



CIGNA MEDICAL COVERAGE POLICY

The following Coverage Policy applies to all plans administered by CIGNA Companies including plans administered by Great-West Healthcare, which is now a part of CIGNA.

Effective Date 12/15/2009
Next Review Date 12/15/2010
Coverage Policy Number 0097

Subject Plantar Fasciitis Treatments

Table of Contents

Coverage Policy	1
General Background	2
Coding/Billing Information	8
References	8
Policy History	12

Hyperlink to Related Coverage Policies

- Acupuncture
- Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy (ESWT) for Musculoskeletal Conditions
- Lower Limb Orthoses and Therapeutic Shoes
- Low-Level Laser Therapy
- Physical Therapy
- Prolotherapy
- Stretch Devices for Joint Stiffness and Contractures
- Tissue-Engineered Skin Substitutes and Growth Factors

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

Coverage Policies are intended to provide guidance in interpreting certain **standard** CIGNA HealthCare benefit plans as well as benefit plans formerly administered by Great-West Healthcare. Please note, the terms of a participant's particular benefit plan document [Group Service Agreement (GSA), Evidence of Coverage, Certificate of Coverage, Summary Plan Description (SPD) or similar plan document] may differ significantly from the standard benefit plans upon which these Coverage Policies are based. For example, a participant's benefit plan document may contain a specific exclusion related to a topic addressed in a Coverage Policy. In the event of a conflict, a participant's benefit plan document **always supercedes** the information in the Coverage Policies. In the absence of a controlling federal or state coverage mandate, benefits are ultimately determined by the terms of the applicable benefit plan document. Coverage determinations in each specific instance require consideration of 1) the terms of the applicable group benefit plan document in effect on the date of service; 2) any applicable laws/regulations; 3) any relevant collateral source materials including Coverage Policies and; 4) the specific facts of the particular situation. Coverage Policies relate exclusively to the administration of health benefit plans. Coverage Policies are not recommendations for treatment and should never be used as treatment guidelines. Proprietary information of CIGNA. Copyright ©2009 CIGNA

Coverage Policy

For information on the use of foot orthoses associated with plantar fasciitis, refer to the CIGNA Coverage Policy Lower Limb Orthoses and Therapeutic Shoes.

CIGNA covers open or endoscopic plantar fasciotomy as medically necessary for the treatment of plantar fasciitis following the failure of six months of appropriate medical therapy.

CIGNA does not cover ANY of the following for the treatment of plantar fasciitis because these interventions are considered experimental, investigational or unproven (this list may not be all-inclusive):

- acupuncture
- autologous platelet injection
- Coblation®
- cryosurgery

- electron-generating devices
 - extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT)
 - laser therapy
 - microwave diathermy
 - radiotherapy
 - stereotactic radiofrequency thermal lesioning
 - trigger-point needling and infiltration of the proximal medial gastrocnemius muscle
-

General Background

Plantar fasciitis is an overuse injury resulting in inflammation of the plantar fascia, which connects the heel to the toes. It is a common cause of heel pain in adults. Symptoms usually start gradually with mild pain at the heel, pain after exercise and pain with standing first thing in the morning. On physical examination, firm pressure will elicit a tender spot over the medial tubercle of the calcaneus. Risk factors for plantar fasciitis may include: obesity, age, being female, limited dorsiflexion of the ankle joint, prolonged weight bearing, and an increase in the amount of walking or running. Heel spurs are not necessarily associated with plantar fasciitis; heel spurs may be found in asymptomatic patients. Early treatment generally results in a shorter duration of symptoms.

First-Line Treatment

The mainstay of nonsurgical treatment and the standard of care for initial treatment is a program of stretching exercises, ice, activity modification, weight loss in overweight patients, recommendations for appropriate footwear, arch taping, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory medications and shock-absorbing shoe inserts or orthoses. Prefabricated orthoses have been shown to be adequate for the majority of patients with various heel pain syndromes. Custom-molded foot orthoses are used when more conservative measures fail (Landorf, et al., 2006; Fink and Mizel, 2001; Pfeffer, et al., 1999). A Cochrane review by Hawke et al. (2008) found custom-made foot orthoses to be a safe intervention in all studies, but it was unclear if these orthoses were effective for plantar fasciitis. For additional information, refer to the CIGNA Lower Limb Orthoses Coverage Policy. These first-line therapies are more likely to be effective if treatment is started early. About 90% of people with plantar fasciitis improve significantly after two months of initial treatment (American Orthopaedic Foot & Ankle Society, 2001).

Iontophoresis is also a widely accepted noninvasive therapy for plantar fasciitis. Iontophoresis is the use of electric impulses from a low-voltage galvanic current stimulation unit to drive topical corticosteroids into soft tissue structures. The effectiveness of iontophoresis combined with traditional modalities has been demonstrated in randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (Osborne and Allison, 2006; Gudeman, et al., 1997). Iontophoresis may be tried as part of a first-line physical therapy program.

Second-Line Treatment

In the event early treatment fails, night splints, steroidal anti-inflammatory injections or a walking cast are the next level of the standard of care.

A night dorsiflexion splint allows passive stretching of the calf and the plantar fascia during sleep. In theory, it also allows healing to occur while the plantar fascia is in an elongated position, thereby creating less tension with the first step in the morning. A night splint can be molded from plaster or fiberglass casting material or may be a prefabricated plastic brace (Young, et al., 2001). A number of studies support the efficacy of night splints (Roos, et al., 2006; Crawford and Thomson, 2003; Barry, et al., 2002; Berlet, et al., 2002; Powell, 1998).

