Medical Policy

Title: Autologous Chondrocyte Implantation for Focal Articular Cartilage Lesions

Professional
Original Effective Date: October 1, 2006
Revision Date(s): January 14, 2010; March 27, 2014; April 2, 2015; October 13, 2015; January 20, 2016; May 10, 2017
Current Effective Date: May 10, 2017

Institutional
Original Effective Date: October 1, 2006
Revision Date(s): January 14, 2010; March 27, 2014; April 2, 2015; October 13, 2015; January 20, 2016; May 10, 2017
Current Effective Date: May 10, 2017

State and Federal mandates and health plan member contract language, including specific provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. To verify a member's benefits, contact Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Customer Service.

The BCBSKS Medical Policies contained herein are for informational purposes and apply only to members who have health insurance through BCBSKS or who are covered by a self-insured group plan administered by BCBSKS. Medical Policy for FEP members is subject to FEP medical policy which may differ from BCBSKS Medical Policy.

The medical policies do not constitute medical advice or medical care. Treating health care providers are independent contractors and are neither employees nor agents of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas and are solely responsible for diagnosis, treatment and medical advice.

If your patient is covered under a different Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan, please refer to the Medical Policies of that plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Comparators</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals: • With focal articular cartilage lesion(s) of the weight-bearing surface of the femoral condyles or trochlea</td>
<td>Interventions of interest are: • Autologous chondrocyte implantation</td>
<td>Comparators of interest are: • Marrow stimulation • Osteochondral autografts</td>
<td>Relevant outcomes include: • Symptons • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Functional outcomes • Quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals: • With focal articular cartilage lesions of joints other than the knee</td>
<td>Interventions of interest are: • Autologous chondrocyte implantation</td>
<td>Comparators of interest are: • Marrow stimulation • Osteochondral autografts</td>
<td>Relevant outcomes include: • Symptons • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Functional outcomes • Quality of life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESCRIPTION
A variety of procedures are being developed to resurface articular cartilage defects. Autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI) involves harvesting chondrocytes from healthy tissue, expanding the cells in vitro, and implanting the expanded cells into the chondral defect under a periosteal or fibrin patch. Second- and third-generation techniques include combinations of autologous chondrocytes, scaffolds, and growth factors.

OBJECTIVE
The objective of this policy is to determine whether autologous chondrocyte implantation improves health outcomes in patients with focal articular cartilage lesions of the knee and other joints.

BACKGROUND
Damaged articular cartilage typically fails to heal on its own and can be associated with pain, loss of function, and disability and may lead to debilitating osteoarthritis over time. These manifestations can severely impair a patient’s activities of daily living and adversely affect quality of life.

Treatment
Conventional treatment options include débridement, subchondral drilling, microfracture, and abrasion arthroplasty. Débridement involves the removal of synovial membrane, osteophytes, loose articular debris, and diseased cartilage and is capable of producing symptomatic relief. Subchondral drilling, microfracture, and abrasion arthroplasty attempt to restore the articular surface by inducing the growth of fibrocartilage into the chondral defect. Compared with the original hyaline cartilage, fibrocartilage has less capability to withstand shock or shearing force and can degenerate over time, often resulting in the return of clinical symptoms. Osteochondral grafts and ACI attempt to regenerate hyaline-like cartilage and thereby restore durable function.

With ACI, a region of healthy articular cartilage is identified and biopsied through arthroscopy. The tissue is sent to a facility licensed by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) where it is minced and enzymatically digested, and the chondrocytes are separated by filtration. The isolated chondrocytes are cultured for 11 to 21 days to expand the cell population, tested, and then shipped back for implantation. With the patient under general anesthesia, an arthrotomy is performed, and the chondral lesion is excised up to the normal surrounding cartilage. Methods to improve the first-generation ACI procedure have been developed, including the use of a scaffold or matrix-induced autologous chondrocyte implantation (MACI) composed of biocompatible carbohydrates, protein polymers, or synthetics. The only FDA-approved MACI product to date is supplied in a sheet, which is cut to size and fixed with fibrin glue. This procedure is considered technically easier and less time consuming than the first-generation...
technique, which required suturing of a periosteal or collagen patch and injection of chondrocytes under the patch.

Desired features of articular cartilage repair procedures are the ability (1) to be implanted easily, (2) to reduce surgical morbidity, (3) not to require harvesting of other tissues, (4) to enhance cell proliferation and maturation, (5) to maintain the phenotype, and (6) to integrate with the surrounding articular tissue. In addition to the potential to improve the formation and distribution of hyaline cartilage, use of a scaffold with MACI eliminates the need for harvesting and suture of a periosteal or collagen patch. A scaffold without cells may also support chondrocyte growth.

