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Myoelectric upper limb prostheses and conventional grip myoelectric prosthetic hands may be considered medically necessary when ALL of the following criteria are met:

- The patient has an amputation or missing limb at the wrist or above (forearm, elbow, etc.); AND
- Standard body-powered prosthetic devices cannot be used or are insufficient to meet the member’s functional needs when performing activities of daily living; AND
- The remaining musculature of the arm(s) contains the minimum microvolt threshold to allow operation of a myoelectric prosthetic device; AND
- The patient has demonstrated sufficient neurological and cognitive function to operate the prosthesis safely and effectively; AND
- The patient is free of comorbidities that could interfere with function of the prosthesis (neuromuscular disease, etc.); AND
- The results of a functional evaluation indicate that with training, use of a myoelectric prosthesis is likely to meet the functional needs of the patient (e.g., gripping, releasing, holding, and coordinating movement of the prosthesis) when performing activities of daily living. This evaluation should consider the patient’s needs for control, durability (maintenance), function (speed, work capability), and usability.

Myoelectric upper limb prosthetic devices are considered not medically necessary when the criteria in this policy are not met.

A prosthetic hand attachment with mechanical fingers (digits) that uses full or partial myoelectric power for independent movement of individual joints is considered investigational.

Note: Advanced technology full or partial myoelectric prosthetic hand attachments with individually powered digits are designed to replace the finer control of missing fingers either in their entirety or in part (e.g. i-limb digits, ProDigits™, and others). Articulation (independent movement) of the prosthetic finger joints involves sophisticated biomechanical technology; in contrast to the conventional grip myoelectric prosthetic hand that is an alternative to a hook-type hand attachment. As yet, the value of a myoelectric prosthetic hand with jointed, individually powered fingers over a conventional myoelectric hand has not been proven.
Policy Guidelines

Amputees should be evaluated by an independent qualified professional to determine the most appropriate prosthetic components and control mechanism (e.g., body-powered, myoelectric, or combination of body-powered and myoelectric). A trial period may be indicated to evaluate the tolerability and efficacy of the prosthesis in a real-life setting.

Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCPCS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L6026</td>
<td>Transcarpal/metacarpal or partial hand disarticulation prosthesis, external power, self-suspended, inner socket with removable forearm section, electrodes and cables, two batteries, charger, myoelectric control of terminal device(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6715</td>
<td>Terminal device, multiple articulating digit, includes motor(s), initial issue or replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6880</td>
<td>Electric hand, switch or myoelectric controlled, independently articulating digits, any grasp pattern or combination of grasp patterns, includes motor(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6925</td>
<td>Wrist disarticulation, external power, self-suspended inner socket, removable forearm shell, Otto Bock or equal electrodes, cables, 2 batteries and one charger, myoelectronic control of terminal device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6935</td>
<td>Below elbow, external power, self-suspended inner socket, removable forearm shell, Otto Bock or equal electrodes, cables, two batteries and one charger, myoelectronic control of terminal device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6945</td>
<td>Elbow disarticulation, external power, molded inner socket, removable humeral shell, outside locking hinges, forearm, Otto Bock or equal electrodes, cables, two batteries and one charger, myoelectronic control of terminal device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6955</td>
<td>Above elbow, external power, molded inner socket, removable humeral shell, internal locking elbow, forearm, Otto Bock or equal electrodes, cables, two batteries and one charger, myoelectronic control of terminal device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6965</td>
<td>Shoulder disarticulation, external power, molded inner socket, removable shoulder shell, shoulder bulkhead, humeral section, mechanical elbow, forearm, Otto Bock or equal electrodes, cables, two batteries and one charger, myoelectronic control of terminal device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6975</td>
<td>Interscapular-thoracic, external power, molded inner socket, removable shoulder shell, shoulder bulkhead, humeral section, mechanical elbow, forearm, Otto Bock or equal electrodes, cables, two batteries and one charger, myoelectronic control of terminal device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7007</td>
<td>Electric hand, switch or myoelectric controlled, adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7008</td>
<td>Electric hand, switch or myoelectric controlled, pediatric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7009</td>
<td>Electric hook, switch or myoelectric controlled, adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7045</td>
<td>Electric hook, switch or myoelectric controlled, pediatric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7181</td>
<td>Electronic elbow, microprocessor simultaneous control of elbow and terminal device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7190</td>
<td>Electronic elbow, adolescent, Variety Village or equal, myoelectronically controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7191</td>
<td>Electronic elbow, child, Variety Village or equal, myoelectronically controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7259</td>
<td>Electronic wrist rotator, any type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

