Medical Policy

BlueCross BlueShield Kansas
An Independent licensee of the
Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Title: Cardiac Rehabilitation in the Outpatient Setting

Professional
Original Effective Date: January 1997
Revision Date(s): August 17, 2010; September 24, 2012; December 11, 2013; July 15, 2014; September 23, 2015; November 24, 2015; May 11, 2016; August 18, 2017; October 1, 2017; April 11, 2018; April 24, 2019; March 23, 2021
Current Effective Date: August 18, 2017

Institutional
Original Effective Date: August 17, 2010
Revision Date(s): August 17, 2010; September 24, 2012; December 11, 2013; July 15, 2014; September 23, 2015; November 24, 2015; May 11, 2016; August 18, 2017; October 1, 2017; April 11, 2018; April 24, 2019; March 23, 2021
Current Effective Date: August 18, 2017

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With diagnosed heart disease	Interventions of interest are: • Outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Comparators of interest are: • Standard management without cardiac rehabilitation	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Symptoms • Morbid events
Individuals: • With diagnosed heart disease without a second event	Interventions of interest are: • Repeat outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Comparators of interest are: • Single course of outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Symptoms • Morbid events
Individuals: • With diagnosed heart disease	Interventions of interest are: • Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease	Comparators of interest are: • Standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Symptoms • Morbid events
Individuals: • With diagnosed heart disease	Interventions of interest are: • Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Pritikin Program	Comparators of interest are: • Standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Symptoms • Morbid events

Summary
Cardiac rehabilitation refers to comprehensive medically supervised programs in the outpatient setting that aim to improve the function of patients with heart disease and prevent future cardiac events. National organizations have specified

DESCRIPTION
Cardiac rehabilitation refers to comprehensive medically supervised programs in the outpatient setting that aim to improve the function of patients with heart disease and prevent future cardiac events. National organizations have specified core components to be included in cardiac rehabilitation programs.

OBJECTIVE
The objective of this policy is to determine whether outpatient cardiac rehabilitation programs improve the health outcomes in patients with heart disease.

BACKGROUND
Cardiac Rehabilitation

In 1995, the U.S. Public Health Service defined cardiac rehabilitation services as, in part, "comprehensive, long-term programs involving medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, cardiac risk factor modification, education, and counseling…. [These programs] are designed to limit the physiologic and psychological effects of cardiac illness, reduce the risk for sudden death or reinfarction, control cardiac symptoms, stabilize or reverse the atherosclerotic process, and enhance the psychosocial and vocational status of selected patients." The U.S. Public Health Service recommended cardiac rehabilitation services for patients with coronary heart disease and with heart failure, including those awaiting or following cardiac transplantation. A 2010 definition of cardiac rehabilitation from the European Association of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation stated: "Cardiac rehabilitation can be viewed as the clinical application of preventive care by means of a professional multi-disciplinary integrated approach for comprehensive risk reduction and global long-term care of cardiac patients."[1,] Since the 1995 release of the U.S. Public Health Service guidelines, other societies, including in 2005 the American Heart Association[2,] and in 2010 the Heart Failure Society of America [3,] have developed guidelines on the role of cardiac rehabilitation in patient care.

Regulatory Status
Not applicable.

POLICY

A. Outpatient cardiac rehabilitation programs are considered **medically necessary** for patients with a history of the following conditions and procedures:
   1. An acute myocardial infarction (MI) (heart attack) within the preceding 12 months; **OR**
   2. A coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgery; **OR**
   3. Current stable angina pectoris; **OR**
   4. Heart valve surgery; **OR**
   5. Percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty (PTCA) or coronary stenting; **OR**
   6. A heart or heart-lung transplant; **OR**
   7. Compensated heart failure.

B. Repeat participation in an outpatient cardiac rehabilitation program in the absence of another qualifying cardiac event is considered **experimental / investigational**.

C. Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease or Pritikin Program is considered **experimental / investigational**.

D. Physical and/or occupational therapy are **not medically necessary** in conjunction with cardiac rehabilitation unless performed for an unrelated diagnosis.

Policy Guidelines

1. Cardiac rehabilitation programs must include the following components:
   a. Physician-prescribed exercise each day cardiac rehabilitation items and services are furnished;
   b. Cardiac risk factor modification;
   c. Psychosocial assessment;
   d. Outcomes assessment; and
   e. An individualized treatment plan detailing how each of the above components are utilized.
2. Cardiac rehabilitation items and services must be furnished in a physician's office or a hospital outpatient setting.
3. All settings must have a physician immediately available and accessible for medical consultations and emergencies at all times when items and services are being furnished under the program.
4. Duration of the Program:
   A cardiac rehabilitation exercise program is eligible for BCBSKS members, services provided in connection with an approved cardiac rehabilitation exercise program may be considered reasonable and necessary for up to 18 sessions, usually 3 sessions a week in a single 6-week period. Coverage for continued participation would be allowed only on a case-by-case basis with exit criteria taken into consideration. It is preferable that programs start within 90 days of the cardiac event and be completed within 6 months of the cardiac event.
5. A comprehensive evaluation may be performed before initiation of cardiac rehabilitation to evaluate the patient and determine an appropriate exercise program. In addition to a medical examination, an electrocardiogram stress test may be performed. An additional stress test may be performed at the completion of the program.

RATIONALE

This evidence review was created in May 1997, archived from 2003 to 2010, and since its return to active review, it has been updated regularly with searches of the MEDLINE database. The most recent literature update was performed through January 13, 2020.
Heart disease is the leading cause of mortality in the United States, accounting for more than half of all deaths. Coronary artery disease is the most common cause of heart disease. In a 2015 update on heart disease and stroke statistics from the American Heart Association, it was estimated that 63,5000 Americans have a new coronary attack (first hospitalized myocardial infarction or coronary heart disease death) and 300,000 have a recurrent attack annually.[4,] Both coronary artery disease and various other disorders—structural heart disease and other genetic, metabolic, endocrine, toxic, inflammatory, and infectious causes—can lead to the clinical syndrome of heart failure, of which there are about 650,000 new cases in the United States annually.[5,] Given the burden of heart disease, preventing secondary cardiac events and treating the symptoms of heart disease and heart failure have received much attention from national organizations.
Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are the length of life,

quality of life, and ability to function—including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance, and the quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent one or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. RCTs are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice. The following is a summary of the key literature to date.