Evidence on the effectiveness of steroid injections in reducing pain in patients with plantar fasciitis includes a systematic review of randomized and quasi-randomized controlled trials (Crawford and Thomson, 2003). In general, the studies that compared steroid injections with placebo substances showed initial significant improvement; however, studies that included follow-up after one month showed no difference in outcome at that time. This suggests that the effectiveness of steroid injections is short-term. Risks of steroid injection into the heel include rupture of the plantar fascia and fat pad atrophy.

The use of a short-leg walking cast for several weeks is a standard of care as a final conservative step in the treatment of plantar fasciitis.

Surgical Intervention

Surgical intervention should be considered only for intractable pain which has not responded to 6–12 months of proper conservative treatment. Plantar fasciotomy can be conducted using open or endoscopic techniques. Endoscopic plantar fasciotomy is a less invasive technique requiring an incision of less than one-half inch in length and utilizing an arthroscope to visualize and release the fascia. It has been proposed as an improvement over open plantar fasciotomy, resulting in less trauma and improved recovery times. There are a substantial number of retrospective studies supporting the use of endoscopic plantar fasciotomy. Based on the large number of reports of relief of heel pain from a series of nonrandomized trials, endoscopic plantar fasciotomy appears effective in the treatment of plantar fasciitis (Urovitz, et al., 2008, Boyle and Slater, 2003; O'Malley, et al., 2000; Lundeen, et al., 2000; Benton-Weil, et al., 1998).

Unproven Therapies for Plantar Fasciitis

There are many therapies that have been suggested for treatment of plantar fasciitis that are not proven in the literature and not accepted as standard of care.

Acupuncture: Acupuncture is a method of producing analgesia or treating disease by stimulating anatomical locations on the skin by the penetration of needles. There are no studies specific to its efficacy in the treatment of plantar fasciitis. The overall body of evidence in general is of poor quality, consisting of numerous uncontrolled studies, case series and case reports. There is no evidence that supports the efficacy of acupuncture for the treatment of plantar fasciitis.

Autologous Platelet Injections: The use of autologous platelet concentrate to accelerate soft and hard tissue healing has been investigated in the medical literature. In addition to hard and soft tissue wound healing, purported benefits of this treatment include reduced inflammation, decreased blood loss, and reduced postoperative narcotic requirements. Several centrifuges are designed to concentrate platelet-enriched plasma from small amounts of autologous blood at the point of care. The platelet concentrate is then combined with other substances to form a gel for patient application. Outcomes have been documented using autologous platelet injection for lateral epicondylitis. More recently, autologous platelet injection has been proposed as a treatment for plantar fasciitis.

Lee and Ahmad (2007) conducted a prospective, randomized, controlled, observer-blinded study (n=64) to compare the efficacy of intralesional autologous blood with corticosteroid injection for plantar fasciitis. Data were complete for 61 patients, 30 patients in the autologous blood group and 31 patients in the corticosteroid group. Over the six-month follow-up period, a significant reduction in pain levels was noted in both groups ($p < 0.0001$). At six months after treatment, patients who had received the corticosteroid injection had lower average levels of pain than those who had received the autologous blood injection, but the difference was not significant ($p = 0.094$). Acknowledged limitations of this study include its short-term follow-up and the lack of a control group that would show the natural history of the disease without intervention.

Kiter et al. (2006) evaluated the efficacy of autologous platelet injection for plantar fasciitis in an RCT (n=45). The 45 patients were treated for heel pain using either the peppering technique (n=15), autologous blood injection (n=15) or corticosteroid injection (n=15). In the peppering technique group, after infiltration of one milliliter (ml) of 2% prilocaine, the needle was inserted, withdrawn and redirected 10–15 times without emerging from the skin. At six-month follow-up, clinical improvement was evaluated using a VAS. Improvements in VAS scores were reported to be 68%, 68% and 65% for the peppering technique, autologous blood injection and corticosteroid injection groups, respectively. Larger, well-designed RCTs are needed to further define the role of autologous blood injection in the treatment for plantar fasciitis.

There is insufficient evidence in the published peer-reviewed medical literature to support the use of autologous blood injection for the treatment of plantar fasciitis.

Coblation®: Coblation, also referred to as cold or controlled ablation, has recently been proposed as a therapy for plantar fasciitis. Coblation bipolar technology uses radiofrequency energy to excite the electrolytes in a conductive medium, such as saline solution, creating precisely focused plasma. The plasma particles are then able to break molecular bonds within tissue, causing the tissue to dissolve at relatively low temperatures. It is

theorized that this plasma radiofrequency-based microsurgery may promote an angiogenic healing response. Because the current does not pass directly through tissue, there is minimal thermal injury to any surrounding tissues.

Coblation technology can be delivered via a number of different wands, hand pieces and other electrosurgical systems. The ArthroCare Topaz™ MicroDebrider™ (ArthroCare Corporation, Sunnyvale, CA) was granted marketing approval by the FDA via the 510(k) process on March 5, 2006, because it is considered to be substantially equivalent to another device already on the market. The 510(k) summary stated that the orthopedic system is substantially equivalent to the ArthroCare Topaz™ ArthroWands. Under the FDA 510(k) approval process, the manufacturer is not required to supply to the FDA evidence of the effectiveness of the Topaz MicroDebrider prior to marketing the device. According to the FDA, the Topaz MicroDebrider is indicated for debridement, resection, ablation, and coagulation of soft tissues and hemostasis of blood vessels in orthopedic and arthroscopic procedures.

