

## Clinical Policy: Mechanical Stretching Devices for Joint Stiffness and Contracture

Reference Number: LA.CP.MP.144

Date of Last Revision: 2/221/23

Coding Implications

Revision Log

See [Important Reminder](#) at the end of this policy for important regulatory and legal information.

### Description

Mechanical stretching devices are used for the prevention and treatment of joint contractures of the extremities, with the goal to maintain or restore range of motion (ROM) to the joint. A variety of mechanical stretching devices are available for extension or flexion of the shoulder, elbow, wrist, fingers, knee, ankle, and toes. These devices are generally used as adjunct treatment to physical therapy and/or exercise.

### Policy/Criteria

- I. It is the policy of Louisiana Healthcare Connections that the low-load prolonged-duration stretch (LLPS) device/dynamic stretch device is medically necessary for the knee, elbow, wrist or finger when meeting both of the following:
  - A. Meets one of the following indications:
    1. In addition to physical therapy in the subacute injury or post-operative period ( $\geq 3$  weeks and  $\leq 4$  months after injury or operation) in members/enrollees with signs and symptoms of persistent joint stiffness or contracture;
    2. In the subacute injury or post-operative period ( $\geq 3$  weeks and  $\leq 4$  months after injury or operation) and both of the following:
      - a. Limited range of motion poses a meaningful functional limitation as judged by the physician;
      - b. Has not responded to other therapy (including physical therapy);
    3. In the acute post-operative period for members/enrollees who have undergone additional surgery to improve the range of motion of the previously affected joint;
  - B. Request is for one of the following:
    1. An initial four weeks;
    2. A subsequent four week period, and improvement was noted upon reevaluation after the prior four week period.
- II. It is the policy of Louisiana Healthcare Connections that the current research does not support the use of any of the following over other currently available alternatives:
  - A. LLPS for any indication not noted in section I;
  - B. Bi-directional static progressive stretch (SPS) devices;
  - C. Patient-actuated serial stretch (PASS) devices.

### Background

A joint contracture is characterized by chronically reduced range of motion (ROM) secondary to structural changes in non-bony tissues, including muscle, tendons, ligaments, and skin. Prolonged immobilization of joints following surgery or trauma is the most common cause of joint contractures. A number of different modalities are used to treat or prevent joint contractures.

Mechanical stretching devices have been ~~investigated~~researched for the treatment of joint contractures. The use of these devices is based on the theory that passive motion early in the healing process can promote movement of the synovial fluid, and thus promote lubrication of the joint; stimulate the healing of articular tissues; prevent adhesions and joint stiffness; and reduce edema without interfering with the healing of incisions or wounds over the moving joint.

Several types of devices exist, including low-load prolonged duration stretch devices (LLPS) (also referred to as dynamic splinting), static progressive stretch ~~devices~~ (SPS) devices, and patient-actuated serial stretch (PASS) (also known as patient-directed serial stretch) devices.

- LLPS devices permit resisted active and passive motion (elastic traction) within a limited range. LLPS devices maintain a set level of tension by means of incorporated springs.
- SPS devices hold the joint in a set position but allow for manual modification of the joint angle and may allow for active motion without resistance (inelastic traction). This type of device itself does not exert a stress on the tissue unless the joint angle is set at the maximum ROM.
- PASS devices permit resisted active and passive motion within a limited range utilizing pneumatic or hydraulic systems that can be adjusted by the patient. The extensioners use pneumatic systems while the flexioners use hydraulic systems. These devices require custom fitting.

Mechanical stretching devices are commonly used in the post-operative period, following an injury or when addressing joint stiffness in the knee, ankle, toe, shoulder, elbow, wrist, or finger. Peer reviewed studies ~~investigating~~researching mechanical stretching devices are limited. The best evidence is available in studies evaluating LLPS when used at the knee, elbow, wrist, and following extensor tendon injuries of the finger and for SPS when used at the elbow.