Outpatient Cardiac Rehabilitation for Heart Disease

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of cardiac rehabilitation in patients who have heart disease is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of cardiac rehabilitation in patients who have heart disease improve net health outcomes?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients

The relevant population of interest is patients with diagnosed heart disease.

Interventions

The treatment being considered is cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

Cardiac rehabilitation is administered by a cardiac rehabilitation specialist on an outpatient clinical basis. Some aspects of cardiac rehabilitation, such as exercise and nutrition changes, are performed by patients at home.

Comparators

The comparator of interest is standard management without cardiac rehabilitation. The following practices are currently being used to manage heart disease: medication, surgery, and medical devices.

Standard management of heart disease is administered by cardiologists in an outpatient clinical setting. Surgery for heart disease is performed by a cardiac surgeon in a tertiary care setting.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, a patient will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

Study Selection Criteria

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

1. To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
2. In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
3. To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
4. Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

Systematic Reviews

Oldridge (2012) identified 6 independent meta-analyses published since 2000 that reported outcomes from 71 RCTs (total N=13824 patients) following cardiac rehabilitation interventions.[6,] The RCTs included in the meta-analyses enrolled patients with myocardial infarction, coronary heart disease, angina, percutaneous coronary intervention, and/or coronary artery bypass graft (CABG). RCTs compared cardiac rehabilitation programs (exercise-only and/or comprehensive rehabilitation) with usual care. Cardiac rehabilitation was associated with a statistically significant ($p<0.05$) reduction in all-cause mortality in 4 of the 5 meta-analyses that reported this outcome. In the pooled analysis, cardiac rehabilitation was associated with an 18.5% mean reduction in all-cause mortality. Also, cardiac rehabilitation was associated with a statistically significant reduction in cardiac mortality in 3 of the 4 meta-analyses that reported disease-specific mortality as an outcome.

Two of the meta-analyses on cardiac rehabilitation were Cochrane reviews. One included patients with coronary heart disease.[7,] and the other focused on patients with systolic heart failure.[8,] Both addressed exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation programs (exercise alone or as part of a comprehensive program). Anderson et al (2016) updated a 2011 Cochrane review addressing exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for individuals with

coronary heart disease.[7,9,] Reviewers included RCTs of exercise-based interventions with at least 6 months of follow-up compared with no-exercise controls in patients with myocardial infarction, CABG, or percutaneous coronary intervention, or with angina pectoris or coronary artery disease. The updated review included 63 RCTs (total N=14486 individuals), of which 16 trials had been published since the 2011 update. Reviewers reported that the overall risk of bias was unclear, although the quality of reporting improved with more recent trials. Due to the nature of the intervention, patients were not blinded to treatment group in any of the studies, but 16 (25%) of 62 studies reported details of blinded assessment of study outcomes. In the pooled analysis, cardiac rehabilitation was not significantly associated with overall mortality. However, among 27 studies, cardiac rehabilitation was significantly associated with reduced cardiovascular mortality (292/3850 for cardiac rehabilitation subjects vs. 375/3619 for control subjects; relative risk [RR], 0.74; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.64 to 0.86). Rates of myocardial infarction, CABG, and percutaneous coronary intervention were not significantly associated with receiving cardiac rehabilitation.

Long et al (2019) reported a Cochrane Review of studies assessing cardiac rehabilitation in patients with heart failure. A total of 44 RCTs were evaluated; 11 of which were new trials, for the effects of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation on adults with heart failure (5,783 total participants).[10,] A single trial, Exercise Based Cardiac Rehabilitation for Adults WithHeart Failure (HF-ACTION) contributed almost half of the patients (with results reported in 18 publications); most other studies were small and single-center. All studies had 6 months or longer follow-up and did not include a formal exercise training intervention as a comparator. The primary outcomes reported were mortality, hospital admission, and health-related quality of life (HRQoL). The overall risk of bias was assessed as being low or unclear, and results were downgraded using the GRADE tool for all outcomes except one. Results showed that cardiac rehabilitation had little effect on all-cause mortality over ≤1 year of follow-up (27 trials, 2,596 participants: cardiac rehabilitation 5.1% vs. control 5.8%; low-quality evidence). However, cardiac rehabilitation may make a difference in the long-term (>1 year of follow-up; 6 trials, 2,845 participants: cardiac rehabilitation 17.2% vs. control 19.6%; high-quality evidence). Mortality related to heart failure was not consistently reported in the studies. Chances of avoiding hospital admission for any cause within 12 months of follow-up were better with cardiac rehabilitation (21 trials, 2182 participants: cardiac rehabilitation 16.5% vs. control 23.7%; moderate-quality evidence). Cardiac rehabilitation may also reduce short-term heart failure-related hospital admission (14 trials, 1,114 participants: cardiac rehabilitation 7.1% vs. control 11.1%; RR 0.59, 95% CI, 0.42 to 0.84; p=.0003), but the evidence was rated low quality. HRQoL was reported by 29 trials, most of which used the Minnesota Living With Heart Failure questionnaire; however, other tools were also used among the 29 trials that reported validated HRQoL measures. For exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation, no trials reported lower HRQoL scores with cardiac rehabilitation than with control, and all but 1 reported on results at ≥6 months follow-up. The pooled results from all measures used showed a clinically important improvement (a 5-point difference on the Minnesota Living With Heart Failure with exercise at up to 12 months' follow-up, but the evidence was of very low quality. Compared with the 2014

review, this version included more women, older patients, and participants with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction in recent trials, and with more trials of cardiac rehabilitation in a home-based setting, this version may be more valid and applicable.

Table 1. Systematic Review Characteristics

Study	Dates	Trials	Participants	N (Range)	Design
Davies et al (2010)[8,]	1995-2008	29	All adults with chronic systolic HF	3,647 (20-2,331)	RCT
Oldridge (2012)[6,]	2000-2011	71	Patients with MI, CHD, angina, PCI, and/or CABG	13,824 (6,111-10,794)	RCT
Anderson et al (2016)[7,]	1975-2014	63	Patients with MI, angina pectoris, CAD, or who underwent CABG or PCI	14,486 (25-3,184)	RCT
Long et al (2016) [10,]	1995-2018	44	Patients with HF	5,783 (19-2,331)	RCT

CABG: coronary artery bypass graft; CAD: coronary artery disease; CHD: coronary heart disease; HF: heart failure; MI: myocardial infarction; PCI: percutaneous coronary intervention; RCT: randomized controlled trial.