A prospective, double-blind RCT (n=80) to evaluate the effectiveness of Coblation-based fasciotomy using the Topaz MicroDebrider is currently underway. The primary outcome measure for this study will be pain relief. Secondary outcomes will include a comparison of postoperative complications and an assessment of function and quality of life by the SF-36 questionnaire. There were no studies identified in the published peer-reviewed literature that assess the effectiveness of Coblation-based fasciotomy for relieving pain associated with plantar fasciitis. Therefore, Coblation technology for this indication is unproven at present.

Cryosurgery: Cryosurgery is a minimally invasive procedure that involves the use of extreme cold to destroy abnormal tissue. There is a paucity of studies investigating the efficacy of cryosurgery for the treatment of recalcitrant plantar fasciitis in the peer-reviewed medical literature. A retrospective case series (n=137) by Cavazos et al. (2009) reported success and failure rates of 77.4% and 22.6%, respectively for chronic plantar fasciitis patients treated with cryosurgery. A mean pain score decreased from 7.6 before cryosurgery to 1.1 ($p < 0.0005$) at 24 months of follow-up. This study is limited by its retrospective, uncontrolled design.

Allen and colleagues (2007) utilized cryosurgery for 59 consecutive patients (61 heels) who had failed prior conservative therapy and were considered surgical candidates. Study results suggested that pain decreased significantly after the procedure ($p < .0001$). However, the nonrandomized design and small sample size of this study decrease its generalizability.

Based on the lack of published data, cryosurgery is considered unproven for the treatment of plantar fasciitis.

Electron-Generating Devices: There is no evidence to support the use of electron generating devices in the treatment of plantar fasciitis (Crawford and Thomson, 2003).

Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy (ESWT): ESWT, also called orthotripsy, is a noninvasive treatment that involves delivery of 1000–3000 shock waves to the painful heel region, and has been introduced as an alternative to surgery for patients with chronic plantar fasciitis that has not responded to medical therapy. The mechanism by which ESWT might work to relieve pain associated with plantar fasciitis is unknown. It has been hypothesized that the shock waves may reduce transmission of pain signals from sensory nerves in the plantar fascia, and/or may stimulate healing (Huang, et al., 2000).

A number of ESWT devices for the treatment of plantar fasciitis are currently approved by the U.S. FDA including the OssaTron® lithotripter (HealthTronics, Marietta, GA); the Epos™ Ultra high-energy device (Dornier Medical Systems, Germering, Germany); the Orthospec™ (Medispec, Ltd, Germantown, MD); the Orbasone Pain Relief System (Orthometrix, Inc., White Plains, NY); and the EMS Swiss Dolorclast® (Electro Medical Systems [EMS], North Attleboro, MA).

Literature Review: The evidence evaluating the effectiveness of ESWT for the treatment of plantar fasciitis consists of RCTs, technology assessments, systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Different treatment protocols and success criteria have been utilized between studies. Varying success rates of 34% –88% have been reported. The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) issued a guidance on the use of ESWT for refractory plantar fasciitis. According to NICE, a review of the evidence raises no major safety concerns; however, current evidence on the efficacy of ESWT for this indication is inconsistent. Therefore, the

procedure should only be used with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent and audit or research (NICE, 2009b).

In a retrospective review (n=225), Chuckpaiwong et al. (2008) reported a success rate of 77.2% at 12-months of follow-up for plantar fasciitis patients treated with high-energy ESWT. The presence of diabetes mellitus, psychological issues, and older age were found to negatively influence ESWT outcome. The study is limited by its retrospective design, lack of a control group and short-term follow-up.

A small RCT by Greve et al. (2009) compared radial shockwave treatment (n=16) and conventional physiotherapy (n=16) for plantar fasciitis. Shockwave treatment was found to be no more effective than conventional physiotherapy treatment when evaluated three months after the end of treatment.

Gerdesmeyer et al. (2008) compared radial ESWT (n=129) to placebo (n=122) for chronic plantar fasciitis in an RCT. Radial ESWT was followed by a decrease of the composite score of heel pain by 72.1% compared to 44.7% after placebo (p=0.0220). An overall success rate of 61.0% was reported for those who received radial ESWT compared to 42.2% for patients in the placebo group (p=0.0020) at 12 weeks. At 12 months of follow-up, results indicated that there was statistically significant improvement for the radial ESWT group (n=112) versus the placebo group (n=116) in the scores evaluating quality of life and function (p < 0.025).

Chow and Cheing (2007) conducted an RCT (n=57) to compare the effectiveness of different energy densities of ESWT for managing chronic heel pain. Patients were randomized into one of three groups receiving either a fixed energy density (n=19), a maximum tolerable energy density (n=19), or control treatment once a week for three weeks (n=19). At three-week follow-up, outcome measures were most improved for the maximum tolerable energy density group. The control group had no significant changes in any outcome measures. Study limitations include the small sample size and short-term follow-up.