Several authors have looked at the implementation of dynamic splinting at the finger following an extensor tendon ~~re~~ repair. <sup>1,2,15-23</sup> Results from a small, prospective, randomized trial comparing dynamic splinting to static splinting suggest that dynamic splinting of complex lacerations of the extensor tendons in zones V ~~through~~ VII provides improved functional outcomes at 4 and 12 weeks and 6 months when compared with static splinting.<sup>1</sup> Another small, prospective, randomized, controlled study comparing postoperative dynamic- versus static-splinting outcomes of patients following extensor tendon repair reported dynamic splinting of simple, complete lacerations of the extensor tendons in zones V and VI. Dynamic splinting provided improved functional outcomes at 4, 6, and 8 weeks but not by 6 months when compared with static splinting.<sup>2</sup>

Dynamic splinting and static progressive stretch devices have both been applied at the elbow in isolation and in comparison to one another. In 2004 Gallucci and colleagues ~~(2004)~~ looked at a sample of 30 patients who were at least 78 days after surgery or trauma who had a functional arc of movement of less than 100 degrees at the elbow. They found that two thirds<sup>2/3</sup> of patients were able to achieve at least a 100 degree arc and therefore, improved function after using a dynamic splint for 75 days.<sup>3</sup> In a 2009 randomized controlled pilot study of 30 patients, Lai and colleagues ~~(2009)~~ found significant improvements in ROM when dynamic splinting was added to the control treatment of botulinum toxin type-A and occupational therapy treatment.<sup>4</sup> Studies in 2010 by Bhat and colleagues ~~(2010)~~ and in 2000 by Gelinas and colleagues ~~(2000)~~ found

similar benefit to SPS at the elbow.<sup>5,6</sup> In both cases, SPS was introduced to the patient approximately 4.5 to 5 months after injury or surgery and once improvements from therapy were stagnant. A functional ROM or arc of movement was achieved in 19 out of 30 patients and 11 out of 22 patients respectively.<sup>5,6</sup> In 2006, Doornberg and colleagues ~~(2006)~~ also demonstrated improvements with ROM overall after SPS intervention but noted that early splinting after the initial injury rather than after elbow encapsectomy yielded greater results.<sup>7</sup> In 2012, Lindenhovius and colleagues ~~(2012)~~ performed a prospective randomized controlled trial looking at the benefit of dynamic splinting versus SPS in improving range of motion and function as measured by the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand (DASH).<sup>8</sup> No significant difference was found between the two groups prior to treatment or after 3, 6 or 12 month follow-ups. Additionally in 2015, Veltman and colleagues ~~(2015)~~ completed a systematic review on the topic that included the results ~~from~~ 232 patients with a similar outcome showing that each device was beneficial but that one was not more effective than the other.<sup>9</sup>

At the knee and wrist, dynamic splinting has been identified as beneficial when further progression of ~~range of motion~~ ROM is needed after surgery or an injury. In 2018, Pace and colleagues ~~(2018)~~ performed a Level IV retrospective study, looking at the implementation of dynamic splinting following knee surgery in 74 adolescents and children who had ROM deficits in flexion, extension, or both directions.<sup>10</sup> 84% of the patients experienced a significant increase in ROM and 58% were able to avoid further surgical intervention. In 2016, Willis and colleagues ~~(2016)~~ looked at the treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome using dynamic splinting at the wrist.<sup>11</sup> They performed a randomized control trial where the experimental group was provided with dynamic splinting in addition to anti-inflammatories and a stretching program. Those patients who received dynamic splinting in addition to the other treatments had a significant decline in the need for surgical intervention after conservative management was complete. Similarly, Glasgow and colleagues in ~~(2011)~~ and Shah and colleagues in ~~(2002)~~ looked at the effect of dynamic splinting at the hand and forearm respectively and demonstrated improvements in ~~range of motion~~ ROM after injury in both areas.<sup>12,13</sup>

~~Although limited, high-level evidence still exists to address the efficacy of LLPS a current review of the literature supports the medical necessity of the current clinical policy.~~ A variety of randomized control trials, observational studies, case series, and medical community acceptance confirms the benefits of dynamic LLPS devices at the knee, elbow, wrist, and fingers when used to relieve persistent joint stiffness that can occur after injury or surgery.