Background

Upper-limb prostheses are used for amputations at any level, from the hand to the shoulder. The need for prosthesis can occur for a number of reasons, including trauma, surgery, or congenital anomalies. The primary goals of the upper-limb prostheses are to restore function and natural appearance. Achieving these goals also requires sufficient comfort and ease of use for continued acceptance by the wearer. The difficulty of achieving these diverse goals with an upper-limb prosthesis increases with the level of amputation (digits, hand, wrist,
elbow, shoulder), and thus the complexity of joint movement increases.

Upper-limb prostheses are classified into 3 categories depending on the means of generating movement at the joints: passive, body-powered, and electrically powered movement. All 3 types of prostheses have been in use for more than 30 years; each possesses unique advantages and disadvantages.

The passive prosthesis relies on manual repositioning, typically by moving with the opposite arm and cannot restore function. It is the lightest of the 3 prosthetic types and is thus generally the most comfortable.

The body-powered prosthesis uses a body harness and cable system to provide functional manipulation of the elbow and hand. Voluntary movement of the shoulder and/or limb stump extends the cable and transmits the force to the terminal device. Prosthetic hand attachments, which may be claw-like devices that allow good grip strength and visual control of objects or latex-gloved devices that provide a more natural appearance at the expense of control, can be opened and closed by the cable system. Patient complaints with body-powered prostheses include harness discomfort, particularly the wear temperature, wire failure, and the unattractive appearance.

Myoelectric prostheses use muscle activity from the remaining limb for control of joint movement. Electromyographic (EMG) signals from the limb stump are detected by surface electrodes, amplified, and then processed by a controller to drive battery-powered motors that move the hand, wrist, or elbow. Although upper arm movement may be slow and limited to 1 joint at a time, myoelectric control of movement may be considered the most physiologically natural.

Myoelectric hand attachments are similar in form to those offered with the body-powered prosthesis but are battery-powered. Commercially available examples are listed in the Regulatory Status section.

A hybrid system, a combination of body-powered and myoelectric components, may be used for high-level amputations (at or above the elbow). Hybrid systems allow control of 2 joints at once (i.e., 1 body-powered, 1 myoelectric) and are generally lighter and less expensive than a prosthesis composed entirely of myoelectric components.

Technology in this area is rapidly changing, driven by advances in biomedical engineering and by the U.S. Department of Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), which is funding a public and private collaborative effort on prosthetic research and development. Areas of development include the use of skin-like silicone elastomer gloves, “artificial muscles,” and sensory feedback. Smaller motors, microcontrollers, implantable myoelectric sensors, and reinervation of remaining muscle fibers are being developed to allow fine movement control. Lighter batteries and newer materials are being incorporated into myoelectric prostheses to improve comfort.

The DEKA Arm System, developed in a joint effort with DARPA and approved by the Food and Drug Administration in May 2014, is the first commercially available myoelectric upper limb that can perform complex tasks with multiple simultaneous powered movements (e.g., movement of the elbow, wrist, and hand at the same time). In addition to the EMG electrodes, the DEKA Arm System contains a combination of mechanisms, including switches, movement sensors, and force sensors.

**Regulatory Status**
 Manufacturers must register prostheses with the restorative devices branch of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and keep a record of any complaints, but do not have to undergo a full FDA review.

In 2014, the DEKA Arm System, now called the LUKE™ arm (DEKA Integrated Solutions, now DEKA Research & Development) was cleared for marketing by FDA through the de novo 513(f)(2) classification process for some novel low- to moderate-risk medical devices that are first-of-a-kind.

FDA product codes: GXY, IQZ.

