	Epifix, per sq. cm
Q4187	Epicord, per sq cm
Q4188	AmnioArmor, per sq cm
Q4189	Artacent AC, 1 mg
Q4190	Artacent AC, per sq cm
Q4191	Restorigin, per sq cm
Q4192	Restorigin, 1 cc
Q4193	Coll-e-Derm, per sq cm
Q4194	Novachor, per sq cm
Q4195	PuraPly, per sq cm
Q4196	PuraPly AM, per sq cm
Q4197	PuraPly XT, per sq cm
Q4198	Genesis Amniotic Membrane, per sq cm
Q4200	SkinTE, per sq cm
Q4201	Matrion, per sq cm
Q4202	Kerxxx (2.5g/cc), 1cc
Q4203	Derma-Gide, per sq cm
Q4204	XWRAP, per sq cm
Q4205	Membrane Graft or Membrane Wrap, per sq cm
Q4206	Fluid Flow or Fluid GF, 1 cc
Q4208	Novafix, per sq cm
Q4209	SurGraft, per sq cm
Q4210	Axolotl Graft or Axolotl DualGraft, per sq cm
Q4211	Amnion Bio or AxoBioMembrane, per sq cm
Q4212	AlloGen, per cc
Q4213	Ascent, 0.5 mg
Q4214	Cellesta Cord, per sq cm
Q4215	Axolotl Ambient or Axolotl Cryo, 0.1 mg

Q4216	Artacent Cord, per sq cm
Q4217	WoundFix, BioWound, WoundFix Plus, BioWound Plus, WoundFix Xplus or BioWound Xplus, per sq cm
Q4218	SurgiCORD, per sq cm
Q4219	SurgiGRAFT-DUAL, per sq cm
Q4220	BellaCell HD or Surederm, per sq cm
Q4221	Amnio Wrap2, per sq cm
Q4222	ProgenaMatrix, per sq cm
Q4226	MyOwn Skin, includes harvesting and preparation procedures, per sq cm
Q4227	AmnioCore™, per sq cm
Q4229	Cogenex Amniotic Membrane, per sq cm
Q4230	Cogenex Flowable Amnion, per 0.5 cc
Q4231	Corplex P, per cc
Q4232	Corplex, per sq cm
Q4233	SurFactor or NuDyn, per 0.5 cc
Q4234	XCellerate, per sq cm
Q4235	AMNIOREPAIR or AltiPly, per sq cm
Q4237	Cryo-Cord, per sq cm
Q4238	Derm-Maxx, per sq cm
Q4239	Amnio-Maxx or Amnio-Maxx Lite, per sq cm
Q4240	CoreCyte, for topical use only, per 0.5 cc
Q4241	PolyCyte, for topical use only, per 0.5 cc
Q4242	AmnioCyte Plus, per 0.5 cc
Q4244	Procenta, per 200 mg
Q4245	AmnioText, per cc
Q4246	CoreText or ProText, per cc
Q4247	Amniotext patch, per sq cm
Q4248	Dermacyte Amniotic Membrane Allograft, per sq cm
Q4249	AMNIPLY, for topical use only, per sq cm
Q4250	AmnioAmp-MP, per sq cm
Q4251	Vim, per sq cm
Q4252	Vendaje, per sq cm
Q4253	Zenith Amniotic Membrane, per sq cm
Q4254	Novafix DL, per sq cm
Q4255	REGUaRD, for topical use only, per sq cm
Q4259	Celera Dual Layer or Celera Dual Membrane, per sq cm
Q4260	Signature APatch, per sq cm
Q4261	TAG, per sq cm
Q4262	Dual Layer Impax Membrane, per sq cm
Q4263	SurGraft TL, per sq cm
Q4264	Cocoon Membrane, per sq cm
Q4265	NeoStim TL, per sq cm
Q4266	NeoStim Membrane, per sq cm
Q4267	NeoStim DL, per sq cm

Q4268	SurGraft FT, per sq cm
Q4269	SurGraft XT, per sq cm
Q4270	Complete SL, per sq cm
Q4271	Complete FT, per sq cm
A2001	InnovaMatrix AC, per sq cm
A2002	Mirragen Advanced Wound Matrix, per sq cm
A2003	bio-ConneKt Wound Matrix, per sq cm
A2004	XCelliStem, per sq cm
A2005	Microlyte Matrix, per sq cm
A2006	NovoSorb SynPath dermal matrix, per sq cm
A2007	Restrata, per sq cm
A2008	TheraGenesis, per sq cm
A2009	Symphony, per sq cm
A2010	Apis, per sq cm
Q4199	Cygnus matrix, per sq cm
Q4272	Esano a, per square centimeter
Q4273	Esano aaa, per square centimeter
Q4274	Esano ac, per square centimeter
Q4275	Esano aca, per square centimeter
Q4276	Orion, per square centimeter
Q4277	Woundplus membrane or e-graft, per square centimeter
Q4278	Epieffect, per square centimeter
Q4280	Xcell amnio matrix, per square centimeter
Q4281	Barrera sl or barrera dl, per square centimeter
Q4282	Cygnus dual, per square centimeter
Q4283	Biovance tri-layer or biovance 3l, per square centimeter
Q4284	Dermabind sl, per square centimeter