While additional evidence is emerging, there is insufficient evidence in the published peer-reviewed literature to support the use of dynamic LLPS at other joints to include the foot, ankle, and shoulder. There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to demonstrate the safety, efficacy, and long-term outcomes on the use of patient-actuated serial stretch (PASS) devices.

### **Coding Implications**

This clinical policy references Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®). CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association. All CPT codes and descriptions are copyrighted 2020, American Medical Association. All rights reserved. CPT codes and CPT descriptions are from the current manuals and those included herein are not intended to be all-inclusive and are

## CLINICAL POLICY

### Mechanical Stretching Devices for Joint Stiffness and Contracture



included for informational purposes only. Codes referenced in this clinical policy are for informational purposes only and my not support medical necessity. Inclusion or exclusion of any codes does not guarantee coverage. Providers should reference the most up-to-date sources of professional coding guidance prior to the submission of claims for reimbursement of covered services.

HCPCS codes that support coverage criteria

HCPCS Codes	Description
E1800	Dynamic adjustable elbow extension/flexion device, includes soft interface material
E1802	Dynamic adjustable forearm pronation/supination device, includes soft interface
E1805	Dynamic adjustable wrist extension/flexion device, includes soft interface material
E1810	Dynamic adjustable knee extension/flexion device, includes soft interface material
E1812	Dynamic knee, extension/flexion device with active resistance control
E1825	Dynamic adjustable finger extension/flexion device, includes soft interface material

#### ~~ICD-10-CM Diagnosis Codes that Support Coverage Criteria~~

<del>ICD-10-CM Code</del>	<del>Description</del>
<del>M24.521—M24.529</del>	<del>Contracture, elbow</del>
<del>M24.531—M24.539</del>	<del>Contracture, wrist</del>
<del>M24.541—M24.549</del>	<del>Contracture, hand</del>
<del>M24.561—M24.569</del>	<del>Contracture, knee</del>
<del>M25.621—M25.629</del>	<del>Stiffness of elbow, not elsewhere classified</del>
<del>M25.631—M25.639</del>	<del>Stiffness of wrist, not elsewhere classified</del>
<del>M25.641—M25.649</del>	<del>Stiffness of hand, not elsewhere classified</del>
<del>M25.661—M25.669</del>	<del>Stiffness of knee, not elsewhere classified</del>

Reviews, Revisions, and Approvals	Revision Date	Approval Date
Converted corporate to local policy.	08/15/2020	
Combined sections II-IV into II and replaced “Experimental/investigational” verbiage with descriptive language. Minor updates to background with no impact on criteria. Replaced all instances of “member” with “member/enrollee.” Annual review. Changed “review date” in the header to “date of last revision” and “date” in the revision log header to “revision date.” References reviewed, updated and reformatted. Reviewed by specialist.	2/22	

Reviews, Revisions, and Approvals	Revision Date	Approval Date
<u>Background updated with no impact on criteria. Removed ICD-10 codes. References reviewed and updated. Reviewed by internal specialist and external specialist.</u>	<u>1/23</u>	