**REGULATORY STATUS**

The culturing of chondrocytes is considered by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to fall into the category of manipulated autologous structural cells, which are subject to a biologic licensing requirement. In 1997, Carticel® (Genzyme; now Vericel) received FDA approval for the repair of clinically significant, “…symptomatic cartilaginous defects of the femoral condyle (medial lateral or trochlear) caused by acute or repetitive trauma…."

In December 2016, MACI ® (Vericel), a matrix-induced autologous chondrocyte implantation, was approved by FDA for “the repair of symptomatic, single or multiple full-thickness cartilage defects of the knee with or without bone involvement in adults.” MACI ® consists of autologous chondrocytes which are cultured onto a bioresorbable porcine-derived collagen membrane. In 2017, production of Carticel® was phased out and MACI ® is the only ACI product that is available in the United States.

A number of other second-generation methods for implanting autologous chondrocytes in a biodegradable matrix are currently in development or testing or are available outside of the United States. They include Atelocollagen (Koken), a collagen gel; Bioseed® C (BioTissue Technologies), a polymer scaffold; CaReS (Ars Arthro), collagen gel; Cartilix (Biomet), a polymer hydrogel; Chondron (Sewon Cellontech), a fibrin gel; Hyalograft C (Fidia Advanced Polymers), a hyaluronic acid–based scaffold; NeoCart (Histogenics), an autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI) with a 3-dimensional chondromatrix in a phase 3 trial; and Novocart® 3D (Aesculap Biologics), a collagen-chondroitin sulfate scaffold in a phase 3 trial. ChondroCelect® (TiGenix), a characterized chondrocyte implantation with a completed phase 3 trial, uses a gene marker profile to determine in vivo cartilage-forming potential and thereby optimizes the phenotype (eg, hyaline cartilage vs fibrocartilage) of the tissue produced with each ACI cell batch. Each batch of chondrocytes is graded based on the quantitative gene expression of a selection of positive and negative markers for hyaline cartilage formation.
POLICY

A. Autologous chondrocyte implantation may be considered medically necessary for the treatment of disabling full-thickness articular cartilage defects of the knee caused by acute or repetitive trauma, when all of the following criteria are met:

1. Adolescent patients should be skeletally mature with documented closure of growth plates (eg, 15 years or older). Adult patients should be too young to be considered an appropriate candidate for total knee arthroplasty or other reconstructive knee surgery (eg, younger than 55 years); AND

2. Focal, full-thickness (grade III or IV) unipolar lesions on the weight bearing surface of the femoral condyles or trochlea at least 1.5 cm² in size; AND

3. Documented minimal to absent degenerative changes in the surrounding articular cartilage (Outerbridge Grade II or less), and normal-appearing hyaline cartilage surrounding the border of the defect; AND

4. Normal knee biomechanics, or alignment and stability achieved concurrently with autologous chondrocyte implantation.

B. Autologous chondrocyte implantation for all other joints, including talar, and any indications other than those listed above is considered experimental / investigational.

Policy Guidelines

1. For smaller lesions (eg, smaller than 4 cm²), if debridement is the only prior surgical treatment, then consideration should be given to marrow-stimulating techniques before autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI) is performed.

2. The average defect size reported in the literature is about 5 cm²; many studies treated lesions as large as 15 cm².

3. Severe obesity, eg, body mass index (BMI) greater than 35 kg/m², may affect outcomes due to the increased stress on weight bearing surfaces of the joint.

4. 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. In addition, meniscal allograft transplantation may be performed in combination, either concurrently or sequentially, with ACI. The charges for the culturing component of the procedure are submitted as part of the hospital bill.

5. The entire autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI) procedure consists of 4 steps:
   a. the initial arthroscopy and biopsy of normal cartilage,
   b. culturing of chondrocytes on an absorbable collagen matrix,
   c. a separate arthrotomy to place the implant, and
   d. post-surgical rehabilitation.
The initial arthroscopy may be scheduled as a diagnostic procedure; as part of this procedure, a cartilage defect may be identified, prompting biopsy of normal cartilage in anticipation of a possible chondrocyte transplant. The biopsied material is then sent for culturing and returned to the hospital when the implantation procedure (ie, arthrotomy) is scheduled.

**Outerbridge cartilage grading scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>softening and swelling of the cartilage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>shows fragmentation and fissuring of the superficial cartilage of less than one-half in diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>fragmentation and deeper fissuring of more than one-half inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>shows erosion of the cartilage down to the bone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE**

This policy has been updated regularly with searches of the MEDLINE database. The most recent update with literature review covers the period through March 2, 2017.