Available myoelectric devices include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Deka Arm System (DEKA Integrated Solutions)
- Dynamic Arm (Advanced Arm Dynamics)
- Dynamic Mode Control hand
- Electrohand 2000 for children (Otto Bock)
- ErgoArm hybrid system (Otto Bock)
- i-LIMB™ (Touch Bionics)
- LTI Boston Digital™ Arm Systems—various upper limb devices and components (Liberating Technologies Inc.)
- Michelangelo® Hand (Otto Bock)
- Otto Bock has a number of myoelectric prosthesis, that may not be in this list (Otto Bock)
- ProDigits™ (Touch Bionics)
- SensorHand™ (Advanced Arm Dynamics)
- Utah Arm Systems (Motion Control)

**Scope**

Medical policies are systematically developed guidelines that serve as a resource for Company staff when determining coverage for specific medical procedures, drugs or devices. Coverage for medical services is subject to the limits and conditions of the member benefit plan. Members and their providers should consult the member benefit booklet or contact a customer service representative to determine whether there are any benefit limitations applicable to this service or supply. This policy does not apply to Medicare Advantage.

**Benefit Application**

In this policy, procedures are considered reconstructive when intended to address a significant variation from normal related to accidental injury, disease, trauma, treatment of a disease, or congenital defect, irrespective of whether a functional impairment is present.

This reconstructive benefit may be applied in cases in which the myoelectric prosthesis is requested based on appearance. Not all benefit contracts include benefits for reconstructive services as defined by this policy. Benefit language supersedes this document.

**Rationale**

This policy was created in 2014. The most recent literature search was through November 21, 2016.

Prospective comparative studies with objective and subjective outcome measures would provide the most informative data on which to compare different prostheses, but little evidence was identified that directly addresses whether myoelectric prostheses improve function and health-related quality of life. Most studies identified describe the development of interfaces and signal processing algorithms for myoelectric prosthetic control.

The available indirect evidence is based on 2 assumptions: (1) use of any prosthesis confers clinical benefit and (2) self-selected use is an acceptable measure of the perceived benefit (combination of utility, comfort, appearance) of a particular prosthesis for that person. Most studies identified describe amputees’ self-selected use or rejection rates. The results are usually presented as hours worn at work, hours worn at home, and hours worn in social situations. Amputees’ self-reported reasons for use and abandonment are also frequently reported. Upper-limb amputee’s needs may depend on the particular situation. For example, increased functional capability may be needed with heavy work or domestic duties, while a more naturally appearing prosthesis with reduced functional capability may be acceptable for an office, school, or other social environment.
Myoelectric Upper-limb prosthesis
A 2007 systematic review of 40 articles published over the previous 25 years assessed upper-limb prosthesis acceptance and abandonment.(1) For pediatric patients, the mean rejection rate was 38% for passive prostheses (1 study), 45% for body-powered prostheses (3 studies), and 32% for myoelectric prostheses (12 studies). For adults, there was considerable variation between studies, with mean rejection rates of 39% for passive (6 studies), 26% for body-powered (8 studies), and 23% for myoelectric (10 studies) prostheses. Reviewers found no evidence that the acceptability of passive prostheses had declined over the period from 1983 to 2004, “despite the advent of myoelectric devices with functional as well as cosmetic appeal.” Body-powered prostheses were also found to have remained a popular choice, with the type of hand attachment being the major factor in acceptance. Body-powered hooks were considered acceptable by many users, but body-powered hands were frequently rejected (80%-87% rejection rates) due to slowness in movement, awkward use, maintenance issues, excessive weight, insufficient grip strength, and the energy needed to operate. Rejection rates of myoelectric prostheses tended to increase with longer follow-up. There was no evidence of a change in rejection rates over the 25 years of study, but the results are limited by sampling bias from isolated populations and the generally poor quality of studies selected.

