



## **Cohere Medicare Advantage Policy – Xenograft Implantation**

*Clinical Policy for Medical Necessity Review*

**Version:** 3.1  
**Revision Date:** July 1, 2025

# Important Notices

## Notices & Disclaimers:

**GUIDELINES ARE SOLELY FOR COHERE'S USE IN PERFORMING MEDICAL NECESSITY REVIEWS AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO INFORM OR ALTER CLINICAL DECISION-MAKING OF END USERS.**

Cohere Health, Inc. ("**Cohere**") has published these clinical guidelines to determine the medical necessity of services (the "**Guidelines**") for informational purposes only, and solely for use by Cohere's authorized "**End Users**". These Guidelines (and any attachments or linked third-party content) are not intended to be a substitute for medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment directed by an appropriately licensed healthcare professional. These Guidelines are not in any way intended to support clinical decision-making of any kind; their sole purpose and intended use is to summarize certain criteria Cohere may use when reviewing the medical necessity of any service requests submitted to Cohere by End Users. Always seek the advice of a qualified healthcare professional regarding any medical questions, treatment decisions, or other clinical guidance. The Guidelines, including any attachments or linked content, are subject to change at any time without notice. This policy may be superseded by existing and applicable Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) statutes.

© 2025 Cohere Health, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

## Other Notices:

HCPCS® and CPT® copyright 2025 American Medical Association. All rights reserved.

Fee schedules, relative value units, conversion factors and/or related components are not assigned by the AMA, are not part of CPT, and the AMA is not recommending their use. The AMA does not directly or indirectly practice medicine or dispense medical services. The AMA assumes no liability for data contained or not contained herein.

HCPCS and CPT are registered trademarks of the American Medical Association.

## Policy Information:

**Specialty Area:** Musculoskeletal Care

**Policy Name:** Cohere Medicare Advantage Policy - Xenograft Implantation

**Type:** ☒ Adult (18+ yo) | ☒ Pediatric (0-17 yo)

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Important Notices</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Medical Necessity Criteria</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Service: Xenograft Implantation</b>	<b>4</b>
Related CMS Documents	4
Description	4
Medical Necessity Criteria	4
Indications	4
Non-Indications	4
Level of Care Criteria	4
Procedure Codes (CPT/HCPCS)	5
<b>Medical Evidence</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Clinical Guideline Revision History/Information</b>	<b>9</b>

# Medical Necessity Criteria

## ***Service: Xenograft Implantation***

### **Related CMS Documents**

Please refer to [CMS Medicare Coverage Database](#) for the most current applicable CMS National Coverage.

- There are no NCDs and/or LCDs for xenograft implantation.

### **Description**

Xenografts are bone grafts derived from non-human animal sources, most commonly bovine (cow) or porcine (pig) bone. These grafts are used to repair bone defects, fractures, or to augment bone in various orthopedic procedures. Xenograft implantation into the articular surface is a cartilage repair procedure to replace naturally occurring damage resulting from trauma or disease.<sup>2</sup>

### **Medical Necessity Criteria**

#### **Indications**

**Xenograft implantation** is considered appropriate if **ALL** of the following are **TRUE**<sup>3-4</sup>:

- This procedure is clinically unproven and not medically necessary. There is inconclusive evidence of its effectiveness.

#### **Non-Indications**

**Xenograft implantation** is not considered appropriate if **ALL** of the following are **TRUE**:

- This is not applicable as there are no indications.

### **Level of Care Criteria**

Not applicable.

### **Procedure Codes (CPT/HCPCS)**

<b>CPT/HCPCS Code</b>	<b>Code Description</b>
0737T	Xenograft implantation into the articular surface

**Disclaimer:** S Codes are non-covered per CMS guidelines due to their experimental or investigational nature.

### **Evaluation of Clinical Harms and Benefits**

Refer to the Medical Evidence section for various citations and references to studies conducted to date that are inconsistent, inadequately powered, or otherwise do not allow for solid scientific conclusions. Potential harms and benefits of applying an “unproven and not medically necessary” designation to this procedure might include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Potential Harms** of applying the clinical criteria in this policy include, but are not limited to, denying opportunities to improve health outcomes for individuals and populations suffering from pain secondary to bone defects from trauma or degenerative conditions. For example, restricting access to this procedure may increase patient and population dependence on excessive pain medication, including opioids, reduced functionality leading to additional medical problems, and a decrease in economic opportunity.

**Potential Benefits** include safeguarding patients and populations from unproven technologies, procedures, and medical treatments until the proposed treatments' safety, efficacy, and anticipated results are thoroughly validated via peer-reviewed scientific literature. This safeguards patients from failed xenograft implantations, which can lead to pain, inflammation, and the displacement of the materials used in the grafts, which in turn may require additional surgeries.