Assessment of efficacy for therapeutic intervention involves a determination of whether an intervention improves health outcomes compared to available alternatives. The optimal study design for this purpose is a randomized controlled trial (RCT) that compares the therapeutic intervention with existing alternative treatments and includes clinically relevant measures of health outcomes. Nonrandomized comparative studies and uncontrolled studies can sometimes provide useful information on health outcomes but are prone to biases such as noncomparability of treatment groups, placebo effect, and variable natural history of the condition.

This evidence review was informed by a 2003 TEC Assessment of autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI), which updated previous TEC Assessments on the same subject.1-4 Some of these studies used the first-generation ACI Carticel, while others evaluated second-generation matrix-induced autologous chondrocyte implantation (MACI) products.

**ACI for Focal Articular Cartilage Lesions of the Knee**

**Network Meta-Analysis of Cartilage Repair Procedures**

In 2016, Riboh et al reported a network meta-analysis on the comparative efficacy of cartilage repair procedures of the knee.5 Nineteen RCTs from 15 separate cohorts (total N=855 patients) were included. The procedures selected for the network analysis were MACI, ACI with a collagen membrane, ACI with a periosteal membrane, osteochondral autografts (OCAG), and microfracture. Outcomes evaluated included graft hypertrophy, hyaline cartilage, Lysholm Knee Score (LKS), reoperation at short, mid, and long term, and Tegner Activity Scale (TAS) score. The rank order of treatment efficacy, taking into account all outcome measures, was ACI with a collagen membrane, OCAG, MACI, ACI with a periosteal membrane, and microfracture.

**Systematic Reviews**

**ACI vs Other Cartilage Repair Procedures**

In 2016, Mundi et al reported on a systematic review of level I studies for cartilage restoration of the knee.6 Included were 12 randomized trials with a total of 765 patients and a mean lesion size.
of 3.9 cm². Five trials compared ACI with marrow stimulation, 3 compared ACI with OCAG, 1 trial compared OCAG with microfracture, and 3 trials compared different generations of ACI. Eleven of the 12 trials were conducted in Europe. Four trials reported significant differences in function with ACI versus marrow stimulation, however, meta-analysis showed no significant differences in pain or function between the 2 treatments at 24-month follow-up. The quality of the evidence was rated as poor to moderate, and only 4 trials reported a sample size calculation. Although meta-analysis could not be performed on the other comparisons, 5 of 6 trials found no significant difference in outcomes between ACI and OCAG or different generations of ACI. The percentage of grafts that failed and the relation between lesion size and success rate were not assessed in this review.

A 2010 systematic review by Harris et al included 13 RCTs and nonrandomized trials of 917 subjects who underwent ACI (n=604), microfracture (n=271), or OCAG (n=42). The mean study quality was rated as 54 (/100), with no studies considered of good or excellent quality, 7 considered fair, and 6 considered poor. Four studies compared different generations of ACI, finding no difference in outcomes but higher complication rates with open, perioseal cover, first-generation ACI. At 1- to 5-year follow-up, 3 of 7 studies showed better clinical outcomes after ACI than after microfracture, 1 study showed better outcomes after microfracture, and 3 studies showed no difference between these treatments. Clinical outcomes after microfracture deteriorated after 18 to 24 months in 3 of 7 studies. Studies comparing ACI with OCAG showed similar short-term clinical outcomes, with more rapid improvement but an increase in arthrofibrosis and donor site morbidity following OCAG. Younger patients with a shorter preoperative duration of symptoms and fewer prior surgical procedures had the best outcomes after surgical intervention. A defect size greater than 4 cm² was the only factor predictive of better outcomes when ACI was compared with other surgical techniques.

Randomized Controlled Trials

In 2017, first-generation ACI with injection of chondrocytes under a collagen cover (sometimes called second-generation ACI) was phased out and replaced with MACI (matrix-induced). Three RCTs were identified specifically on MACI. These are described next.

**MACI vs ACI**

In 2005, Bartlett et al on reported a randomized comparison of MACI to ACI with a collagen cover in 91 patients. Overall, results were comparable for the 2 treatments. The modified Cincinnati Knee Rating System (CKRS) score improved by 17.6 points in the ACI group and by 19.6 points in the ACI group (p=NS). Visual analog scale scores improved from 6.0 to 4.3 in the ACI group and from 6.0 to 4.1 in the MACI group. Factors associated with worse clinical outcomes were a failed prior procedure, duration of symptoms, and patient age. Second-look arthroscopy at 1 year for 42 patients showed excellent-to-good International Cartilage Repair Society (ICRS) scores in 79.2% of ACI and in 66.6% of MACI patients (p=NS). The authors did not report whether the study was adequately powered for this comparison. Histology from 14 ACI and 11 MACI patients showed a similar percentage of hyaline-like cartilage (42.9% ACI, 36.4% MACI).

