FEP 7.01.15 Meniscal Allografts and Other Meniscal Implants

Description

Meniscal allografts and other meniscal implants (e.g., collagen or polyurethane) are intended to improve symptoms and reduce joint degeneration in patients who have had a total or partial meniscus resection.

FDA REGULATORY STATUS

Collagen Meniscus Implants

In 2008, the ReGen Collagen Scaffold was cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process. FDA determined that this device was substantially equivalent to existing absorbable surgical mesh devices. The ReGen Collagen Scaffold (also known as MenaFlex™ CMI) was the only collagen meniscus implant (CMI) with FDA clearance at that time. Amid controversy about this 510(k) clearance decision, FDA reviewed it decision. In October 2010, FDA rescinded the approval, stating that MenaFlex™ is intended for different purposes and is technologically dissimilar from the predicate devices identified in the approval process. The manufacturer appealed the rescission, and won its appeal in 2014. The product, now called CMI®, is manufactured by Ivy Sports Medicine. CMI® is the only FDA-approved collagen meniscus product currently on the market. FDA product code: OLC.

POLICY STATEMENT

Meniscal allograft transplantation may be considered medically necessary in patients who have had a prior meniscectomy and have symptoms related to the affected side, when all of the following criteria are met:

- Adult patients should be too young to be considered an appropriate candidate for total knee arthroplasty or other reconstructive knee surgery (e.g., <55 years)
- Disabling knee pain with activity that is refractory to conservative treatment
- Absence or near absence (>50%) of the meniscus, established by imaging or prior surgery
- Documented minimal to absent diffuse degenerative changes in the surrounding articular cartilage (e.g., Outerbridge grade II or less, <50% joint space narrowing)
- Normal knee biomechanics, or alignment and stability achieved concurrently with meniscal transplantation.

Meniscal allograft transplantation may be considered medically necessary when performed in combination, either concurrently or sequentially, with treatment of focal articular cartilage lesions using any of the following procedures:

- autologous chondrocyte implantation, or
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- osteochondral allografting, or
- osteochondral autografting.

Use of other meniscal implants incorporating materials such as collagen and polyurethane are considered investigational.

**POLICY GUIDELINES**

Patients should exhibit symptoms of persistent disabling knee pain that has not adequately responded to physical therapy and analgesic medications. Uncorrected misalignment and instability of the joint are contraindications. Therefore additional procedures, such as repair of ligaments or tendons or creation of an osteotomy for realignment of the joint, may be performed at the same time.

Severe obesity (e.g., body mass index >35 kg/m²) may affect outcomes due to the increased stress on weight-bearing surfaces of the joint. Meniscal allograft transplantation is typically recommended for young active patients who are too young for total knee arthroplasty.

**BENEFIT APPLICATION**

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

**RATIONALE**

**Summary of Evidence**

For individuals who are undergoing partial meniscectomy who receive meniscal allograft transplantation, the evidence includes systematic reviews of mostly case series and an RCT. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The systematic reviews concluded that most studies have shown statistically significant improvements in pain and function following the procedure. The benefits have also been shown to have a long-term effect (>10 years). Reviews have also reported acceptable complication and failure rates. There remains no evidence that meniscal allograft transplantation can delay or prevent the development of knee osteoarthritis. A limitation of the evidence is its reliance primarily on case series. Because the single RCT, which enrolled a very small number of patients, pooled data from randomized and nonrandomized groups, results cannot be interpreted in a meaningful way. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are undergoing partial meniscectomy and concomitant repair of malalignment, focal chondral defects, and/or ligamentous insufficiency who receive meniscal allograft transplantation, the evidence includes a systematic review of case series as well as case series published after the systematic review. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The systematic review concluded that pain and function improved following the procedure. One of the series published after the review showed that patients with more severe cartilage damage experienced favorable outcomes similar to patients with less cartilage damage. Another series published subsequently reported an overall 9.7-year survival of the implant. A limitation of the evidence is its reliance primarily on case series. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are undergoing partial meniscectomy who receive collagen meniscal implants, the evidence includes 2 systematic reviews primarily of case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The reviews reported overall positive results with the collagen meniscus implant, but the quality of the selected studies (RCTs, observational studies) was low.
Radiologic evaluations have shown reductions in the size of the implant in a large portion of patients. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

International Meniscus Reconstruction Experts Forum
In 2015, the International Meniscus Reconstruction Experts Forum published consensus statements on the practice of meniscal allograft transplantation (MAT) (see Table 1).2 The Forum’s statements included guidance on indications, graft procurement and preparation, surgical technique, and rehabilitation.

Table 1. Select Consensus Statements on the Practice of MAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indications for MAT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unicompartmental pain post-meniscectomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In combination with anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction when meniscus deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In combination with articular cartilage repair if meniscus deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT not recommended for asymptomatic meniscus deficient patient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially poorer outcomes expected in patients with moderate to severe OA (Kellgren-Lawrence grade ≥3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irradiated fresh frozen or fresh viable grafts are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical axis alignment should be performed prior to MAT; if mechanical axis deviation present, consider realignment osteotomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on current evidence, superiority of 1 surgical technique over another (all-suture vs bone) is not established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome scores should include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disease-specific: Western Ontario Meniscal Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region-specific: Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activity: Marx Activity Rating Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of life/utility: EuroQoL 5 dimensions questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT: meniscal allograft transplantation; OA: osteoarthritis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
The 2012 guidance from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence stated that the evidence on “partial replacement of the meniscus of the knee using a biodegradable scaffold raises no major safety concerns,” but evidence for any advantage of the procedure over standard surgery was limited.27

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons
The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons updated its 2009 position in 2014, still recommending MAT for active people younger than 55 years old, with the goal of replacing the meniscus cushion before the articular cartilage is damaged.28 The website also notes that “synthetic (artificial) meniscal tissue has been tried, but there is conflicting information at this time.”

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations
Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage
In 2010, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) issued a national noncoverage determination for the collagen meniscus implant (CMI).29 A number of concerns regarding the efficacy and safety were raised by the CMS analysis, which compared data reported to the Food and Drug Administration and published data. Concerns included an increased number of reoperations and a higher serious adverse event rate than in the control group. CMS concluded that the CMI does not improve
health outcomes in the Medicare population and that CMI is not reasonable and necessary for the treatment of meniscal injury or tear.
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### POLICY HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>New Policy</td>
<td>Policy updated with literature review; references 17, 21-24 added; title and investigational statement changed from “collagen” to “other”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Revise Policy</td>
<td>Policy updated with literature review; adding reference 23. No change to policy statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Revise Policy</td>
<td>Policy updated with literature review through January 28, 2015; Rationale extensively revised; references 9, 16 and 20 added; no change to the policy statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Revise Policy</td>
<td>Policy updated with literature review through February 23, 2017; references 1, 6, 16-17, 19, 27, and 30 added. Policy statements unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>Revise Policy</td>
<td>Policy updated with literature review through February 5, 2018; references 7 and 22 added; note 28 updated. Multiple references were deleted. “Polyurethane” removed from the policy; statements otherwise unchanged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.