One prospective controlled study compared preferences for body-powered and myoelectric hands in children.(2) Juvenile amputees (toddlers to teenagers, n=120) were fitted in a randomized order with 1 of the 2 types of prostheses; after a 3-month period, the terminal devices were switched, and the children selected one of the prostheses to use. After 2 years, some (n=11) of the original study sites agreed to reevaluate the children, and 78 (74% follow-up from the 11 sites) appeared for interview and examination. At the time of follow-up, 34 (44%) were wearing the myoelectric prosthesis, 26 (34%) were wearing a body-powered prosthesis (13 used hands, 13 used hooks), and 18 (22%) were not using a prosthesis. There was no difference in the children’s ratings of the myoelectric and body-powered devices (3.8 on a 5-point scale). Of the 60 children who wore a prosthesis, 19 were considered to be “passive” users (i.e., they did not use the prosthesis to pick up or hold objects [prehensile function]). A multicenter within-subject randomized study, published in 1993, compared function with myoelectric and body-powered hands (identical size, shape, color) in 67 children with congenital limb deficiency and 9 children with traumatic amputation.(3) Each type of hand was worn for 3 months before functional testing. Some specific tasks were performed slightly faster with the myoelectric hand; others were performed better with the body-powered hand. Overall, no clinically important differences were found in performance. Interpretation of these results is limited by changes in technology since this study was published.

Silcox et al conducted a within-subject comparison of preference for body-powered or myoelectric prostheses in adults.(4) Of 44 patients who had been fitted with a myoelectric prosthesis, 40 (91%) also owned a body-powered prosthesis and 9 (20%) owned a passive prosthesis. Twenty-two (50%) patients had rejected the myoelectric prosthesis, 13 (32%) had rejected the body-powered prosthesis, and 5 (55%) had rejected the passive prosthesis. Use of a body-powered prosthesis was unaffected by the type of work; good-to-excellent use was reported in 35% of patients with heavy work demands and in 39% of patients with light work demands. In contrast, the proportion of patients using a myoelectric prosthesis was higher in the group with light work demands (44%) than in those with heavy work demands (26%). There was also a trend toward higher use of the myoelectric prosthesis (n=16) in comparison with a body-powered prosthesis (n=10) in social situations. Appearance was cited more frequently (19 patients) as a reason for using a myoelectric prosthesis than any other factor. Weight (16 patients) and speed (10 patients) were more frequently cited than any other factor as reasons for nonuse of the myoelectric prosthesis.

McFarland et al conducted a cross-sectional survey of major combat-related upper-limb loss in veterans and service members from Vietnam (n=47) and Iraq (n=50) recruited through a national survey.(5) In the first year of limb loss, the Vietnam group received a mean of 1.2 devices (usually body-powered), while the Iraq group received a mean of 3.0 devices (typically 1 myoelectric/hybrid, 1 body-powered, 1 cosmetic). At the time of the survey, upper-limb prosthetic devices were used by 70% of the Vietnam group and 76% of the Iraq group. Body-powered devices were favored by the Vietnam group (78%), while a combination of myoelectric/hybrid (46%) and body-powered (38%) devices were favored by the Iraq group. Replacement of myoelectric/hybrid devices was 3 years or longer in the Vietnam group while 89% of the Iraq group replaced myoelectric/hybrid devices in under 2 years. All types of upper-limb prostheses were abandoned in 30% of the Vietnam group and 22% of the Iraq group; the most common reasons for rejection included short residual limbs, pain, poor comfort (e.g., weight of the device), and lack of functionality.

Biddiss and Chau published results from an online or mailed survey of 242 upper-limb amputees from the United
States, Canada, and Europe in 2007. Of the survey respondents, 14% had never worn a prosthesis and 28% had rejected regular prosthetic use; 64% were either full-time or consistent part-time wearers. Factors in device use and abandonment were the level of limb absence, sex, and perceived need (e.g., working vs unemployed). Prosthesis rejectors were found to discontinue use due to a lack of functional need, discomfort (excessive weight and heat), and impediment to sensory feedback. Dissatisfaction with available prosthesis technology was a major factor in abandoning prosthesis use. No differences between users and nonusers were found for experience with a particular type of prosthesis (passive, body-powered, myoelectric) or terminal device (hand or hook).

In another online survey, most of the 43 responding adults used a myoelectric prosthetic arm and/or hand for 8 or more hours at work/school (86%) or for recreation (67%), while most of the 11 child respondents used their prosthesis for 4 hours or less at school (72%) or for recreation (88%). Satisfaction was greatest (≥50% of adults, 100% of children) for the appearance of the myoelectric prosthesis and least (≥75% of adults, 50% of children) for the grasping speed, which was considered too slow. Of 33 respondents with a transradial amputation, 55% considered the weight “a little too heavy” and 24% considered the weight to be “much too high.” The types of activities that most adults (between 50% and 80%) desired to perform with the myoelectric prosthesis were handicrafts, operation of electronic and domestic devices, using cutlery, personal hygiene, dressing and undressing, and, to a lesser extent, writing. Most (80%) of the children indicated that they wanted to use their prosthesis for dressing and undressing, personal hygiene, using cutlery, and handicrafts.