**MACI vs Microfracture**

SUMMIT was the pivotal, industry-sponsored multicenter randomized open-label trial comparing MACI with microfracture for larger cartilage defects (≥3 cm²), which typically fare worse than
smaller lesions when treated with microfracture. Patients (N=144) were included who had at least 1 symptomatic grade III or IV focal cartilage defect on the femoral condyles or trochlea, a stable knee, an intact or partial meniscus, and a moderate-to-severe Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) pain value (<55). Average lesion size was 4.8 cm² (range, 3-20 cm²); 34.6% of patients had undergone a prior marrow stimulation procedure. At 2-year follow-up, the MACI group had significantly better subscores for KOOS pain (coprimary outcome; difference, 11.76; p<0.001) and function (coprimary outcome; difference, 11.41; p=0.16) as well as the other KOOS subscales (activities of daily living, knee-related quality of life, other symptoms). With response to treatment defined as a 10-point improvement in both the KOOS pain and function subscales, significantly more patients in the MACI group responded to treatment (87.5%) than in the microfracture group (68.1%; p=0.016). There were no significant differences between groups for cartilage repair, as measured by second look arthroscopy, biopsy, or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

In 2010, Basad et al reported on a small randomized trial that compared MACI (n=40) with microfracture (n=20) in patients with a single posttraumatic chondral defect between 4 and 10 cm². Both groups improved at the 2-year follow-up, with a significant advantage of MACI over microfracture on the LKS (92 vs 69, p=0.005), TAS (4 vs 3, p=0.04), and ICRS patient (p=0.03) and ICRS surgeon (p=0.02) scores. Patients treated with MACI from this trial, along with newly enrolled patients (n=65), were followed for 5 years. However, the rate of follow-up decreased from 93.8% at 24 months to 38.5% at 60 months, limiting interpretation of the 5-year results. Twelve (18.5%) patients developed symptoms between 6 and 36 months such as pain, locking, crepitus, or recurrent effusion. Arthroscopy of these 12 showed partial disintegration of regenerated tissue (n=5), subchondral edema (n=2), graft fibrillation (n=4), and progression to osteoarthritis (n=1). All 12 underwent additional procedures, including OCAG and microfracture, with good results.

Observational Studies
A variety of issues have been addressed with observational studies on ACI, including combination treatment with meniscal allograft, the durability of the procedure, realignment procedures performed in combination with ACI, comparison of femoral defects and patellar defects, and influence of prior marrow stimulation. They are discussed next.

Combined Meniscal Allograft and Cartilage Repair
The 2010 systematic review by Harris et al evaluated combined meniscal allograft transplantation and cartilage repair/restoration. Six level IV studies (case series) with a total of 110 patients were included. Patients underwent meniscal allograft transplantation with ACI (n=73), osteochondral allograft (n=20), OCAG (n=17), or microfracture (n=3). All studies showed improvement in clinical outcomes at final follow-up compared with the preoperative baseline. Outcomes were also compared with historical outcomes of each procedure performed in isolation. Four of the 6 studies found outcomes equivalent to procedures performed in isolation, while 2 studies found that outcomes with combined surgery were not as good as the historical controls. Across the 6 studies, 13 (12%) failures were reported; they included 11 isolated meniscal allograft transplantation failures, 1 combined meniscal allograft and ACI failure, and 1 isolated ACI failure. Three knees with failed meniscal allograft transplantation were converted to total knee arthroplasty. Nearly 50% of patients underwent 1 or more subsequent surgeries after combined meniscal allograft transplantation and cartilage repair/restoration procedures.
Durability and Effects of Realignment and Prior Procedures

A 2014 study by Nawaz et al evaluated functional outcomes and survival rates for ACI (periosteal or collagen membrane covered) and MACI in 869 patients. For the group as a whole, graft survival was estimated by Kaplan-Meier analysis to be 78.2% (95% confidence interval [CI], 74.9% to 81.1%) at 5 years and 50.7% (95% CI, 45.2% to 55.9%) at 10 years. Graft survival did not differ between the first- and second-generation (MACI) procedures. Functional and pain scores were significantly better in the MACI group, but this finding may have been confounded by the shorter follow-up with the newer technique.