Table 2. Systematic Review Results

Study	All-Cause Mortality	Cardiovascular Mortality
Davies et al (2010)[8,]	13 studies (≤12 mo)	NR
Difference in pooled mortality, fixed-effect RR	1.02	NR
95% CI	0.70-1.51	NR
p-value	0.90	NR
Oldridge (2012)[6,]	6 studies	6 studies
Reduction, mean %	18.50	29.4
p-value	<0.05	NR
Range, %	NR	20-43
Anderson et al (2016)[7,]	47 studies; N=12,455 participants	27 studies; N=7,469 participants
RR	0.96	0.74
95% CI	0.88-1.04	0.64-0.86
Long et al (2019) [10,]	2,845 participants, 6 studies	(studies did not consistently report deaths due to heart failure)

Study	All-Cause Mortality	Cardiovascular Mortality
RR	0.88	NR
95 % (CI)	0.75-1.02	NR

CI: confidence interval; NR: not reported; RR: relative risk.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Findings of a large, multicenter RCT from the United Kingdom, which evaluated the effectiveness of cardiac rehabilitation in a "real-life" setting, were published by West et al (2012).[11,] Called the Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial (RAMIT), the study included patients from 14 centers with established multifactorial cardiac rehabilitation programs (including exercise, education, and counseling), involved more than 1 discipline, and provided an intervention lasting a minimum of 10 hours. A total of 1,813 patients were randomized—903 to cardiac rehabilitation and 910 to a control condition. Vital status was obtained at 2 years for 99.9% (all but 1 patient) and at 7 to 9 years for 99.4% of patients. By 2 years, 166 patients had died, 82 in the cardiac rehabilitation group and 84 in the control group. The between-group difference in mortality at 2 years (the primary study outcome) was not statistically significant (RR=0.98; 95% CI, 0.74 to 1.30). After 7 to 9 years, 488 patients had died, 245 in the cardiac rehabilitation group and 243 in the control group (RR=0.99; 95% CI, 0.85 to 1.15). In addition, at 1 year, cardiovascular morbidity did not differ significantly between groups. For a combined endpoint including death, nonfatal myocardial infarction, stroke, or revascularization, the RR was 0.96 (95% CI, 0.88 to 1.07). In discussing the study's negative findings, trialists noted that medical management of heart disease had improved over time, and patients in the control group might have had better outcomes than in earlier RCTs on this topic. Moreover, an editorial accompanying the publication of the trial's findings emphasized that RAMIT was not an efficacy trial, but rather, a trial evaluating the effectiveness of actual cardiac rehabilitation programs in the United Kingdom. [12,] Finally, these results might in part reflect the degree to which clinically-based cardiac rehabilitation programs in the United Kingdom differ from the treatment protocols used in RCTs based in research settings.

A concern raised by the negative findings in the RAMIT trial is that most of the RCTs evaluating cardiac rehabilitation were conducted in an earlier era of heart disease management and might not be relevant to current care. However, RAMIT's results, along with 15 additional RCTs reported since a 2011 Cochrane review, were included in the updated 2016 Cochrane review, which found improvements in cardiovascular mortality associated with exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation.

Pandey et al (2017) evaluated endurance exercise training as part of a cardiac rehabilitation program in a population of heart failure patients stratified by ejection fraction.[13,]Participants had heart failure with preserved ejection fraction or reduced ejection fraction, were 65 years of age or older, and had participated in a 16-week exercise program that intensified from 40% to 50% of heart rate reserve in the first 2 weeks to 60% to 70% over the ensuing weeks as part of a previously published RCT (Kitzman et al [2010]).[14,] The primary outcome for assessing change in exercise capacity

was percentage change in peak oxygen uptake (mL/kg per minute) from baseline to end of exercise training (16-week follow-up). Data on testing from 48 patients (24 reduced ejection fraction, 24 heart failure with preserved ejection fraction) were assessed. heart failure with preserved ejection fraction patients experienced greater improvement in exercise training patients (18.7%) than reduced ejection fraction patients (-0.3%; p<0.001) as measured by peak oxygen uptake. There was no information on subsequent hospitalizations rates or clinical outcomes such as heart failure progression or mortality. This secondary analysis was used to assert the appropriateness of cardiac rehabilitation in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction patients.

Table 3. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics

Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	*Comparator*
West et al (2012); RAMIT[11,]	United Kingdom	14	1997-2000	Patients diagnosed with acute MI (N=1813)	Cardiac rehabilitation (n=903)	Control (n=910)
Pandey et al (2017)[13,]	U.S.	1	NR	Patients aged ≥ 65 with HFrEF (n=24) or HFpEF (n=24) (N=48)	16-wk supervised moderate endurance exercise training (n=48)	HRrEF (n=24) vs. HFpEF (n=24)

HF: heart failure; HFpEF: HF with preserved ejection fraction; HFrEF: HF with reduced ejection fraction; MI: myocardial infarction; NR: not reported; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RAMIT: Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial.

Table 4. Summary of Key RCT Results

Study	2-yr Mortality	Readmission to Hospital for Any Cardiac Condition at 1 y	Training-Related Improvement in Vo2 peak Change
West et al (2012); RAMIT[11,]	N=1813 participants	N=1813 participants	NR
CR	82 patients	222 (25%)	NR
Control	84 patients	239 (26%)	NR
RR	0.98	NR	NR
95% CI	0.74-1.30	NR	NR
Pandey et al (2017)[13,]	NR	NR	N=48 participants
HFrEF	NR	NR	18.7+/-17.6
HFpEF	NR	NR	-0.3+/-15.4
p-value	NR	NR	<0.001

CI: confidence interval; CR: cardiac rehabilitation; HF: heart failure; HFpEF: HF with preserved ejection fraction; HFrEF: HF with reduced ejection fraction; NR: not reported; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RR: relative risk; Vo_2peak: peak oxygen uptake. RAMIT: Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial.

The purpose of the limitation's tables (see Tables 5 and 6) is to display notable limitations identified in each study. This information is synthesized as a summary of the body of evidence following each table and provides the conclusions on the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the position statement.