## References

1. Kitis A, Ozcan RH, Bagdatli D, Buker N, Kara IG. Comparison of static and dynamic splinting regimens for extensor tendon repairs in zones V to VII. *J Plast Surg Hand Surg.* 2012;46(3 to 4):267 to 271. doi:10.3109/2000656X.2012.684247
2. Mowlavi A, Burns M, Brown RE. Dynamic versus static splinting of simple zone V and zone VI extensor tendon repairs: a prospective, randomized, controlled study. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2005;115(2):482 to 487. doi:10.1097/01.prs.0000149479.96088.5d
3. Gallucci GL, Boretto JG, Dávalos MA, Alfie VA, Donndorff A, De Carli P. The use of dynamic orthoses in the treatment of the stiff elbow. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol.* 2014;24(8):1395 to 1400. doi:10.1007/s00590-014-1419-y
4. Lai JM, Francisco GE, Willis FB. Dynamic splinting after treatment with botulinum toxin type-A: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Adv Ther.* 2009;26(2):241 to 248. doi:10.1007/s12325-008-0139-2
5. Bhat AK, Bhaskaranand K, Nair SG. Static progressive stretching using a turnbuckle orthosis for elbow stiffness: a prospective study. *J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong).* 2010;18(1):76 to 79. doi:10.1177/230949901001800117
6. Gelinas JJ, Faber KJ, Patterson SD, King GJ. The effectiveness of turnbuckle splinting for elbow contractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2000;82(1):74 to 78. doi:10.1302/0301-620x.82b1.9792
7. Doornberg JN, Ring D, Jupiter JB. Static progressive splinting for posttraumatic elbow stiffness. *J Orthop Trauma.* 2006;20(6):400 to 404. doi:10.1097/00005131-200607000-00006
8. Lindenhovius AL, Doornberg JN, Brouwer KM, Jupiter JB, Mudgal CS, Ring D. A prospective randomized controlled trial of dynamic versus static progressive elbow splinting for posttraumatic elbow stiffness. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2012;94(8):694 to 700. doi:10.2106/JBJS.J.01761
9. Veltman ES, Doornberg JN, Eygendaal D, van den Bekerom MP. Static progressive versus dynamic splinting for posttraumatic elbow stiffness: a systematic review of 232 patients. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2015;135(5):613 to 617. doi:10.1007/s00402-015-2199-5
10. Pace JL, Nasreddine AY, Simoni M, Zurakowski D, Kocher MS. Dynamic Splinting in Children and Adolescents With Stiffness After Knee Surgery. *J Pediatr Orthop.* 2018;38(1):38 to 43. doi:10.1097/BPO.0000000000000730
11. Willis FB, Fowler B. Longitudinal Outcomes Following a Randomized Controlled Trial of Dynamic Splint Stretching for Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. *Hand (N Y).* 2016;11(3):290 to 294. doi:10.1177/1558944715626925
12. Glasgow C, Tooth LR, Fleming J, Peters S. Dynamic splinting for the stiff hand after trauma: predictors of contracture resolution. *J Hand Ther.* 2011;24(3):195 to 206. doi:10.1016/j.jht.2011.03.001