Minas et al (2014) prospectively followed 210 ACI-treated patients (362 grafts) for at least 10 years. Malalignment, patellar maltracking, and meniscal or ligamentous deficiency had also been corrected as needed. At a mean follow-up of 12 years, 53 (25%) patients had graft failure. For the 157 patients who had successful grafts, functional outcomes were significantly improved from baseline to follow-up, as measured by the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Index (WOMAC), Knee Society Score (KSS) for knee and function, and 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (all p<0.001). Graft survival was significantly longer in patients with complex versus salvage-type lesions (p=0.03), with concomitant high tibial osteotomy (HTO) versus no HTO (p=0.01), and with primary ACI versus ACI after a prior marrow stimulation procedure (p=0.004). For example, primary graft survival was 79% compared with 44% for defects previously treated with microfracture.

A 3-fold increased ACI failure after previous treatment with marrow stimulation techniques was found in a cohort of 321 patients with more than 2 years of follow-up. Independent analysis showed a failure rate of 8% (17/214) of joints without prior marrow stimulation of the lesion, compared with 26% (29/111) of joints that had not. The 2014 Nawaz study of 869 patients treated with ACI or MACI (described above) found that overall graft survival was 78.2% at 5 years and 50.7% at 10 years using Kaplan-Meier analysis. Graft failure was 5 times more likely with a previously treated lesion (<25% survival at 12 years) compared with a previously untreated lesion (>75% survival at 12 years) (hazard ratio, 5.33; 95% CI, 4.07 to 6.99; p<0.001). Other factors affecting survival were graft location and the severity of degenerative changes.

Patellar Defects

ACI for patellar cartilage defects is typically less effective than ACI for lesions of the femoral condyles. Some studies have reported biomechanical alignment procedures and unloading to improve outcomes for retropatellar ACI. In 2013, Trinh et al reported on a systematic review of ACI combined with patellofemoral osteotomy (anteriorization and/or medialization) versus ACI alone. Eleven studies (10 with level III or IV evidence) with a total of 366 patients were included. Three studies directly compared isolated ACI and combined treatment for patellar or trochlear lesions, showing a statistically significant benefit for the combined treatment. In 2014, Gomoll et al reported on a multicenter registry study of the treatment of mono- or bipolar patellar defects with ACI in 110 patients with a minimum of 4 years of follow-up (mean, 90 months; range, 48-192 months). Concurrent surgical procedures included tibial tubercle osteotomy in 69% of patients, lateral release in 41%, vastus medialis advancement in 20%, and trochleoplasty in 5%. At the latest follow-up, statistically and clinically significant improvements in pain and function were obtained in International Knee Documentation Committee, CKRS,
WOMAC, and KSS scores, although it was noted that results were inferior to ACI for cartilage lesions of the femoral condyles.

**Graft Hypertrophy**

In 2015, Ebert et al reported on graft hypertrophy (tissue overgrowth) at 24 months after MACI in a consecutive series of 180 patients. Patients were assessed clinically using the KOOS and underwent MRI at 3, 12, and 24 months post-MACI. Seventeen (9.4%) grafts had failed by 24 months. Three grafts were hypertrophic at 3 months but, the hypertrophy had resolved by 24 months. At 24 months, 47 (26.1%) grafts were hypertrophic. KOOS scores did not differ between patients with hypertrophic grafts and those with normal tissue infill. Longer follow-up is needed to evaluate whether tissue growth continues and to determine the effect of the hypertrophy on graft stability.

**Section Summary: ACI for Treatment of Focal Articular Cartilage Lesions of the Knee**

The evidence on ACI for the treatment of focal articular cartilage lesions of the knee includes a network analysis, systematic reviews, RCTs, and longer term observational studies. For large lesions, ACI results in better outcomes than microfracture, particularly in the long term. Studies comparing ACI with OCAG have shown similar outcomes with smaller lesions, and improved outcomes with ACI when a defect is greater than 4 cm². In 2017, first-generation ACI was replaced with a preparation that seeds the chondrocytes onto a bioresorbable collagen sponge (MACI). Studies to date have not shown improved outcomes compared to first-generation ACI. There is some evidence of an increase in implant hypertrophy (overgrowth) at 2 years that may exceed that of the collagen membrane covered implant. Long-term studies with a larger number of patients are needed to determine whether hypertrophy impacts graft survival. Observational studies have indicated that location of a lesion on the patella or a prior cartilage procedure may negatively impact the success of ACI, realignment procedures improve the success of ACI, and ACI combined with meniscal allograft results in outcomes similar to either procedure performed alone.

**ACI for Joints Other Than the Knee**

There has been interest in applying ACI to cartilage defects in other joints. The most commonly reported is use of ACI for the talus.

In 2010, Zengerink et al published a systematic review of treatment of osteochondral lesions of the talus. Fifty-one nonrandomized and 1 randomized trial were included in the review. Success rates were 85% for bone marrow stimulation, 87% for osteochondral autografting, and 76% for ACI. Because of the high cost of ACI and the knee morbidity seen with osteochondral autografting, reviewers concluded that bone marrow stimulation is the treatment of choice for primary osteochondral talar lesions.