Wang et al. (2006) conducted a prospective RCT of 149 patients (168 heels) with chronic plantar fasciitis. The shock wave group (n=79) received high-energy ESWT to the affected heel in a single session. Patients in the control group (n=70) received conservative treatment consisting of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, orthotics, physical therapy, an exercise program, and/or a local cortisone injection. Follow-up occurred at 34–64 months for the control group and 60–72 months for the treatment group. After treatment, the shock wave group showed significantly better pain and function scores compared to the control group (p< 0.001). No complications or device-related problems were reported. Acknowledged weaknesses of the study include lack of treatment standardization in the control group and the lack of a sham procedure in the study design (Wang, et al., 2006).

The ECRI Institute issued an evidence report on the use of ESWT for the treatment of plantar fasciitis in 2006. The evidence included RCTs (n=13) and case series (n=7) with a total of 2,233 patients. Only four trials that used a single high-energy treatment met inclusion criteria for the analysis. Study results indicated that patients treated with a single session of high energy ESWT had less pain on the first few steps in the morning than patients given a sham treatment. No evidence-based conclusion could be reached by ECRI as to whether patients treated with a course of low or medium energy ESWT had less, more, or the same amount of pain than patients given a sham treatment. It was summarized that ESWT is a safe procedure that may provide some relief from the pain of chronic plantar fasciitis; however, the degree of pain relief may not be clinically significant (ECRI, 2006).

A number of RCTs (n=45–272) have compared ESWT to placebo for the treatment of plantar fasciitis with conflicting results. A greater reduction in heel pain for patients treated with ESWT has been reported in some studies (Kudo, et al., 2006; Malay, et al., 2006; Theodore, et al., 2004; Rompe, et al., 2003), while similar improvement rates for both treatment and placebo groups have been reported in other studies (Haake, et al., 2003; Buchbinder, et al., 2002). In general, these studies have limitations such as small sample sizes and short-term follow-up that limit the generalizability of their results.

Technology Assessments: A technology assessment of RCTs evaluating the safety and efficacy of ESWT for the treatment of chronic plantar fasciitis was performed for the Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH). Ho (2007) concluded “the lack of convergent findings from these randomized trials of ESWT for plantar fasciitis suggests uncertainty about its effectiveness. The evidence reviewed does not support the use of this technology for this condition” (Ho, 2007).

A technology assessment by the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC) found the available evidence to be insufficient to permit a conclusion on the health outcome effects of ESWT for plantar fasciitis (Blue Cross Blue Shield Association TEC, 2005).

Systematic Reviews/Meta-analyses: A systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs by Thomson et al. (2005) was statistically significant in favor of ESWT for the treatment of plantar heel pain, but the effect size was very small. A sensitivity analysis including only the four trials of highest quality did not produce evidence of a statistically significant benefit (Thomson, et al., 2005).

A Cochrane review of RCTs by Crawford and Thomson (2003) found the effectiveness of ESWT for plantar fasciitis to be unclear. There was some indirect evidence found to indicate that patients' heel pain improves spontaneously regardless of their treatment allocation, demonstrating that the condition is self-limiting.

Ogden et al. (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of RCTs (n=8) evaluating the effectiveness of ESWT for plantar fasciitis (n=840). Success rates for five studies using low-energy shock waves ranged from 58–88%. For the three studies that utilized high-energy shock waves, the success rates ranged from 81–87%.

For additional information, refer to the CIGNA Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy for Musculoskeletal Conditions Coverage Policy.

Insoles with Magnetic Foil: The theory behind magnet therapy is that magnetic fields create an electrical current that interrupts the transmission of pain signals in the central nervous system as well as increasing blood flow to an area, boosting the flow of oxygen and other nutrients, ultimately reducing pain and swelling. Two RCTs comparing magnetic versus sham insoles for reducing pain have demonstrated that there is no difference between the therapies in patients with plantar fasciitis (Winemiller, et al., 2003; Caselli, et al., 1997). The limited evidence found in the published peer-reviewed literature does not support the use of magnetic insoles for the treatment of plantar fasciitis.

For additional information, refer to the CIGNA Lower Limb Orthoses Coverage Policy.

Laser Therapy: Laser therapy, also called low-level laser therapy (LLLT) is a form of phototherapy which involves the application of low-power monochromatic and coherent light to injuries and lesions to stimulate healing. LLLT is used to increase the speed, quality and tensile strength of tissue repair, resolve inflammation, and give pain relief.

In a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial (n=25), Kiritsi et al. (2009) compared the effect of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) (n=15) versus placebo (n=10) on plantar fasciitis. Outcomes were documented by ultrasound of the plantar fascia and reported pain scores. Enrolled patients had unilateral plantar fasciitis, so the contralateral asymptomatic fascia was used as control. Pain levels were reported to be significantly improved after LLLT compared to the placebo group (i.e., after night rest [p=0.006], with daily activities [p=0.01]). The small sample size of this study limits the generalizability of results.

Basford et al. (1998) conducted a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled clinical study of 32 subjects comparing dummy versus active laser therapy over four weeks using relief of pain as the endpoint. No significant differences were found between the groups in pain scores either during treatment or at one-month follow-up.

The available data regarding the efficacy of laser therapy for the treatment of plantar fasciitis is limited.

Microwave Diathermy: Microwave diathermy uses microwave radiation to create heat within the tissues. There is no evidence supporting the efficacy of this modality in the treatment of plantar fasciitis (Crawford and Thomson, 2003).