13. Shah MA, Lopez JK, Escalante AS, Green DP. Dynamic splinting of forearm rotational contracture after distal radius fracture. *J Hand Surg Am.* 2002;27(3):456 to 463. doi:10.1053/jhsu.2002.33196
14. Health Technology Assessment. Mechanical stretching device for the treatment of joint contractures of the extremities. Hayes. www.hayesinc.com. Published May 09, 2018 (annual review May 09, 2022). Accessed October 10, 2022.
15. Sameem M, Wood T, Ignacy T, Thoma A, Strumas N. A systematic review of rehabilitation protocols after surgical repair of the extensor tendons in zones V-VIII of the hand. *J Hand Ther.* 2011;24(4):365 to 372. doi:10.1016/j.jht.2011.06.005
16. Neuhaus V, Wong G, Russo KE, Mudgal CS. Dynamic splinting with early motion following zone IV/V and TI to TIII extensor tendon repairs. *J Hand Surg Am.* 2012;37(5):933 to 937. doi:10.1016/j.jhsa.2012.01.039
17. Chester DL, Beale S, Beveridge L, Nancarrow JD, Titley OG. A prospective, controlled, randomized trial comparing early active extension with passive extension using a dynamic splint in the rehabilitation of repaired extensor tendons. *J Hand Surg Br.* 2002;27(3):283 to 288. doi:10.1054/jhsb.2001.0745
18. Giessler GA, Przybilski M, Germann G, Sauerbier M, Megerle K. Early free active versus dynamic extension splinting after extensor indicis proprius tendon transfer to restore thumb extension: a prospective randomized study. *J Hand Surg Am.* 2008;33(6):864 to 868. doi:10.1016/j.jhsa.2008.01.028
19. Larson D, Jerosch-Herold C. Clinical effectiveness of post-operative splinting after surgical release of Dupuytren's contracture: a systematic review. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2008;9:104. Published 2008 Jul 21. doi:10.1186/1471-2474-9-104
20. Khandwala AR, Webb J, Harris SB, Foster AJ, Elliot D. A comparison of dynamic extension splinting and controlled active mobilization of complete divisions of extensor tendons in zones 5 and 6. *J Hand Surg Br.* 2000;25(2):140 to 146. doi:10.1054/jhsb.1999.0356
21. Walsh MT, Rinehimer W, Muntzer E, Patel J, Sitler MR. Early controlled motion with dynamic splinting versus static splinting for zones III and IV extensor tendon lacerations: a preliminary report. *J Hand Ther.* 1994;7(4):232 to 236. doi:10.1016/s0894-1130(12)80241-9
22. Saldana MJ, Choban S, Westerbeck P, Schacherer TG. Results of acute zone III extensor tendon injuries treated with dynamic extension splinting. *J Hand Surg Am.* 1991;16(6):1145 to 1150. doi:10.1016/s0363-5023(10)80082-6
23. Griffin M, Hindocha S, Jordan D, Saleh M, Khan W. Management of extensor tendon injuries. *Open Orthop J.* 2012;6:36 to 42. doi:10.2174/1874325001206010036
24. Furia JP, Willis FB, Shanumgam R, Curran SA. Systematic review of contracture reduction in the lower extremity with dynamic splinting. *Adv Ther.* 2013;30(8):763 to 770. doi:10.1007/s12325-013-0052-1
25. Jongs RA, Harvey LA, Gwinn T, Lucas BR. Dynamic splints do not reduce contracture following distal radial fracture: a randomised controlled trial. *J Physiother.* 2012;58(3):173 to 180. doi:10.1016/S1836-9553(12)70108-X
1. Kitis A, Ozcan RH, Bagdatli D, Buker N, Kara IG. Comparison of static and dynamic splinting regimens for extensor tendon repairs in zones V to VII. *J Plast Surg Hand Surg.* 2012 Sep;46(3-4):267-271. doi:10.3109/2000656X.2012.684247
2. Mowlavi A, Burns M, Brown RE. Dynamic versus static splinting of simple zone V and zone VI extensor tendon repairs: a prospective, randomized, controlled study. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2005 Feb;115(2):482-487. doi:10.1097/01.prs.0000149479.96088.5d