A 2012 systematic review by Niemeyer et al evaluated 16 studies (213 patients) on ACI or MACI for lesions of the talus. All were case series, with a mean sample of 13 patients (range, 2-46 patients) and mean follow-up of 32 months (range, 6-120 months). Most series were prospective. In 6 studies, periosteum-covered ACI was applied while 10 studies used second-generation MACI. Nine different methods were used to evaluate pre- and postoperative clinical function, with the most common being the American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society (AOFAS) ankle-hindfoot.
score. Overall clinical success rate, defined as the percentage of good and excellent results, was 89.9% (range, 50%-100%).

A 2009 report examined the association between defect size and outcomes following marrow stimulation techniques in 120 ankles.23 Eight ankles subsequently underwent osteochondral transplantation, and 22 ankles were considered clinical failures (AOFAS ankle-hindfoot score, <80). Linear regression suggested a cutoff defect size of 1.5 cm² for marrow stimulation techniques, with an 80% failure rate compared with a 10.5% failure rate for ankles with a defect size of less than 1.5 cm². Three (5.2%) of 58 ankles with a defect area of less than 1 cm² showed clinical failure, while 7 (18.9%) of 37 ankles with a defect area between 1.0 and 1.5 cm² failed.

Section Summary: ACI for Joints Other Than the Knee
The evidence on ACI for joints other than the knee includes systematic reviews primarily of observational studies. The most commonly reported use of ACI is for the talus. One systematic review found that outcomes following treatment with ACI were inferior to microfracture. As has been found with ACI for the knee, marrow stimulation has a higher failure rate with larger lesions. Comparative trials are needed to determine whether ACI improves outcomes for larger lesions of the talus.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE
For individuals who have focal articular cartilage lesion(s) of the weight-bearing surface of the femoral condyles or trochlea who receive autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI), the evidence includes systematic reviews, randomized controlled trials (RCTs), and prospective observational studies. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. There is a large body of evidence on ACI for the treatment of focal articular cartilage lesions of the knee. For large lesions, ACI results in better outcomes than microfracture, particularly in the long term. In addition, there is a limit to the size of lesions that can be treated with osteochondral autograft transfer, due to a limit on the number of osteochondral cores that can be safely harvested. As a result, ACI has become the established treatment for large articular cartilage lesions in the knee. In 2017, first-generation ACI with a collagen cover was phased out and replaced with an ACI preparation that seeds the chondrocytes onto a bioresorbable collagen sponge. Although the implantation procedure for this second-generation ACI is less technically demanding, studies to date have not shown improved outcomes compared to first-generation ACI. Some evidence has suggested increase in hypertrophy (overgrowth) of the new implant that may exceed that of the collagen membrane covered implant. Long-term studies with a larger number of patients will be needed to determine whether this hypertrophy impacts graft survival. Based on mid-term outcomes that approximate those of first-generation ACI and the lack of alternatives, second-generation ACI may be considered an option for large disabling full-thickness cartilage lesions of the knee. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have focal articular cartilage lesions of joints other than the knee who receive ACI, the evidence includes 1 RCT and systematic reviews of case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The greatest amount of literature is for ACI of the talus. One systematic review found that outcomes following ACI treatment were inferior to microfracture. However, as has been found with cartilage lesions for the knee, marrow stimulation may have a higher failure rate with larger
lesions. Comparative trials are needed to determine whether ACI improves outcomes for larger lesions in joints other than the knee. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

**CLINICAL INPUT FROM PHYSICIAN SPECIALTY SOCIETIES AND ACADEMIC MEDICAL CENTERS**

While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process, through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted.

**2015 Input**

In response to requests regarding the use of ACI for patellar lesions, input was received from 2 physician specialty societies (6 reviewers) and 4 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2015. The clinical input was generally supportive of the use of ACI for large patellar lesions, although there was a range in the degree of support. Reviewers indicated that outcomes were improved when realignment procedures were performed concurrently with ACI of the patella, and that success rates were lower when using ACI after a prior microfracture. A majority of reviewers recommended that a prior surgical procedure not be required for lesions greater than 4 cm².

**2011 Input**

In response to requests, input was received from 2 physician specialty societies and 3 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2011. The clinical input was generally in agreement with the stated criteria for ACI with the exception of the following: input was mixed regarding the requirement for an inadequate response to a prior surgical procedure and the requirement for an absence of meniscal pathology. Input was also mixed regarding the investigational status of ACI in patellar and talar joints.