## Medical Evidence

In their study of osteochondral regeneration, Rastegar et al. (2022) examined the regenerative effect of decellularized osteochondral extracellular matrix xenografts in combination with biological products in an osteochondral defect. The objective of this study was to prepare decellularized osteochondral scaffolds from sheep and implant the xenograft into a rabbit model with an osteochondral defect. The decellularization was performed by multistate methods and resulted in approximately 98% cell elimination. The authors concluded that xenograft decellularized extracellular matrix and biological factor platforms represent a promising approach to human osteochondral regeneration.<sup>6</sup>

Anderson et al. (2022) reviewed studies related to NeoCart, a third-generation autologous chondrocyte (ACI) therapeutic. Phased clinical trials, which began in 2003, found that the control microfracture procedure demonstrated the most pain relief and functional improvement depending on the size of the patient's lesion. The study was terminated in Phase III, and the therapy was not approved for use.<sup>2</sup>

Amid et al. (2020) conducted a systematic review to evaluate the chemical and structural features of various xenograft bone substitutes. Of the 25 studies included in the final review, 19 were examinations of bovine xenografts. The authors found that the porosity, crystallinity, Ca/P (calcium-to-phosphorus) ratio, and osteogenesis of the xenografts varied significantly—a heterogeneity they attributed to disparate preparation methods.<sup>5</sup>

Elder et al. (2018) evaluated an antigen removal procedure as part of a larger effort to develop an osteochondral xenograft for articulate cartilage repair. The antigen removal protocol extracted nearly 90% of DNA from cartilage and bone and 80% of glycosaminoglycan from cartilage. The authors concluded that this procedure for producing an osteochondral xenograft shows promise for the treatment of osteochondral lesions in human knees.<sup>7</sup>

Sutherland et al. (2015) examined the use of cartilage matrices, including their promise as a biomaterial for enhanced cartilage regeneration. These

materials provide for enhanced cartilage regeneration due to their ability to provide stem cells with physical attachment sites, as well as mechanical and chemical signals.<sup>1</sup>

Moyad et al. (2011) reviewed the literature regarding cartilage injuries in the adult knee and the workup and management techniques in current use. Previously, autologous chondrocyte implantation often resulted in complications from hypertrophy of the periosteal graft. Porcine tissue xenografts have been studied and found to have lower complication rates.<sup>8</sup>

No current, peer-reviewed studies were found to unequivocally support the use of xenograft implantation into the articular surface.

## References

1. Sutherland AJ, Converse GL, Hopkins RA, et al. The bioactivity of cartilage extracellular matrix in articular cartilage regeneration. *Adv Healthc Mater.* 2015;4(1):29–39. doi: 10.1002/adhm.201400165
2. Anderson DE, Gridley A, Crawford DC. Next generation cartilage repair and the pre-arthroplasty patient. *Oper Tech Sports Med.* 2022 Dec 1;30(4):150956.
3. Murphy MP, Koepke LS, Lopez MT, et al. Articular cartilage regeneration by activated skeletal stem cells. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(10):1583–1592. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-1013-2.
4. Bracey DN, Cignetti NE, Jinnah AH, et al. Bone xenotransplantation: A review of the history, orthopedic clinical literature, and a single-center case series. *Xenotransplantation.* 2020;27(5):e12600. doi: 10.1111/xen.12600.
5. Amid R, Kheiri A, Kheiri L, et al. Structural and chemical features of xenograft bone substitutes: A systematic review of in vitro studies. *Biotechnol Appl Biochem.* 2021;68(6):1432–1452. doi: 10.1002/bab.2065.
6. Rastegar Adib F, Bagheri F, Sharifi AM. Osteochondral regeneration in rabbits using xenograft decellularized ECM in combination with different biological products: Platelet-rich fibrin, amniotic membrane extract, and mesenchymal stromal cells. *J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater.* 2022;110(9):2089–2099. doi:10.1002/jbm.b.35063
7. Elder S, Chenault H, Gloth P, et al. Effects of antigen removal on a porcine osteochondral xenograft for articular cartilage repair. *J Biomed Mater Res A.* 2018;106(8):2251–2260. doi: 10.1002/jbm.a.36411.
8. Moyad TF. Cartilage injuries in the adult knee: Evaluation and management. *Cartilage.* 2011;2(3):226–236. doi: 10.1177/1947603510383973



# Clinical Guideline Revision History/Information

Original Date: May 27, 2024		
Review History		
Version 2	06/10/2024	422.101 Disclaimer added
Version 3	05/22/2025	Annual Review.  Reformatted policy to align with 2025 format.  Removed the Harms and Benefits section.  Literature review - Medical Evidence section updated to support non-coverage based on a lack of evidence (Rastegar et al. 2022; Elder et al 2018; Moyad et al 2011).
Version 4	07/01/2025	Added Harms and Benefits section.