3. Gallucci GL, Boretto JG, Davalos MA, Alfie VA, Donndorff A, De Carli P. The use of dynamic orthoses in the treatment of the stiff elbow. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol*. 2014;24:1395–1400. doi:10.1007/s00590-014-1419-y
4. Lai JM, Francisco GE, Willis FB. Dynamic splinting after treatment with botulinum toxin type A: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Adv Ther*. 2009 Feb;26(2):241–248. doi:10.1007/s12325-008-0139-2
5. Bhat AK, Bhaskaranand K, Nair SG. Static progressive stretching using a turnbuckle orthosis for elbow stiffness: a prospective study. *J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong)*. 2010;18:76–79. doi:10.1177/230949901001800117
6. Gelinas JJ, Faber KJ, Patterson SD, King GJ. The effectiveness of turnbuckle splinting for elbow contractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 82(1):74–78. doi:10.1302/0301-620x.82b1.9792
7. Doornberg JN, Ring D, Jupiter JB. Static progressive splinting for posttraumatic elbow stiffness. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2006;20(6):400–404. doi:10.1097/00005131-200607000-00006
8. Lindenhovius AL, Doornberg JN, Brouwer KM, Jupiter JB, Mudgal CS, Ring D. A prospective randomized controlled trial of dynamic versus static progressive elbow splinting for posttraumatic elbow stiffness. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2012;94(8):694–700. doi:10.2106/JBJS.J.01761
9. Veltman ES, Doornberg JN, Eygendaal D, van den Bekerom MP. Static progressive versus dynamic splinting for posttraumatic elbow stiffness: a systematic review of 232 patients. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. 2015;135(5):613–617. doi:10.1007/s00402-015-2199-5
10. Pace JL, Nasreddine AY, Simoni M, Zurakowski D, Kocher MS. Dynamic splinting in children and adolescents with stiffness after knee surgery. *J Pediatr Orthop*. 2018;38(1):38–43. doi:10.1097/BPO.0000000000000730
11. Willis FB, Fowler B. Longitudinal Outcomes Following a Randomized Controlled Trial of Dynamic Splint Stretching for Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. *Hand (N Y)*. 2016;11(3):290–294. doi:10.1177/1558944715626925
12. Glasgow C, Tooth LR, Fleming J, Peters S. Dynamic splinting for the stiff hand after trauma: predictors of contracture resolution. *J Hand Ther*. 2011;24(3):195–206. doi:10.1016/j.jht.2011.03.001
13. Shah MA, Lopez JK, Escalante AS, Green DP. Dynamic splinting of forearm rotational contracture after distal radius fracture. *J Hand Surg Am*. 2002 ;27(3):456–463. doi:10.1053/jhsu.2002.33196
14. Health Technology Assessment. Mechanical Stretching Device for the Treatment of Joint Contractures of the Extremities. Hayes. [www.hayesinc.com](http://www.hayesinc.com). Published May 9 2018(annual review September 3, 2020.) Accessed November 11, 2021.
15. Sameem M, Wood T, Ignacy T, Thoma A, Strumas N. A systematic review of rehabilitation protocols after surgical repair of the extensor tendons in zones V–VIII of the hand. *J Hand Ther*. 2011;24(4):365–372. doi:10.1016/j.jht.2011.06.005
16. Neuhaus V, Wong G, Russo KE, Mudgal CS. Dynamic splinting with early motion following zone IV/V and TI to TIII extensor tendon repairs. *J Hand Surg Am*. 2012;37(5):933–937. doi:10.1016/j.jhsa.2012.01.039
17. Chester DL, Beale S, Beveridge L, Nancarrow JD, Titley OG. A prospective, controlled, randomized trial comparing early active extension with passive extension using a dynamic splint in the rehabilitation of repaired extensor tendons. *J Hand Surg Br*. 2002;27(3):283–288. doi:10.1054/jhsb.2001.0745

18. Giessler GA, Przybilski M, Germann G, Sauerbier M, Megerle K. Early free active versus dynamic extension splinting after extensor indicis proprius tendon transfer to restore thumb extension: a prospective randomized study. *J Hand Surg Am.* 2008;33(6):864-868. doi:10.1016/j.jhsa.2008.01.028
19. Larson D, Jerosch-Herold C. Clinical effectiveness of post-operative splinting after surgical release of Dupuytren's contracture: a systematic review. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2008;9:104. Published 2008 Jul 21. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-9-104.
20. Khandwala AR, Webb J, Harris SB, Foster AJ, Elliot D. A comparison of dynamic extension splinting and controlled active mobilization of complete divisions of extensor tendons in zones 5 and 6. *J Hand Surg Br.* 2000;25(2):140-146. doi:10.1054/jhsb.1999.0356
21. Walsh MT, Rinehimer W, Muntzer E, Patel J, Sitler MR. Early controlled motion with dynamic splinting versus static splinting for zones III and IV extensor tendon lacerations: a preliminary report. *J Hand Ther.* 1994;7(4):232-236. doi:10.1016/s0894-1130(12)80241-9
22. Saldana MJ, Chohan S, Westerbeck P, Schacherer TG. Results of acute zone III extensor tendon injuries treated with dynamic extension splinting. *J Hand Surg Am.* 1991;16(6):1145-1150. doi:10.1016/s0363-5023(10)80082-6
23. Griffin M, Hindocha S, Jordan D, Saleh M, Khan W. Management of extensor tendon injuries. *Open Orthop J.* 2012;6:36-42. doi:10.2174/1874325001206010036
24. Furia JP, Willis FB, Shanumgam R, Curran SA. Systematic review of contracture reduction in the lower extremity with dynamic splinting. *Adv Ther.* 2013;30(8):763-770. doi:10.1007/s12325-013-0052-1
25. Jongs RA, Harvey LA, Gwinn T, Lucas BR. Dynamic splints do not reduce contracture following distal radial fracture: a randomised controlled trial. *J Physiother.* 2012;58(3):173-180. doi:10.1016/S1836-9553(12)70108-X