A 2009 study evaluated the acceptance of a myoelectric prosthesis in 41 children between 2 and 5 years of age. To be fitted with a myoelectric prosthesis, the children had to communicate well and follow instructions from strangers, have interest in an artificial limb, have bimanual handling (use of both limbs in handling objects), and have a supportive family setting. A 1- to 2-week interdisciplinary training program (inpatient or outpatient) was provided for the child and parents. At a mean 2-year follow-up (range, 0.7–5.1 years), a questionnaire was distributed to evaluate acceptance and use during daily life (100% return rate). Successful use, defined as a mean daily wearing time of more than 2 hours, was achieved in 76% of the study group. The average daily use was 5.8 hours per day (range, 0.1–4 h/d). The level of amputation significantly influenced the daily wearing time, with above elbow amputees wearing the prosthesis for longer periods than children with below elbow amputations. Three (60%) of 5 children with amputations at or below the wrist refused use of any prosthetic device. There were statistically nonsignificant trends for increased use in younger children, in those who had inpatient occupational training, and in those children who had a previous passive (vs body-powered) prosthesis. During the follow-up period, maintenance averaged 1.9 times per year (range, 0–8 repairs); this was correlated with the daily wearing time. The authors discussed that a more important selection criteria than age was the activity and temperament of the child; e.g., a myoelectric prosthesis would more likely be used in a calm child interested in quiet bimanual play, whereas a body-powered prosthesis would be more durable for outdoor sports, and in sand or water.

An evaluation of a rating scale called the Assessment of Capacity for Myoelectric Control (ACMC) was described by Lindner et al in 2009. For this evaluation, a rater identified 30 types of hand movements in 96 patients (age range, 2–57 years) who performed a self-chosen bimanual task, such as preparation of a meal, making the bed, doing crafts, or playing with different toys; each of the 30 types of movements was rated on a 4-point scale (not capable or not performed, sometimes capable, capable on request, spontaneously capable). The types of hand movements were variations of 4 main functional categories (gripping, releasing, holding, coordinating), and the evaluations took approximately 30 minutes. Statistical analysis indicated that the ACMC is a valid assessment for measuring differing ability among users of upper-limb prostheses, although the instrument was limited by having the task difficulty determined by the patient (e.g., a person with low ability might have chosen a very easy and familiar task). Lindner et al recommended that further research with standard tasks is needed and that additional tests of reliability are required to examine the consistency of the ACMC over time.

**Myoelectric Hand with Individual Digit Control**

Although the availability of a myoelectric hand with individual control of digits has been widely reported in lay technology reports, video clips, and basic science reports, no peer-reviewed publications were found to evaluate functional outcomes of individual digit control in amputees.

**Summary of Evidence**

For individuals who have a missing a missing limb at the wrist or above who receive myoelectric upper limb prosthesis components at the wrist or proximal to the wrist, the evidence includes cohort studies and survey data.
Relevant outcomes are functional outcomes and quality of life. The goals of upper-limb prostheses relate to restoration of both appearance and function while maintaining sufficient comfort for continued use. The identified literature focuses primarily on patient acceptance and reasons for disuse; detailed data on function and functional status, and direct comparisons between body-powered and newer model myoelectric prostheses are limited or lacking. The limited evidence suggests that, compared with body-powered prostheses, myoelectric components may improve range of motion to some extent, have similar capability for light work, but may have reduced performance under heavy working conditions. The literature also indicates that the percentage of amputees who accept use of a myoelectric prosthesis is approximately the same as those who prefer to use a body-powered prosthesis, and that self-selected use depends at least in part on the individual’s activities of daily living. Appearance is most frequently cited as an advantage of myoelectric prostheses, and for patients who desire a restorative appearance the myoelectric prosthesis can provide greater function than a passive prosthesis, with equivalent function to a body-powered prosthesis for light work. Nonuse of any prosthesis is associated with lack of functional need, discomfort (excessive weight and heat), and impediment to sensory feedback. Because of the differing advantages and disadvantages of currently available prostheses, myoelectric components for persons with an amputation at the wrist or above may be considered when passive or body-powered prostheses cannot be used or are insufficient to meet the functional needs of the patient in activities of daily living. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have a missing limb distal to the wrist who receive a myoelectric prosthesis with individually powered digits, no peer-reviewed publications evaluating functional outcomes in amputees were identified. Relevant outcomes are functional outcomes and quality of life. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

### Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
Some current trials are listed in Table 1 below.