Table 5. Relevance Limitations

Study	Population[a]	Intervention[b]	Comparator[c]	Outcomes[d]	Follow-Up[e]
West et al (2012); RAMIT[11,]					1,2. Trial was closed prematurely
Pandey et al (2017)[13,]			2. No comparator used		1,2. Only 16 wks follow-up

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive limitations assessment.
a Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Clinical context is unclear; 3. Study population is unclear; 4. Study population not representative of intended use.
b Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest.
c Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively.
d Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. No CONSORT reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinical significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinical significant difference not supported.
e Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms.

RAMIT: Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial.
Table 6. Study Design and Conduct Limitations

Study	Allocation[a]	Blinding[b]	Selective Reporting[c]	Follow-Up[d]	Power[e]	Statistical[f]
West et al (2012); RAMIT[11,]	3. Allocation concealment unclear	1,2. Not blinded				
Pandey et al (2017)[13,]	1. Participants not randomly allocated	1,2. Not blinded				

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive limitations assessment.
a Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias.
b Blinding key: 1. Not blinded to treatment assignment; 2. Not blinded outcome assessment; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician.
c Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication.
d Follow-Up key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials).

e Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference.
f Statistical key: 1. Intervention is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Intervention is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated.

RAMIT: Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial.
Observational Studies

Sumner et al (2017) published a systematic review of controlled observational studies evaluating cardiac rehabilitation in patients diagnosed with acute myocardial infarction.[15,] Cardiac rehabilitation interventions consisted of structured multicomponent programs that included exercise and at least one of the following: education, information, health behavior change, and psychological or social support. Usual care interventions generally supervised medical interventions were the control conditions. Ten studies met reviewers' eligibility criteria. In a meta-analysis of 5 studies reporting all-cause mortality (an unadjusted outcome), there was a significantly lower risk of death in the group that received cardiac rehabilitation (odds ratio, 0.25; 95% CI, 0.16 to 0.40). Three studies that reported an adjusted analysis of all-cause mortality also found a significant benefit from cardiac rehabilitation (odds ratio, 0.47; 95% CI, 0.38 to 0.59). Similarly, a meta-analysis of 3 studies reporting cardiac-related mortality (an unadjusted analysis) found a significant benefit from cardiac rehabilitation (odds ratio, 0.21; 95% CI, 0.12 to 0.37). Only 1 study reported an adjusted analysis of cardiac-related mortality, so data could not be pooled.

Nilsson et al (2018) investigated the effect of a 12-week cardiac rehabilitation program with a high-intensity interval exercise component using participant peak oxygen uptake as a measure of improved exercise capacity.[16,] Increased exercise capacity has been shown to improve survival among persons with coronary heart disease. The objective of the study was to assess whether this addition to a cardiac rehabilitation program yielded improved long-term results. One hundred thirty-three coronary patients participated in this prospective cohort study and were evaluated at baseline, at the end of the 12-week program, and again at a 15-month follow-up. Additional test measurements included a cardiopulmonary exercise test, body mass index, blood pressure tests, and a quality of life questionnaire. Of the 133 patients, 86 patients had complete information for the 15-month follow-up. Mean peak oxygen uptake improved from a baseline of 31.9 mL/kg/min to 35.9 mL/kg/min ($p<0.001$) at the end of the 12-week program, and to 36.8 mL/kg/min (CI not reported) at 15-month follow-up. Most of the 86 patients reported maintaining an exercise routine. Study limitations included the small sample size, a relatively low-risk male population at baseline, and lack of information on the qualifying event for cardiac rehabilitation. The authors concluded that the cardiac rehabilitation program intervention potentially fostered consistent and beneficial exercise habits as demonstrated by improved peak oxygen uptake.

Section Summary: Outpatient Cardiac Rehabilitation for Heart Disease

Overall, the evidence from RCTs reviewed in well-structured systematic reviews suggests that cardiac rehabilitation is associated with reduced cardiovascular mortality in patients

with coronary heart disease. Additional RCTs, systematic reviews, and observational studies have evaluated outpatient cardiac rehabilitation in patients with heart failure or in the postintervention setting. An overview of 6 meta-analyses found a statistically significant association between cardiac rehabilitation and all-cause mortality and/or cardiac mortality. The available evidence has limitations, including lack of blinded outcome assessment, but, for the survival-related outcomes of interest, this limitation is less critical.

Repeat Outpatient Cardiac Rehabilitation
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of repeat cardiac rehabilitation in patients who have heart disease without a second event is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of repeat cardiac rehabilitation in patients who have heart disease without a second event improve net health outcomes?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is patients with diagnosed heart disease who have had cardiac rehabilitation before but who have not had a second cardiac event.

Interventions
The treatment being considered is repeat cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

Cardiac rehabilitation is administered by a cardiac rehabilitation specialist on an outpatient clinical basis. Some aspects of cardiac rehabilitation, such as exercise and nutrition changes, are performed by patients at home.

Comparators
The comparator of interest is standard management with a single course of cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

Cardiac rehabilitation is administered by a cardiac rehabilitation specialist on an outpatient clinical basis. Some aspects of cardiac rehabilitation, such as exercise and nutrition changes, are performed by patients at home.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, a patient will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the principles described in the first indication.

No studies were identified that evaluated the effectiveness of repeat participation in a cardiac rehabilitation program.

Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation for Heart Disease
There is no standard definition of an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program and, thus, specific programs are reviewed individually. Two programs have been evaluated by Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and describe the published evidence supporting these programs is reviewed. The ideal trial design would be an RCT comparing the impact of intensive cardiac rehabilitation with standard cardiac rehabilitation on health outcomes.

Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease in patients who have diagnosed heart disease is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease in patients who have heart disease improve net health outcomes?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is patients with diagnosed heart disease.

Interventions
The treatment being considered is the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease. The Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease is an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program that focuses on exercise, diet, stress management, and support from others. The multiple 4-hour sessions are administered by an Ornish-certified physician, cardiac therapist, or other certified health care provider.

Comparators
The comparator of interest is standard management without repeat cardiac rehabilitation. The following practices are currently being used to manage heart disease: medication, surgery, and medical devices.

Standard management of heart disease is administered by cardiologists in an outpatient clinical setting. Surgery for heart disease is performed by a cardiac surgeon in a tertiary care setting.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, a patient will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the principles described in the first indication.