Radiotherapy: Radiotherapy for plantar fasciitis treatment has been well-established in Germany for about 100 years. The exact radiobiological mechanisms of the effect of ionizing radiation on plantar fasciitis have been incompletely investigated and understood.

Miszczyk et al. (2007) evaluated the effectiveness of radiotherapy and assessed the impact of fraction dose (fd) compared to total dose (TD) in the treatment of 856 patients with plantar fasciitis. Outcome measures included pain relief level, period of anesthetic effect preservation after treatment, presence of pain and the timing of its appearance, and analgesia use. Complete follow-up data were available for 327 patients. The mean follow-up period was 74 months. After treatment, a lack of pain was reported by 48% of the patients. Pain relief greater than 50% was reported by 21% of patients and 17% reported pain relief less than 50%. The mean pain relief duration was 72 months. The last follow-up, 25% of these patients reported having pain at rest and 32% had pain while walking. A dose-effect relationship was not found. This study is limited by its retrospective, nonrandomized design and loss to follow-up.

In 2001, the Patterns of Care Study in Benign Diseases Panel of the German Society for Radiation Oncology distributed a standardized questionnaire to all radiotherapy departments in Germany to determine their experience with radiotherapy for plantar fasciitis (Micke, et al., 2004). The records of 7947 patients were prospectively evaluated over a median follow-up period of 28 months for reduction in pain scores. Several different types of equipment and doses of radiation were utilized among the centers. No dose-response relationship could be established. Complete relief of pain for more than three months was reported in a median of 70% of all treated patients, and pain relief lasting a minimum of 12 months was reported in 65% of patients. No statistical analysis of the significance of these percentages was reported.

Further research is needed to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of radiotherapy for the treatment of plantar fasciitis.

Stereotactic Radiofrequency Thermal Lesioning: Stereotactic radiofrequency thermal lesioning, or radiofrequency lesioning, is a minimally invasive procedure, in which a probe the size of a needle is placed through the skin in the heel in the area of pain. While the patient is under intravenous (IV) sedation, the tip of the probe heats up to 87° Celsius (189° Fahrenheit), and is kept there for 90 seconds. The proposed mechanism of action is desensitization of the nerve endings. In a retrospective study of 39 patients, Sollitto et al. (1997) found that 92% of patients experience resolution of symptoms. This study is limited by the lack of a control group and randomization; a more rigorous design is needed.

Trigger-Point Needling and Infiltration: Trigger-point needling for plantar fasciitis is the needling and infiltration of anesthetic into the myofascial trigger points at the proximal portion of the medial gastrocnemius muscle. Imamura et al. (2003) conducted a randomized, controlled study of 64 subjects comparing conventional physical therapy to physical therapy plus injection of 1% lidocaine to the taut band at the proximal portion of the medial gastrocnemius muscle of the involved limb. Statistically significant reduction of pain and improvement in function were found in both groups without difference between them. However, the time required to achieve the same improvement was significantly less in the injected group than in the control group. Post-injection soreness and local hematoma were found in 30% of the patients receiving trigger-point needling. Additional studies are needed to support the effectiveness of this therapy.

Professional Societies/Organizations

In a joint policy statement, the American Podiatric Medical Association (APMA) and the American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons (ACFAS) acknowledge that ESWT is one of the many procedures used to treat plantar fasciitis. In addition to the clinical trials used for FDA approval of the Ossatron and Dornier Epos Ultra devices, the societies presented a review of seven studies in their document. Despite the limited evidence from relatively small studies, few randomized trials, and conflicting results identified in the literature, the APMA/ACFAS concluded that "ESWT appears to be an efficacious, FDA-approved, non-surgical option in the treatment of chronic proximal plantar fasciitis" (APMA/ ACFAS, 2003).

Summary

Conservative first- and second-line treatments for plantar fasciitis are most often successful. For those who fail medical management, plantar fasciotomy or plantar fascia release may be considered. A number of unproven treatment modalities have been proposed for plantar fasciitis, the most controversial of which is extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT). Although promising, the evidence in the published peer-reviewed literature regarding the efficacy of ESWT remains inconclusive at this time.

Coding/Billing Information

Note: This list of codes may not be all-inclusive.

Covered when medically necessary:

CPT ^{®*} Codes	Description
28008	Fasciotomy, foot and/or toe
29893	Endoscopic plantar fasciotomy

ICD-9-CM Diagnosis Codes	Description
	Multiple/Varied codes

Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered when used for the treatment of plantar fasciitis:

CPT* Codes	Description
20552	Injection(s); single or multiple trigger point(s), one or two muscle(s)
20553	Injection(s); single or multiple trigger point(s), three or more muscle(s)
28890	Extracorporeal shock wave, high energy, performed by a physician, requiring anesthesia other than local, including ultrasound guidance, involving the plantar fascia
97024	Application of a modality to one or more areas; diathermy (eg, microwave)
97810	Acupuncture, one or more needles; without electrical stimulation, initial 15 minutes of personal one-on-one contact with the patient
97811	Acupuncture, one or more needles; without electrical stimulation, initial 15 minutes of personal one-on-one contact with the patient, with re-insertion of needle(s)
97813	Acupuncture, one or more needles; with electrical stimulation, initial 15 minutes of personal one-on-one contact with the patient
97814	Acupuncture, one or more needles; with electrical stimulation; initial 15 minutes of personal one-on-one contact with the patient, with re-insertion of needle(s)
0019T	Extracorporeal shock wave involving musculoskeletal system, not otherwise specified, low energy
0101T	Extracorporeal shock wave involving musculoskeletal system, not otherwise specified, high energy
	Multiple/Varied codes

ICD-9-CM Diagnosis Codes	Description
728.71	Plantar fascial fibromatosis

*Current Procedural Terminology (CPT[®]) © 2008 American Medical Association: Chicago, IL.