#### Table 1. Summary of Key Clinical 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>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02274532</td>
<td>Myoelectric SoftHand Pro to Improve Prosthetic Function for People With Below-elbow Amputations: A Feasibility Study</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sep 2016 (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT01551420</td>
<td>Home Study of an Advanced Upper Limb Prosthesis</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Dec 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02349035</td>
<td>Application of Targeted Reinnervation for People With Transradial Amputation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jan 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unpublished**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCT No.</th>
<th>Trial Name</th>
<th>Planned Enrollment</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCT01901081</td>
<td>A Feasibility Study to Assess Safety and Functionality of Implantable Myoelectric Sensors for Upper Extremity Prosthetic Control in Transradial Amputees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>May 2016 (unknown)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCT: national clinical trial
* Denotes industry-sponsored or co-sponsored trial

### 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.

#### 2012 Input
In response to requests, input on partial hand prostheses was received from 1 physician specialty society and 2 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2012. Input was mixed. The reviewers agreed that there was a lack of evidence and experience with individual digit control, although some thought that these devices might provide functional gains for selected patients.

#### 2008 Input
In response to requests, input was received from 1 physician specialty society and 4 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2008. The American Academy of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation and all 4 reviewers from academic medical centers supported use of electrically powered upper-extremity prosthetic components. Reviewers also supported evaluation of the efficacy and tolerability of the prosthesis in a real-life setting, commenting that outcomes are dependent on the personality and functional demands of the individual patient.

**Practice Guidelines and Position Statements**
No guidelines or statements were identified.

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

**Medicare National Coverage**
There is no national coverage determination (NCD). In the absence of an NCD, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

**References**


**Appendix**

N/A

**History**
New PR (PREMERA) policy to replace 1.04.04. Myoelectric upper limb prostheses and conventional grip myoelectric prosthetic hands may be considered medically necessary when criteria are met. Myoelectric prosthetic hand attachments with mechanical fingers that have independently powered joints are considered investigational.

Interim Update. Policy Guidelines added with details about when orthotics, prosthetics, or prosthetic components added to a conventional prosthesis are not covered. Added The Deka Arm System to the Regulatory Status section. No new references added. Policy statements unchanged.

Coding update. New HCPCS codes L6026 (replaces L6025 deleted 12/31/14) and L7259 added to the policy.


Minor update. Added HCPCS L7181 to coding table.

Annual Review. Policy statements unchanged. No references added.

Annual review. Policy updated with literature review through November 21, 2016; no references added. Policy statements unchanged.

Coding update; removed HCPCS code L6025 as it was terminated on 12/31/2014.

Coding update; added HCPCS code L6925.

Disclaimer: This medical policy is a guide in evaluating the medical necessity of a particular service or treatment. The Company adopts policies after careful review of published peer-reviewed scientific literature, national guidelines and local standards of practice. Since medical technology is constantly changing, the Company reserves the right to review and update policies as appropriate. Member contracts differ in their benefits. Always consult the member benefit booklet or contact a member service representative to determine coverage for a specific medical service or supply. CPT codes, descriptions and materials are copyrighted by the American Medical Association (AMA).
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Discrimination is Against the Law

Premera Blue Cross complies with applicable Federal civil rights laws and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, or sex. Premera does not exclude people or treat them differently because of race, color, national origin, age, disability or sex.

Premera:
- Provides free aids and services to people with disabilities to communicate effectively with us, such as:
  - Qualified sign language interpreters
  - Written information in other formats (large print, audio, accessible electronic formats, other formats)
- Provides free language services to people whose primary language is not English, such as:
  - Qualified interpreters
  - Information written in other languages

If you need these services, contact the Civil Rights Coordinator.