Ornish et al (1990) conducted an RCT, called the Lifestyle Heart Trial, comparing a version of the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease with usual care. Initial results were reported in 1990, and 5-year results in 1998.[17,18,] Eligibility for the trial included diagnosed coronary artery disease, left ventricular ejection fraction greater than 25%, no myocardial infarction during the previous 6 weeks, not scheduled for CABG, and not taking lipid-lowering medication. Ninety-four eligible patients were randomized to an intervention group (n=53) or a usual care control group (n=43). Final consenting was done after randomization; 28 (53%) of patients assigned to the intervention group and 20 (43%) assigned to the control group agreed to participate in the trial.
The Lifestyle intervention consisted of recommending a low-fat vegetarian diet and an individualized exercise regimen. Also, patients were taught stress management techniques and were taught to practice them at home for at least an hour a day. Also, twice-weekly group discussions were offered to provide social support. It is not clear how long patients attended these group discussions (ie, the number of weeks or months). As reported by Ornish et al (1990), the mean percentage diameter stenosis decreased from 40% at baseline to 37.8% at 1 year in the intervention group and increased from 42.7% to 46.1% in the control group (p=0.001). The frequency and duration of chest pain did not differ between groups. However, during chest pain episodes, at 1 year, the intervention group reported mean chest pain severity of 1.7 (on a 7-point scale) whereas the mean score in the control group was 2.5 (p<0.001).
Twenty (71%) of 28 patients in the intervention group and 15 (75%) of 20 in the control group completed the 5-year follow-up. The intervention and control groups did not differ significantly in the number of myocardial infarction events (2 vs. 4), CABGs (2 vs. 5), or deaths (2 vs. 1). However, compared with the control group, the intervention group had

significantly fewer percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasties (8 vs. 14, p<0.050) and cardiac hospitalizations (23 vs. 44, p<0.001).

Section Summary: Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease
One RCT was identified that evaluated the Ornish Program in patients diagnosed with heart disease and compared it with usual care. This RCT, which included patients with coronary artery disease but no recent cardiac event, had mixed findings at 1 and 5 years. The trial had a small sample size for a cardiac trial (N=48), and only 35 patients were available for the 5-year follow-up. The Ornish Program is considered by Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to be an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program, but the program described in this RCT might meet criteria for standard cardiac rehabilitation. No studies were identified that compared the Ornish Program with any other cardiac rehabilitation program.

Pritikin Program

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of the Pritikin Program in patients who have diagnosed heart disease is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of the Pritikin Program in patients who have heart disease improve net health outcomes?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is patients with diagnosed heart disease.

Interventions
The treatment being considered is the Pritikin Program.

The Pritikin Program is an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program based on effective exercise, a healthy diet, and a healthy mindset. The Pritikin Program is administered by cardiologist, cardiac therapists, and other healthcare providers.

Comparators
The comparator of interest is standard cardiac management. The following practices are currently being used to manage heart disease: medication, surgery, and medical devices. Standard management of heart disease is administered by cardiologists in an outpatient clinical setting. Surgery for heart disease is performed by a cardiac surgeon in a tertiary care setting.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, a patient will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the principles described in the first indication.

No RCTs evaluating the Pritikin Program were identified. The published evidence on this program consists of case series, and only one (Barnard et al [1983]) included patients with heart disease.[19,] (Other case series included patients without heart failure, eg, those with high cholesterol levels.) Sixty-four patients with documented coronary artery disease attended a 26-day residential treatment program between 1976 and 1977. During the program, patients were encouraged to walk for 30 to 45 minutes twice a day, learned how to prepare foods consistent with the Pritikin diet, and attended over 60 hours of group education classes. Serum samples were taken at baseline and at the end of the program. Patients were called in March 1980 for a follow-up interview and asked to send in serum samples. At the 3- to 4-year follow-up, 12 (19%) of 64 patients had had bypass surgery, and 4 patients had died. Fifty (81%) patients provided serum samples at follow-up, and the mean cholesterol level (166 mg/dL) was significantly lower than the baseline value (220 mg/dL). The trial was limited in the lack of a control group, especially a group receiving "standard" outpatient cardiac rehabilitation, and long-term mortality outcomes were not reported.

Section Summary: Pritikin Program

No RCTs have evaluated the Pritikin Program; a single case series in patients with heart disease was identified. Conclusions cannot be drawn from this series on the impact of intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Pritikin Program compared with standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation.

Summary of Evidence
For individuals who have diagnosed heart disease who receive outpatient cardiac rehabilitation, the evidence includes multiple randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and systematic reviews of these trials. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events. Meta-analyses of the available trials have found that cardiac rehabilitation improves health outcomes for select patients, particularly those with coronary heart disease, heart failure, and who have had cardiac surgical interventions. The available evidence has limitations, including lack of blinded outcome assessment, but for the survival-related outcomes of interest, this limitation is less critical. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have diagnosed heart disease without a second event who receive repeat outpatient cardiac rehabilitation, the evidence includes no trials. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events. No studies were identified evaluating the effectiveness of repeat participation in a cardiac rehabilitation program. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have diagnosed heart disease who receive intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease, the evidence includes an RCT and uncontrolled studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events. No RCTs have compared the Ornish Program with a "standard" cardiac rehabilitation program; an RCT compared it with usual care. The trial included patients with coronary artery disease and no recent cardiac events and had mixed findings at 1 and 5 years. The trial had a small sample size for a cardiac trial (N=48), and only 35 patients were available for the 5-year follow-up. The Ornish Program is considered by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services as an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program, but the program described in the RCT could meet criteria for standard cardiac rehabilitation. No studies were identified comparing the Ornish Program with any other cardiac rehabilitation program. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have diagnosed heart disease who receive intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Pritikin Program, the evidence includes a case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events. Studies are needed that compare the impact of intensive cardiac rehabilitation using the Pritikin Program with standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation programs. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Supplemental Information

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

American College of Cardiology Foundation et al
In 2013, the American College of Cardiology Foundation and the American Heart Association updated their joint guidelines on the management of heart failure.[20,] These guidelines included the following class IIA recommendation on cardiac rehabilitation (level of evidence: B): "Cardiac rehabilitation can be useful in clinically stable patients with heart failure to improve functional capacity, exercise duration, health-related quality of life, and mortality." The 2017 focused update of the guideline did not include additional information on cardiac rehabilitation.[21,]