### **Important Reminder**

This clinical policy has been developed by appropriately experienced and licensed health care professionals based on a review and consideration of currently available generally accepted standards of medical practice; peer-reviewed medical literature; government agency/program approval status; evidence-based guidelines and positions of leading national health professional organizations; views of physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas affected by this clinical policy; and other available clinical information. LHCC makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information used or relied upon in developing this clinical policy. This clinical policy is consistent with standards of medical practice current at the time that this clinical policy was approved.

The purpose of this clinical policy is to provide a guide to medical necessity, which is a component of the guidelines used to assist in making coverage decisions and administering benefits. It does not constitute a contract or guarantee regarding payment or results. Coverage decisions and the administration of benefits are subject to all terms, conditions, exclusions and limitations of the coverage documents (e.g., evidence of coverage, certificate of coverage, policy, contract of insurance, etc.), as well as to state and federal requirements and applicable LHCC administrative policies and procedures.

This clinical policy is effective as of the date determined by LHCC. The date of posting may not be the effective date of this clinical policy. This clinical policy may be subject to applicable legal



## CLINICAL POLICY

### Mechanical Stretching Devices for Joint Stiffness and Contracture



and regulatory requirements relating to provider notification. If there is a discrepancy between the effective date of this clinical policy and any applicable legal or regulatory requirement, the requirements of law and regulation shall govern. LHCC retains the right to change, amend or withdraw this clinical policy, and additional clinical policies may be developed and adopted as needed, at any time.

This clinical policy does not constitute medical advice, medical treatment or medical care. It is not intended to dictate to providers how to practice medicine. Providers are expected to exercise professional medical judgment in providing the most appropriate care, and are solely responsible for the medical advice and treatment of members/enrollees. This clinical policy is not intended to recommend treatment for members/enrollees. Members/enrollees should consult with their treating physician in connection with diagnosis and treatment decisions.

Providers referred to in this clinical policy are independent contractors who exercise independent judgment and over whom LHCC has no control or right of control. Providers are not agents or employees of LHCC.

This clinical policy is the property of LHCC. Unauthorized copying, use, and distribution of this clinical policy or any information contained herein are strictly prohibited. Providers, members/enrollees and their representatives are bound to the terms and conditions expressed herein through the terms of their contracts. Where no such contract exists, providers, members/enrollees and their representatives agree to be bound by such terms and conditions by providing services to members/enrollees and/or submitting claims for payment for such services.

©2020 Louisiana Healthcare Connections. All rights reserved. All materials are exclusively owned by Louisiana Healthcare Connections and are protected by United States copyright law and international copyright law. No part of this publication may be reproduced, copied, modified, distributed, displayed, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means, or otherwise published without the prior written permission of Louisiana Healthcare Connections. You may not alter or remove any trademark, copyright or other notice contained herein. Louisiana Healthcare Connections is a registered trademark exclusively owned by Louisiana Healthcare Connections.