References

1. Allen BH, Fallat LM, Schwartz SM. Cryosurgery: an innovative technique for the treatment of plantar fasciitis. J Foot Ankle Surg. 2007 Mar-Apr;46(2):75-9.
2. American Orthopaedic Foot & Ankle Society. Plantar Fasciitis. Updated April 2001. Accessed Apr 1, 2004. Available at URL address: http://www.orthoinfo.aaos.org/fact/thr_report.cfm?Thread_ID=144&topcategory=Foot

3. American Podiatric Medical Association (APMA)/American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons (ACFAS). APMA and ACFAS Joint Policy Statement on Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy. December, 2003. Accessed May 10, 2006. Available at URL address: http://www.acfas.org/NR/rdonlyres/17CA33BD-A58B-40CB-9674-1392E7890076/0/ESWT_APMA_ACFASPolicyFinal_12_8_2003.pdf
4. Barry LD, Barry AN, Chen Y. A retrospective study of standing gastrocnemius-soleus stretching versus night splinting in the treatment of plantar fasciitis. *J Foot ankle Surg.* 2002 Jul-Aug;41(4):221-227.
5. Basford JR, Malanga GA, Krause DA, Harmse WS. A randomized controlled evaluation of low-intensity laser therapy: plantar fasciitis. *Arch Phys Med Rehab.* 1998 Mar;79(3):49-254.
6. Berlet GC, Anderson RB, Davis H, Kiebzak GM. A prospective trial of night splinting in the treatment of recalcitrant plantar fasciitis: the Ankle Dorsiflexion Dynasplint. *Orthopedics.* 2002 Nov;25(11):1273-1275.
7. Benton-Weil W, Borrelli AH, Weil LS Jr, Weil LS Sr. Percutaneous plantar fasciotomy: a minimally invasive procedure for recalcitrant plantar fasciitis. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 1998 Jul-Aug;37(4):269-272.
8. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, Technology Evaluation Center. Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy (ESWT) for Chronic Plantar Fasciitis. Technology assessment. 2005 Mar. Accessed May 10, 2006. Available at URL address: http://www.bcbs.com/tec/Vol19/19_18.pdf
9. Boyle RA, Slater GL. Endoscopic plantar fascia release: a case series. *Foot Ankle Int.* 2003 Feb;24(2):176-179.
10. Buchbinder R. Plantar fasciitis. *N Engl J Med.* 2004 May 20;350(21):2159-2166.
11. Buchbinder R, Ptaszik, Gordon J, Buchman J, Prabakaran V, Forbes A. Ultrasound-guided extracorporeal shock wave therapy for plantar fasciitis. *JAMA.* 2002;288(11):1364-1372.
12. California Technology Assessment Forum (CTAF). Extracorporeal Shock-wave Therapy (ESWT) for Plantar Fasciitis not Responding to Conservative Therapy. June 20, 2007. Accessed Jun 5, 2009, Available at URL address: <http://www.ctaf.org/content/assessment/detail/739>
13. Caselli MA, Clark N, Lazarus S, Velez Z, Venegas L. Evaluation of magnetic foil and PPT Insoles in the treatment of heel pain. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc.* 1997 Jan;87(1):1-16.
14. Cavazos GJ, Khan KH, D'Antoni AV, Harkless LB, Lopez D. Cryosurgery for the treatment of heel pain. *Foot Ankle Int.* 2009 Jun;30(6):500-5.
15. Chuckpaiwong B, Berkson EM, Theodore GH. Extracorporeal shock wave for chronic proximal plantar fasciitis: 225 patients with results and outcome predictors. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2009 Mar-Apr;48(2):148-55. Epub 2009 Jan 9.
16. Crawford F, Thomson C. Interventions for treating plantar heel pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2003;(3):CD000416.
17. ECRI Institute. Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy for the Treatment of Plantar Fasciitis. Plymouth Meeting (PA): ECRI Institute Health Technology Assessment Information Service; 2006 November. 109 p. (Evidence Report; no. 140). Available at URL address: <http://www.ecri.org>.
18. Fink B, Mizel M. What's new in foot and ankle surgery. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2001;83-A(5):791-796.
19. Furia JP. High-energy extracorporeal shock wave therapy as a treatment for insertional Achilles tendinopathy. *Am J Sports Med.* 2006 May;34(5):733-40.