American College of Physicians
In 2012, the American College of Physicians and 6 other cardiology associations published joint guidelines on the management of stable ischemic heart disease.[22,] The guidelines included the following statement on cardiac rehabilitation: "Medically supervised exercise

programs (cardiac rehabilitation) and physician-directed, home-based programs are recommended for at-risk patients at first diagnosis." The 2014 update to the guideline did not include additional information on cardiac rehabilitation.[23,]

American Heart Association et al
In 2007, the American Heart Association and the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation issued a consensus statement on the core components of cardiac rehabilitation programs.[5,] The core components included patient assessment before beginning the program, nutritional counseling, weight management, blood pressure management, lipid management, diabetes management, tobacco cessation, psychosocial management, physical activity counseling, and exercise training. Programs that only offered supervised exercise training were not considered cardiac rehabilitation. The guidelines specified the assessment, interventions, and expected outcomes for each of the core components. For example, symptom-limited exercise testing before exercise training was strongly recommended. The guidelines did not specify the optimal overall length of programs or number or duration of sessions.

In 2019, the American Heart Association, with the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation and the American College of Cardiology, released a scientific statement on home-based cardiac rehabilitation.[24,] They make the following suggestions for healthcare providers:

- Recommend center-based cardiac rehabilitation (CBCR) to all eligible patients.
- As an alternative, recommend home-based cardiac rehabilitation (HBCR) to clinically stable low- and moderate-risk patients who cannot attend CBCR.
- Design and test HBCR "using effective processes of care for CVD secondary prevention."
- For healthcare organizations, develop and support the following:
    - Maximization of CR referrals
    - High-quality CBCR and HBCR programs "using evidence-based standards and guidelines, strategies to maximize patient adherence both in the shorter and longer-term, and outcome tracking methods to help promote continuous quality improvement."
    - "Testing and implementation of evidence-based hybrid approached to CR" that are optimized for each patient and that "promote long-term adherence and favorable behavior change."
- For CR professionals, "work with other healthcare professionals and policymakers to implement additional research and...expand the evidence base for HBCR."

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

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 7.

Table 7. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
NCT03385837	Activity Level and Barriers to Participate of Cardiac Rehabilitation in Advanced Heart Failure Patients	50	Dec 2018
NCT02762825	Novel Cardiac Rehabilitation in Patients Heart Failure and Preserved Ejection Fraction	66	Sep 2020
NCT02984449	Preventive Heart Rehabilitation in Patients Undergoing Elective Open Heart Surgery to Prevent Complications and to Improve Quality of Life (Heart-ROCQ) - A Prospective Randomized Open Controlled Trial, Blinded End-point (PROBE)	350	Aug 2025
Unpublished			
NCT01822769	Cardiopulmonary Rehabilitation for Adolescents and Adults With Congenital Heart Disease	28	Dec 2017 (last updated 01/25/18)
NCT03385837	Activity Level and Barriers to Participate of Cardiac Rehabilitation in Advanced Heart Failure Patients	50	Dec 2018 (unknown; last updated 12/12/17)
NCT02619422	Multicenter, Prospective, Randomized, Open, Blinded for the End Point Evaluator to Compare Compliance to Secondary Prevention Measures After Acute Coronary Syndrome and Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation Program vs. Standard Program	509	Feb 2018 (last updated 06/06/18)

NCT: national clinical 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

93797	Physician services for outpatient cardiac rehabilitation; without continuous ECG monitoring (per session)
93798	Physician services for outpatient cardiac rehabilitation; with continuous ECG monitoring (per session)
G0422	Intensive cardiac rehabilitation; with or without continuous ECG monitoring with exercise, per session
G0423	Intensive cardiac rehabilitation; with or without continuous ECG monitoring; without exercise, per session

ICD-10 Diagnoses

I20.8	Other forms of angina pectoris
I20.9	Angina pectoris, unspecified
I21.01	ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction involving left main coronary artery
I21.02	ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction involving left anterior descending coronary artery
I21.09	ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction involving other coronary artery of anterior wall
I21.11	ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction involving right coronary artery
I21.19	ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction involving other coronary artery of inferior wall
I21.21	ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction involving left circumflex coronary artery
I21.29	ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction involving other sites
I21.3	ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction of unspecified site
I21.4	Non-ST elevation (NSTEMI) myocardial infarction
I21.A1	Myocardial infarction type 2
I22.0	Subsequent ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction of anterior wall
I22.1	Subsequent ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction of inferior wall
I22.2	Subsequent non-ST elevation (NSTEMI) myocardial infarction
I22.8	Subsequent ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction of other sites
I22.9	Subsequent ST elevation (STEMI) myocardial infarction of unspecified site
I25.110	Atherosclerotic heart disease of native coronary artery with unstable angina pectoris
I25.111	Atherosclerotic heart disease of native coronary artery with angina pectoris with documented spasm
I25.118	Atherosclerotic heart disease of native coronary artery with other forms of angina pectoris
I25.119	Atherosclerotic heart disease of native coronary artery with unspecified angina pectoris
I25.2	Old myocardial infarction
I25.700	Atherosclerosis of coronary artery bypass graft(s), unspecified, with unstable angina pectoris
I25.701	Atherosclerosis of coronary artery bypass graft(s), unspecified, with angina pectoris with documented spasm
I25.708	Atherosclerosis of coronary artery bypass graft(s), unspecified, with other forms of angina pectoris
I25.709	Atherosclerosis of coronary artery bypass graft(s), unspecified, with unspecified angina pectoris
I25.710	Atherosclerosis of autologous vein coronary artery bypass graft(s) with unstable angina pectoris
I25.711	Atherosclerosis of autologous vein coronary artery bypass graft(s) with angina pectoris with documented spasm
I25.718	Atherosclerosis of autologous vein coronary artery bypass graft(s) with other forms of angina pectoris
I25.719	Atherosclerosis of autologous vein coronary artery bypass graft(s) with unspecified angina pectoris
I25.720	Atherosclerosis of autologous artery coronary artery bypass graft(s) with unstable angina pectoris
I25.721	Atherosclerosis of autologous artery coronary artery bypass graft(s) with angina pectoris with documented spasm