If you believe that Premera has failed to provide these services or discriminated in another way on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, or sex, you can file a grievance:
- Civil Rights Coordinator - Complaints and Appeals
  PO Box 91102, Seattle, WA 98111
  Toll free 855-332-4535, Fax 425-918-5592. TTY 800-842-5357
  Email AppealsDepartmentInquiries@Premera.com

You can find a grievance in person or by mail, fax, or email. If you need help filing a grievance, the Civil Rights Coordinator is available to help you.

You can also file a civil rights complaint with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Civil Rights, electronically through the Office for Civil Rights Complaint Portal, available at https://ocrportal.hhs.gov/ocr/portal/lobby.jsf, or by mail or phone at:
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
  200 Independence Avenue SW, Room 509F, HHH Building
  Washington, D.C. 20201, 1-800-368-1019, 800-537-7697 (TDD)

Getting Help in Other Languages

This Notice has Important Information. This notice may have important information about your application or coverage through Premera Blue Cross. There may be key dates in this notice. You may need to take action by certain deadlines to keep your health coverage or help with costs. You have the right to get this information and help in your language at no cost. Call 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Oromoo (Cushite):

Francais (French):

Kreyòl ayisyen (Creole):

Deutsche (German):

Hmoob (Hmong):

Ilokano (Ilocano):
Daytoy a Pakdaar ket naglaon iti Napateg nga Impomarsion. Daytoy a pakdaar mabalina nga adda ket naglaon iti napateg nga impomarsion maipanggep iiti aplikasyon no yenno coverage babaen iti Premera Blue Cross. Daytoy ket mabalina dagiti importante a peltaiti daytoy a pakdaar. Mabalina nga adda rumbeng nga aramidenyo nga addang sakbay dagiti partikular a naituding nga adda tidaw tapno mapagtaladneyo ti coverage ti salun-atyo wenno tulong kadagiti gastos. Adda karbenganyo a mangala iti daytoy nga impomarsion ken tulong ti bukdoyo a pagasao nga awan ti bayadanyo. Tumawag ti numero nga 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Italiano (Italian):

中文 (Chinese):
本通知有重要的訊息。本通知可能有關於您透過 Premera Blue Cross 提交的申請或保障的重要訊息。本通知可能有重要日期。您可能需要在截止日期之前採取行動，以保留您的健康保險或者費用補貼。您有權利免費以您的母語得到本訊息和幫助。請接電話 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).
Informații de importanță despre informația pe care o ai privind cobertura Premera Blue Cross: 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Estimele dumneavoastră pot fi necesare pentru a vă asigura că dânsiile și usații dumneavoastră se pot asigura pentru durata lor. Dacă am putea să vă asigurăm că aceste informații sunt complete și corecte, vom putea să vă vinem în ajutor așa cum este cazul.

Este posibil să vă solicităm să întocmaiți informațiile dumneavoastră pentru a vă asigura că dânsiile și usații dumneavoastră se pot asigura pentru durata lor. Dacă am putea să vă asigurăm că aceste informații sunt complete și corecte, vom putea să vă vinem în ajutor așa cum este cazul.

Informații de importanță despre informația pe care o ai privind cobertura Premera Blue Cross: 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Informații de importanță despre informația pe care o ai privind cobertura Premera Blue Cross: 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Este aviso poderá conter informação importante acerca de sua solicitação ou cobertura a través de Premera Blue Cross. Este aviso poderá conter informação importante acerca de sua solicitação ou cobertura a através de Premera Blue Cross. Este aviso poderá conter informação importante acerca de sua solicitação ou cobertura a através de Premera Blue Cross. Este aviso poderá conter informação importante acerca de sua solicitação ou cobertura a através de Premera Blue Cross. Este aviso poderá conter informação importante acerca de sua solicitação ou cobertura a através de Premera Blue Cross. Este aviso poderá conter informação importante acerca de sua solicitação ou cobertura a através de Premera Blue Cross. Este aviso poderá conter informação importante acerca de sua solicitação ou cobertura a através de Premera Blue Cross. Este aviso podrá contener información importante acerca de su solicitud o cobertura a través de Premera Blue Cross.