20. Gerdesmeyer L, Frey C, Vester J, Maier M, Weil L Jr, Weil L Sr, et al. Radial extracorporeal shock wave therapy is safe and effective in the treatment of chronic recalcitrant plantar fasciitis: results of a confirmatory randomized placebo-controlled multicenter study. *Am J Sports Med.* 2008 Nov;36(11):2100-9. Epub 2008 Oct 1.
21. Gollwitzer H, Diehl P, von Korff A, Rahlfs VW, Gerdesmeyer L. Extracorporeal shock wave therapy for chronic painful heel syndrome: a prospective, double blind, randomized trial assessing the efficacy of a new electromagnetic shock wave device. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2007 Sep-Oct;46(5):348-57.
22. Greve JM, Grecco MV, Santos-Silva PR. Comparison of radial shockwaves and conventional physiotherapy for treating plantar fasciitis. *Clinics (Sao Paulo).* 2009;64(2):97-103.
23. Gudeman SD, Eisele SA, Heidt RS Jr, Colosimo AJ, Stroupe AL. Treatment of plantar fasciitis by Iontophoresis of 0.4% dexamethasone. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Am J Sports Med.* 1997 May-June;25(3):312-316.
24. Haake M, Buch M, Shoellner C. Extracorporeal shock wave therapy for plantar fasciitis: randomized controlled multicenter trial. *BMJ.* 2003;327(7406):75.
25. Hawke F, Burns J, Radford JA, du Toit V. Custom-made foot orthoses for the treatment of foot pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2008 Jul 16;(3):CD006801
26. Ho C. Extracorporeal shock wave treatment for chronic plantar fasciitis (heel pain). *Issues Emerg Health Technol.* 2007 Jan;(96 (part 1)):1-4.
27. Huang HH, Oureshi AA, Biundo JJ Jr. Sports and other soft tissue injuries, tendonitis, bursitis, and occupation-related syndromes. *Curr Opin Rheumatol.* 2000;12:150-154.
28. Imamura M, Imamura S, De Carvalho AE Jr, Mazagao RA, Casisus DA, Fischer AA. Plantar fasciitis: A new treatment approach. *Arch Phys Med.* 2003 Sep;84(9):E4.
29. Kiritsi O, Tsitas K, Malliaropoulos N, Mikroulis G. Ultrasonographic evaluation of plantar fasciitis after low-level laser therapy: results of a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Lasers Med Sci.* 2009 Oct 20. [Epub ahead of print]
30. Kiter E, Celikbas E, Akkaya S, Demirkan F, Kilic BA. Comparison of injection modalities in the treatment of plantar heel pain: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc.* 2006 Jul-Aug;96(4):293-6.
31. Krischek O, Rompe JD, Herbsthofer B, Nafe B. Symptomatic low-energy shockwave therapy in heel pain and radiologically detected plantar heel spur. *Orthop Ihre Grenzgeb.* 1998 Mar-Apr;136(2):169-174.
32. Landorf KB, Keenan AM, Herbert RD. Effectiveness of different types of foot orthoses for the treatment of plantar fasciitis. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc.* 2004 Nov-Dec;94(6):542-9.
33. Landorf KB, Keenan AM, Herbert RD. Effectiveness of foot orthoses to treat plantar fasciitis: a randomized trial. *Arch Intern Med.* 2006 Jun 26;166(12):1305-10.
34. Lee TG, Ahmad TS. Intralesional autologous blood injection compared to corticosteroid injection for treatment of chronic plantar fasciitis. A prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *Foot Ankle Int.* 2007 Sep;28(9):984-90.
35. Lundeen RO, Aziz S, Burks JB, Rose JM. Endoscopic plantar fasciotomy; a retrospective analysis of results in 53 patients. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2000 Jul-Aug;39(4):208-217.
36. McPoil TG, Martin RL, Cornwall MW, Wukich DK, Irrgang JJ, Godges JJ. Heel pain--plantar fasciitis: clinical practice guidelines linked to the international classification of function, disability, and health from

the orthopaedic section of the American Physical Therapy Association. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2008 Apr;38(4):A1-A18. Epub 2008 Mar 31.

37. Micke O, Seegenschmiedt MH. Radiotherapy in painful heel spurs (plantar fasciitis): results of a national patterns of care study. *Int J Radiation Oncology Biol Phys.* 2004;58(3):828-843.
38. Miszczyk L, Jochymek B, Wozniak G. Retrospective evaluation of radiotherapy in plantar fasciitis. *Br J Radiol.* 2007 Oct;80(958):829-34. Epub 2007 Sep 17.
39. Moeller JL, Hutchinson MR. Orthopedics. In: *Rakel: Textbook of Family Medicine*, 7th ed. Saunders 2007.
40. National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). Interventional procedure overview of extracorporeal shockwave therapy for refractory plantar fasciitis. April 2009a. Accessed November 6, 2009. Available at URL address: <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/index.jsp?action=download&o=43959>
41. National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). Extracorporeal shockwave therapy for refractory plantar fasciitis. Guidance. August 2009b. Accessed November 6, 2009. Available at URL address: <http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/pdf/IPG311Guidance.pdf>
42. Ogden JA, Alvarez R, Levitt R, Cross GL, Marlow M. Shock wave therapy for chronic proximal plantar fasciitis. *Clin Orthop Rel Res.* 2001;387:47-59.
43. O'Malley J|MJ, Page A, Cook R. Endoscopic plantar fasciotomy for chronic heel pain. *Foot Ankle Int.* 2000 Jun;21(6):505-510.
44. Osborne HR, Allison GT. Treatment of plantar fasciitis by LowDye taping and iontophoresis: short term results of a double blinded, randomised, placebo controlled clinical trial of dexamethasone and acetic acid. *Br J Sports Med.* 2006 Jun;40(6):545-9; discussion 549. Epub 2006 Feb 17.
45. Pfeffer G, Bacchetti P, Deland J, Lewis A, Anderson R, Davis W. et al. Comparison of custom and prefabricated orthoses in the initial treatment of proximal plantar fasciitis. *Foot Ankle Int.* 1999 Apr;20(4):214-221.
46. Porter MD, Shadbolt B. Intralesional corticosteroid injection versus extracorporeal shock wave therapy for plantar fasciopathy. *Clin J Sport Med.* 2005 May;15(3):119-24.
47. Powell M, Post WR, Keener J, Wearden S. Effective treatment of chronic plantar fasciitis with dorsiflexion night splints: a crossover prospective randomized outcome study. *Foot Ankle Int.* 1998 Jan;19(1):10-18.
48. Probe RA, Baca M, Adams R, Preece C. Night splint treatment for plantar fasciitis. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research.* 1999;368:190-195.
49. Rompe JD, Hopf C, Nafe B, Burger R. Low-energy extracorporeal shock wave therapy for painful heel: a prospective controlled single-blind study. *Orthop Trauma Surg.* 1996;115(2):75-79.
50. Rompe JD, Schoellner, Carsten MD, Nafe B. Evaluation of Low-Energy Extracorporeal Shock Wave Application for Treatment of Chronic Plantar Fasciitis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2002 Mar;84-A (3):335-341.
51. Rompe JD, Furia J, Weil L, Maffulli N. Shock wave therapy for chronic plantar fasciopathy. *Br Med Bull.* 2007;81-82:183-208. Epub 2007 Apr 24.
52. Roos E, Engstrom M, Soderberg B. Foot orthoses for the treatment of plantar fasciitis. *Foot Ankle Int.* 2006 Aug;27(8):606-11.