Normothermic Wound Therapy – Considered not medically necessary:

HCPC Codes	Description
A6000	Noncontact wound-warming wound cover for use with the noncontact wound-warming device and warming card
E0231	Noncontact wound-warming device (temperature control unit, AC adapter and power cord) for use with warming card and wound cover
E0232	Warming card for use with the noncontact wound-warming device and noncontact wound-warming wound cover

Low Frequency, Noncontact, Non-Thermal Ultrasound Wound Therapy - Medicare – Considered Medically Necessary when criteria in the applicable policy statements listed above are met

Non-Medicare – Considered not medically necessary

CPT Codes	Description
97610	Low frequency, non-contact, non-thermal ultrasound, including topical application(s), when performed, wound assessment, and instruction(s) for ongoing care, per day

Electrical Stimulation and Electromagnetic Therapy – Considered not medically necessary:

HCPC	Description
------	-------------

Codes	
E0761	Nonthermal pulsed high frequency radiowaves, high peak power electromagnetic energy treatment device
E0769	Electrical stimulation or electromagnetic wound treatment device, not otherwise classified
G0281	Electrical stimulation, (unattended), to one or more areas, for chronic Stage III and Stage IV pressure ulcers, arterial ulcers, diabetic ulcers, and venous stasis ulcers not demonstrating measurable signs of healing after 30 days of conventional care, as part of a therapy plan of care
G0282	Electrical stimulation, (unattended), to one or more areas, for wound care other than described in G0281
G0295	Electromagnetic therapy, to one or more areas, for wound care other than described in G0329 or for other uses
G0329	Electromagnetic therapy, to one or more areas for chronic Stage III and Stage IV pressure ulcers, arterial ulcers, diabetic ulcers and venous stasis ulcers not demonstrating measurable signs of healing after 30 days of conventional care as part of a therapy plan of care

***Note:** Codes may not be all-inclusive. Deleted codes and codes not in effect at the time of service may not be covered.

**To verify authorization requirements for a specific code by plan type, please use the [Pre-authorization Code Check](#).

CPT codes, descriptions and materials are copyrighted by the American Medical Association (AMA). HCPCS codes, descriptions and materials are copyrighted by Centers for Medicare Services (CMS).

Date Created	Date Reviewed	Date Last Revised
11/25/2002	03/02/2010 ^{MDCRPC} , 01/04/2011 ^{MDCRPC} , 11/01/2011 ^{MDCRPC} , 09/04/2012 ^{MDCRPC} , 07/02/2013 ^{MDCRPC} , 05/06/2014 ^{MPC} , 12/02/2014 ^{MPC} , 10/06/2015 ^{MPC} , 08/02/2016 ^{MPC} , 06/06/2017 ^{MPC} , 04/03/2018 ^{MPC} , 04/02/2019 ^{MPC} , 04/07/2020 ^{MPC} , 04/06/2021 ^{MPC} , 04/05/2022 ^{MPC} , 04/04/2023 ^{MPC}	11/22/2023

^{MPC} Medical Policy Committee

Revision History	Description
07/29/2015	Added Medicare language for skin substitutes
10/06/2015	Added new products to indications and non-coverage
08/02/2016	Added new products to the exclusion/non-coverage list
05/02/2017	MPC approved to utilize KP criteria for Skin-Engineered substitutes for Medicare members
01/23/2018	Added the 2018 new HCPC codes Q4176-82
09/27/2018	Added C9360, C9361, C9363, C9364
09/30/2019	Revised skin substitute criteria to meet state mandate requirements
11/05/2019	MPC approved to adopt the revisions to skin substitutes criteria, effective 04/01/2020: specifically updating the list of approved products for diabetic ulcers and venous insufficiency ulcers as directed by the Kaiser Permanente National Surgical Core Group (SCG) and the National Product Council (NPC) as listed in the criteria above
04/07/2020	Added the LCA for Amniotic Derived Skin Substitutes and updated the link to the MLN Matters article on ASC payment for skin substitutes
04/28/2020	Added code Q4195
04/05/2021	Added codes to the "Skin Substitutes - Considered not medically necessary" section
04/06/2021	Removed platelet rich plasma codes as there is a separate criteria page for that service.
04/05/2022	Updated applicable codes. Added LCD/LCA for Wound and Ulcer Care
10/26/2022	Updated applicable codes, including new codes released 01/01/22 and 04/01/22.
03/03/2023	Updated applicable new codes released 10/01/2022 to the "Skin Substitutes- considered not medically necessary" section including HCPC codes A2014, A2015, A2016, A2017, A2018.
03/06/2023	Updated applicable new codes released 07/01/2022 to the "Skin Substitutes- considered not medically necessary" section including HCPC codes Q4259, Q4260, Q4261.
04/18/2023	Updated Medicare Billing and Coding article link A58567 and A53046
11/22/2023	Updated new HCPC codes for Non-Covered Skin Substitutes, effective 7/1/2023.