I25.728 Atherosclerosis of autologous artery coronary artery bypass graft(s) with other forms of angina pectoris
I25.729 Atherosclerosis of autologous artery coronary artery bypass graft(s) with unspecified angina pectoris
I25.730 Atherosclerosis of nonautologous biological coronary artery bypass graft(s) with unstable angina pectoris
I25.731 Atherosclerosis of nonautologous biological coronary artery bypass graft(s) with angina pectoris with documented spasm
I25.738 Atherosclerosis of nonautologous biological coronary artery bypass graft(s) with other forms of angina pectoris
I25.739 Atherosclerosis of nonautologous biological coronary artery bypass graft(s) with unspecified angina pectoris
I25.750 Atherosclerosis of native coronary artery of transplanted heart with unstable angina
I25.751 Atherosclerosis of native coronary artery of transplanted heart with angina pectoris with documented spasm
I25.758 Atherosclerosis of native coronary artery of transplanted heart with other forms of angina pectoris
I25.759 Atherosclerosis of native coronary artery of transplanted heart with unspecified angina pectoris
I25.760 Atherosclerosis of bypass graft of coronary artery of transplanted heart with unstable angina
I25.761 Atherosclerosis of bypass graft of coronary artery of transplanted heart with angina pectoris with documented spasm
I25.768 Atherosclerosis of bypass graft of coronary artery of transplanted heart with other forms of angina pectoris
I25.769 Atherosclerosis of bypass graft of coronary artery of transplanted heart with unspecified angina pectoris
I25.790 Atherosclerosis of other coronary artery bypass graft(s) with unstable angina pectoris
I25.791 Atherosclerosis of other coronary artery bypass graft(s) with angina pectoris with documented spasm
I25.798 Atherosclerosis of other coronary artery bypass graft(s) with other forms of angina pectoris
I25.799 Atherosclerosis of other coronary artery bypass graft(s) with unspecified angina pectoris
I50.20 Unspecified systolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.21 Acute systolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.22 Chronic systolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.23 Acute on chronic systolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.30 Unspecified diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.31 Acute diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.32 Chronic diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.33 Acute on chronic diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.40 Unspecified combined systolic (congestive) and diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.41 Acute combined systolic (congestive) and diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.42 Chronic combined systolic (congestive) and diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.43 Acute on chronic combined systolic (congestive) and diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.810 Right heart failure, unspecified

I50.811 Acute right heart failure
I50.812 Chronic right heart failure
I50.813 Acute on chronic right heart failure
I50.814 Right heart failure due to left heart failure
I50.82 Biventricular heart failure
I50.83 High output heart failure
I50.84 End stage heart failure
I50.9 Heart failure, unspecified

REVISIONS

08-17-2010	Policy added to the bcbsks.com web site.
09-24-2012	Description section updated.
	In the Policy section: ▪ In Item E, added "It is preferable that programs start within 90 days of the cardiac event and be completed within 6 months of the cardiac event."
	Rationale section updated.
	Reference section updated.
12-11-2013	Added Medical Policy and Coding Disclaimers.
	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: ▪ In Item A, added #7, "Compensated heart failure".
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: ▪ Added ICD-10 Diagnosis codes *(Effective October 1, 2014)*
	Updated Reference section.
07-15-2014	Description section updated
	In Policy section: ▪ Added to A 7 "(Stable congestive heart failure with left ventricular ejection fraction of 35% or less and New York Heart Association (NYHA) class II to IV symptoms despite being on optimal heart failure therapy for at least 6 weeks)" to define compensated heart failure.
	Revision section updated
	References updated
09-23-2015	Title of policy changed from "Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs"
	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: ▪ In Item A, removed "items and services" and "who have experienced one or more" and added "outpatient", "programs," "with a history", and "conditions and procedures", to read "Outpatient cardiac rehabilitation programs are considered medically necessary for patients with a history of the following conditions and procedures:" ▪ In Item A 1, added "(MI) (heart attack)", to read "An acute myocardial infarction (MI) (heart attack) within the preceding 12 months; OR" ▪ In Item A 2, added "graft (CABG)", to read "A coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgery; OR ▪ In Item A 4, added "surgery" and removed "repair or replacement", to read "Heart valve surgery; OR" ▪ In Item A 6, added "OR", to read "A heart or heart-lung transplant; OR" ▪ In Item A 7, removed "(Stable congestive heart failure with left ventricular ejection fraction of 35% or less and New York Heart Association (NYHA) class II to IV symptoms despite being on optimal heart failure therapy for at least 6 weeks)"

	▪ In Item B 2, removed ", including education, counseling, and behavioral intervention at least once during the program, tailored to patients' individual needs", to read "Cardiac risk modification" ▪ In Item B 5, removed "for each patient", to read "An individualized treatment plan detailing how components are utilized."
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: ▪ Removed bullet stating "A single initial visit with the physician for referral to a program may be allowed under CPT code 99215."
	Updated References section.
11-24-2015	In Coding section: ▪ Removed ICD-10 code I20.0.
	Updated References section.
05-11-2016	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: ▪ Previous Policy Items B, C, D, E, and F were moved to Policy Guidelines section. ▪ In Policy Guidelines, added "each of the above" to Item 1 (previous Policy Item B) to read "An individualized treatment plan detailing how each of the above components are utilized."
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
08-18-2017	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: ▪ Added new Item C, "Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease or Pritikin Program is considered experimental / investigational." ▪ In Policy Guidelines, removed "Note: This policy does not address programs considered to be "intensive cardiac rehabilitation programs," such as the Dean Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease and the Pritikin Program."
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: ▪ Added HCPCS codes: G0422, G0423.
	Updated References section.
10-01-2017	In Coding section: ▪ Added ICD-10 codes: I21.A1, I50.810, I50.811, I50.812, I50.813, I50.814, I50.82, I50.83, I50.84.
04-11-2018	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: ▪ Removed ICD-9 codes.
	Updated References section.
04-24-2019	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
03-23-2021	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.