53. Seil R, Wilmes P, Nuhrenborger C. Extracorporeal shock wave therapy for tendinopathies. *Expert Rev Med Devices*. 2006 Jul;3(4):463-70.
54. Sollitto RJ, Plotkin EL, Klein PG, Mullin P. Early clinical results of the use of radiofrequency lesioning in the treatment of plantar fasciitis. *J Foot Ankle Surg*. 1997 May-Jun;36(3):215-219.
55. Stuber K, Kristmanson K. Conservative therapy for plantar fasciitis: a narrative review of randomized controlled trials. *JCCA J Can Chiropr Assoc*. 2006 Jun;50(2):118-33.
56. Theodore GH, Buch M, Amendola A, Bachmann C, Fleming LL, Zingas C. Extracorporeal shock wave therapy for the treatment of plantar fasciitis. *Foot Ankle Int*. 2004 May;25(5):290-7.
57. Tice JA. Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy for Musculoskeletal Disorders. California Technology Assessment Forum (CTAF). June 9, 2004. Accessed May 10, 2006. Available at URL address: http://www.ctaf.org/content/assessments_pdf/32362336391_ESWT%2004%20final.pdf
58. Urovitz EP, Birk-Urovitz A, Birk-Urovitz E. Endoscopic plantar fasciotomy in the treatment of chronic heel pain. *Can J Surg*. 2008 Aug;51(4):281-3.
59. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Ossatron® Premarket Approval (PMA). Accessed May 20, 2005. Available at URL address: <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/pdf/p990086b.pdf>
60. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). ArthroCare Topaz™ ArthroWands. 510(k) Summary. Accessed May 12, 2007. Available at URL address: <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/pdf5/K053567.pdf>
61. Wilner JM, Strash WW. Extracorporeal shockwave therapy for plantar fasciitis and other musculoskeletal conditions utilizing the Ossatron--an update. *Clin Podiatr Med Surg*. 2004 Jul;21(3):441-7, viii.
62. Winemiller MH, Billow RG, Laskowski ER, Harmsen WS. Effect of magnetic vs sham-magnetic insoles on plantar heel pain. *JAMA*. 2003 Sep 17;290(11):1474-1479.
63. Young C, Rutherford D, Niedfeldt M. Treatment of plantar fasciitis. *Am Fam Physician*. 2001;63(3):467-474.

Policy History

<u>Pre-Merger Organizations</u>	<u>Last Review Date</u>	<u>Policy Number</u>	<u>Title</u>
CIGNA HealthCare	6/15/2008	0097	Plantar Fasciitis Treatments

"CIGNA" and the "Tree of Life" logo are registered service marks of CIGNA Intellectual Property, Inc., licensed for use by CIGNA Corporation and its operating subsidiaries. All products and services are provided exclusively by such operating subsidiaries and not by CIGNA Corporation. Such operating subsidiaries include Connecticut General Life Insurance Company, CIGNA Behavioral Health, Inc., Intracorp, and HMO or service company subsidiaries of CIGNA Health Corporation and CIGNA Dental Health, Inc. In Arizona, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare of Arizona, Inc. In California, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare of California, Inc. and Great-West Healthcare of California, Inc. In Connecticut, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare of Connecticut, Inc. In North Carolina, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare of North Carolina, Inc. In Virginia, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare Mid-Atlantic, Inc. All other medical plans in these states are insured or administered by Connecticut General Life Insurance Company.

Connecticut General Life Insurance Company has acquired the business of Great-West Healthcare from Great-West Life & Annuity Insurance Company (GWLA). Certain products continue to be provided by GWLA (Life, Accident and Disability, and Excess Loss). GWLA is not licensed to do business in New York. In New York, these products are sold by GWLA's subsidiary, First Great-West Life & Annuity Insurance Company, White Plains, N.Y.