**2008 Input**

In response to requests, input was received from 1 physician specialty society and 3 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2008. The reviewers generally agreed that ACI should be considered when all other treatments have been unsuccessfully tried in individuals who have a localized chondral defect in an otherwise normal joint articular surface. Reviewers noted the lack of alternative options for larger lesions (eg, >4 cm²). Additional literature was provided, which was subsequently reviewed.

**PRACTICE GUIDELINES AND POSITION STATEMENTS**

**American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons**

In a 2010 clinical practice guideline on the diagnosis and treatment of osteochondritis dissecans (OCD), the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) was unable to recommend for or against a specific cartilage repair technique in symptomatic skeletally immature or mature patients with an unsalvageable osteochondritis dissecans lesion. This recommendation of insufficient evidence was based on a systematic review that found 4 level IV studies that addressed cartilage repair techniques for an unsalvageable OCD lesion. Since each of the level IV articles utilized different techniques, different outcome measures, and differing lengths of follow-up, the work group deemed that the evidence for any specific technique was inconclusive.
National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence
In 2005, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) issued an updated Technology Appraisal Guidance on the use of autologous chondrocyte implantation. The NICE guidance cited insufficient evidence to determine the benefits of autologous chondrocyte implantation and indicated this technology “should not be used for the treatment of articular cartilage defects except where the treatment is part of a clinical study.” The guidance noted many limitations in available trial data including length of follow-up, comparison to conservative treatment, assessment of the quality of cartilage produced, and the impact of cartilage produced on functional outcomes and health-related quality of life.

U.S. PREVENTIVE SERVICES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS
Not applicable.

ONGOING AND UNPUBLISHED CLINICAL TRIALS
Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this policy are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Key Trials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCT No.</th>
<th>Trial Name</th>
<th>Planned Enrollment</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCT01251588^a</td>
<td>An Extension Protocol for Participants of Genzyme-Sponsored Prospective, Randomized, Open-Label, Parallel-Group, Multicenter Study of Matrix-Induced Autologous Chondrocyte Implantation (MACI® Implant) for the Treatment of Symptomatic Articular Cartilage Defects of the Femoral Condyle Including the Trochlea for the Repair of Articular Cartilage Injuries in the Knee</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Mar 2015 (completed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCT: national clinical trial.
^a Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

CODING
The following codes for treatment and procedures applicable to this policy are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member’s contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

CPT/HCPCS
27412 Autologous chondrocyte implantation, knee
29870 Arthroscopy, knee, diagnostic, with or without synovial biopsy (separate procedure)
29871 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; for infection, lavage and drainage
29873 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; with lateral release
29874 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; for removal of loose body or foreign body (eg, osteochondritis dissecans fragmentation chondral fragmentation)
29875 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; synovectomy, limited (eg, plica or shelf resection) (separate procedure)
29876 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; synovectomy, major, 2 or more compartments (eg, medical or lateral)
29877 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; debridement/shaving of articular cartilage (chondroplasty)
29879 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; abrasion arthroplasty (includes chondroplasty where necessary) or multiple drilling or microfracture
29880 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; with meniscectomy (medial AND lateral, including any meniscal shaving) including debridement/shaving of articular cartilage (chondroplasty), same or separate compartment(s), when performed
29881 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; with meniscectomy (medial OR lateral, including any meniscal shaving) including debridement/shaving of articular cartilage (chondroplasty), same or separate compartment(s), when performed
29882 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; with meniscus repair (medial OR lateral)
29883 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; with meniscus repair (medial AND lateral)
29884 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; with lysis of adhesions, with or without manipulation (separate procedure)
J7330 Autologous cultured chondrocytes, implant
S2112 Arthroscopy, knee, surgical for harvesting of cartilage (chondrocyte cells)

ICD-9 Diagnoses
715.16 Primary localized osteoarthrosis, lower leg
715.26 Secondary localized osteoarthrosis, lower leg
715.36 Localized osteoarthrosis not specified whether primary or secondary, lower leg
715.96 Osteoarthrosis, unspecified whether generalized or localized, lower leg
716.16 Traumatic arthropathy, lower leg
718.86 Other joint derangement, not elsewhere classified, lower leg
719.86 Other specified disorders of lower leg joint
732.7 Osteochondropathies; Osteochondritis dissecans
733.90 Disorder bone and cartilage; unspecified
959.7 Injury, other and unspecified; knee, leg, ankle, and foot