REFERENCES

1. Corra U, Piepoli MF, Carre F, et al. Secondary prevention through cardiac rehabilitation: physical activity counseling and exercise training: key components

of the position paper from the Cardiac Rehabilitation Section of the European Association of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation. Eur Heart J. Aug 2010;31(16):1967-1974. PMID 20643803
2. Leon AS, Franklin BA, Costa F, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation and secondary prevention of coronary heart disease: an American Heart Association scientific statement from the Council on Clinical Cardiology (Subcommittee on Exercise, Cardiac Rehabilitation, and Prevention) and the Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism (Subcommittee on Physical Activity), in collaboration with the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation. Circulation. Jan 25 2005;111(3):369-376. PMID 15668354
3. Heart Failure Society of America, Lindenfeld J, Albert NM, et al. HFSA 2010 Comprehensive Heart Failure Practice Guideline. J Card Fail. Jun 2010;16(6):e1-194. PMID 20610207
4. Mozaffarian D, Benjamin EJ, Go AS, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics--2015 update: a report from the American Heart Association. Circulation. Jan 27 2015;131(4):e29-322. PMID 25520374
5. Balady GJ, Williams MA, Ades PA, et al. Core components of cardiac rehabilitation/secondary prevention programs: 2007 update: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Exercise, Cardiac Rehabilitation, and Prevention Committee, the Council on Clinical Cardiology; the Councils on Cardiovascular Nursing, Epidemiology and Prevention, and Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism; and the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation. Circulation. May 22 2007;115(20):2675-2682. PMID 17513578
6. Oldridge N. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation in patients with coronary heart disease: meta-analysis outcomes revisited. Future Cardiol. Sep 2012;8(5):729-751. PMID 23013125
7. Anderson L, Thompson DR, Oldridge N, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for coronary heart disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Jan 5 2016;1:CD001800. PMID 26730878
8. Davies EJ, Moxham T, Rees K, et al. Exercise based rehabilitation for heart failure. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2010(4):CD003331. PMID 20393935
9. Heran BS, Chen JM, Ebrahim S, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for coronary heart disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Jul 6 2011(7):CD001800. PMID 21735386
10. Long L, Mordi IR, Bridges C, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for adults with heart failure. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2019 Jan;1:CD003331. PMID 30695817
11. West RR, Jones DA, Henderson AH. Rehabilitation after myocardial infarction trial (RAMIT): multi-centre randomised controlled trial of comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation in patients following acute myocardial infarction. Heart. Apr 2012;98(8):637-644. PMID 22194152
12. Doherty P, Lewin R. The RAMIT trial, a pragmatic RCT of cardiac rehabilitation versus usual care: what does it tell us? [editorial]. Heart. Apr 2012;98(8):605-606. PMID 22505460

13. Pandey A, Kitzman DW, Brubaker P, et al. Response to endurance exercise training in older adults with heart failure with preserved or reduced ejection fraction. J Am Geriatr Soc. Aug 2017;65(8):1698-1704. PMID 28338229
14. Kitzman DW, Brubaker PH, Morgan TM, et al. Exercise training in older patients with heart failure and preserved ejection fraction: a randomized, controlled, single-blind trial. Circ Heart Fail. Nov 2010;3(6):659-667. PMID 20852060
15. Sumner J, Harrison A, Doherty P. The effectiveness of modern cardiac rehabilitation: A systematic review of recent observational studies in non-attenders versus attenders. PLoS One. May 2017;12(5):e0177658. PMID 28498869
16. Nilsson BB, Lunde P, Grogaard HK, et al. Long-term results of high-intensity exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation in revascularized patients for symptomatic coronary artery disease. Am J Cardiol. Jan 1 2018;121(1):21-26. PMID 29096886
17. Ornish D, Brown SE, Scherwitz LW, et al. Can lifestyle changes reverse coronary heart disease? The Lifestyle Heart Trial. Lancet. Jul 21 1990;336(8708):129-133. PMID 1973470
18. Ornish D, Scherwitz LW, Billings JH, et al. Intensive lifestyle changes for reversal of coronary heart disease. Jama. Dec 16 1998;280(23):2001-2007. PMID 9863851
19. Barnard RJ, Guzy PM, Rosenberg JM, et al. Effects of an intensive exercise and nutrition program on patients with coronary artery disease: five-year follow-up. J Cardiac Rehabil 1983;3:183-190.
20. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of heart failure: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on practice guidelines. Circulation. Oct 15 2013;128(16):1810-1852. PMID 23741057
21. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/HFSA Focused Update of the 2013 ACCF.AHA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure. Circulation. 2017;136:e137-e161. PMID: 28455343
22. Qaseem A, Fihn SD, Dallas P, et al. Management of stable ischemic heart disease: summary of a clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians/American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association/American Association for Thoracic Surgery/Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association/Society of Thoracic Surgeons. Ann Intern Med. Nov 20 2012;157(10):735-743. PMID 23165665
23. Lanza GA, Grea F. Stable Ischemic Heart Disease: The Update to the 2012 Guideline. https://www.acc.org/latest-in-cardiology/articles/2015/01/30/12/26/stable-ischemic-heart-disease-the-update-to-the-2012-guideline. Accessed February 10, 2020.
24. Thomas RJ, Beatty AL, Beckie TM, et al. Home-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation: A Scientific Statement From the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation, the American Heart Association, and the American College of Cardiology. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 2019 Jul;74(1). PMID 31097258
25. Centers for Medicare % Medicaid Services (CMS). National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs (20.31). 2010; http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=339&ncdver=1&CoverageSelection=National&KeyWord=inten

sive+cardiac&KeyWordLook Up=Title&KeyWordSearchType=And&clickon=search&bc=gAAAABAAAAAA&. Accessed February 10, 2020.
26. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). CMS Manual System: Pub 100-03 Medicare National Coverage Determinations. Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs for Chronic Heart Failure. 2014; https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=359&ncdVer=1. Accessed February 10, 2020.
27. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Decision Memo for INTENSIVE CARDIAC Rehabilitation (ICR) Program - Dr. Ornish's Program for Reversing Heart Disease (CAG-00419N). 2010; https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-decision-memo.aspx?NCAId=240&NCDId=339&ncdver=1&CoverageSelection=National&KeyWord=intensive+cardiac&K eyWordLookUp=Title&KeyWordSearchType=And&clickon=search&IsPopup=y&bc= AAAAAAAACAAAAA%3d%3 d&. Accessed February 10, 2020.

Other References

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Cardiology Liaison Committee, April 2010; May 2014; May 2015; July 2016; May 2018.