ICD-10 Diagnoses (Effective October 1, 2015)
M12.561 Traumatic arthropathy, right knee
M12.562 Traumatic arthropathy, left knee
M17.0 Bilateral primary osteoarthritis of knee
M17.11 Unilateral primary osteoarthritis, right knee
M17.12 Unilateral primary osteoarthritis, left knee
M17.2 Bilateral post-traumatic osteoarthritis of knee
M17.31 Unilateral post-traumatic osteoarthritis, right knee
M17.32 Unilateral post-traumatic osteoarthritis, left knee
M17.4 Other bilateral secondary osteoarthritis of knee
M17.5 Other unilateral secondary osteoarthritis of knee
M17.9 Osteoarthritis of knee, unspecified
M23.8X1 Other internal derangements of right knee
M23.8X2 Other internal derangements of left knee
M23.91 Unspecified internal derangement of right knee
M23.92 Unspecified internal derangement of left knee
M25.861 Other specified joint disorders, right knee
M25.862 Other specified joint disorders, left knee

Contains Public Information
M89.8X6 Other specified disorders of bone, lower leg  
M89.9 Disorder of bone, unspecified  
M93.261 Osteochondritis dissecans, right knee  
M93.262 Osteochondritis dissecans, left knee  
M94.261 Chondromalacia, right knee  
M94.262 Chondromalacia, left knee  
M94.8X6 Other specified disorders of cartilage, lower leg  
S89.81XA Other specified injuries of right lower leg, initial encounter  
S89.81XD Other specified injuries of right lower leg, subsequent encounter  
S89.81XS Other specified injuries of right lower leg, sequela  
S89.82XA Other specified injuries of left lower leg, initial encounter  
S89.82XD Other specified injuries of left lower leg, subsequent encounter  
S89.82XS Other specified injuries of left lower leg, sequela  
S89.90XA Unspecified injury of unspecified lower leg, initial encounter  
S89.90XD Unspecified injury of unspecified lower leg, subsequent encounter  
S89.90XS Unspecified injury of unspecified lower leg, sequela  
S89.91XA Unspecified injury of right lower leg, initial encounter  
S89.91XD Unspecified injury of right lower leg, subsequent encounter  
S89.91XS Unspecified injury of right lower leg, sequela  
S89.92XA Unspecified injury of left lower leg, initial encounter  
S89.92XD Unspecified injury of left lower leg, subsequent encounter  
S89.92XS Unspecified injury of left lower leg, sequela  

**REVISIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-02-2015</td>
<td>A stand-alone policy entitled “Autologous Chondrocyte Implantation for Focal Articular Cartilage Lesions” was created from the “Transplantation for Chondral Defects” medical policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Description section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Policy section:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In Item A, removed &quot;or osteochondritis dissecans&quot;, to read, “Autologous chondrocyte implantation may be considered medically necessary for the treatment of disabling full-thickness articular cartilage defects of the knee caused by acute or repetitive trauma in patients who have had an inadequate response to a prior surgical procedure, when all of the following criteria are met:&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In Item A #2, removed Outerbridge definition as this is defined in Policy Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In Item A #3, removed Outerbridge definition as this is defined in Policy Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removed Item A #5 &quot;Absence of meniscal pathology.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removed all language regarding Osteochondral Autograft Transplants for the treatment of cartilaginous defects and Osteochondral Allograft Transplant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In Policy Guidelines, added Items 1-5, and removed all language regarding Autologous Chondrocyte Transplant or Implants and Osteochondral Autograft Transplants and Osteochondral Allograft Transplants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Rationale section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Coding section:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Added CPT codes 29879, 29880, 29881, 29882, 29883, and 29884.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removed CPT codes 27415, 27416, 28446, 29866, and 29867.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removed ICD-9 Diagnosis code 717.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Revision section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Autologous Chondrocyte Implantation for Focal Articular Cartilage Lesions

Updated References section.

10-13-2015
Updated Rationale section.
Updated References section.

01-20-2016
Updated Description section.

In Policy section:
- In Item A, removed "in patients who have had an inadequate response to a prior surgical procedure" to read, "Autologous chondrocyte implantation may be medically necessary for the treatment of disabling full-thickness articular cartilage defects of the knee caused by acute or repetitive trauma, when all of the following criteria are met:"

Updated Rationale section.
Updated References section.

05-10-2017
Updated Description section.

In Policy section:
- In Item B, removed "patellar and" to read, "Autologous chondrocyte implantation for all other joints, including talar, and any indications other than those listed above is considered experimental / investigational."
- Removed Item C, "Matrix-induced autologous chondrocyte implantation is considered experimental / investigational."
- In Policy Guidelines Item 5 b, added "on an absorbable collagen matrix" to read, "culturing of chondrocytes on an absorbable collagen matrix"
- In Policy Guidelines Item 5 c, added "place the implant" and removed "create a periosteal flap and implant the chondrocytes" to read, "a separate arthrotomy to place the implant"

Updated Rationale section.
Updated References section.
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