

Clinical Practice Guideline: Achilles Tendon Repair

Date of Implementation: July 16, 2015

Product: Specialty

GUIDELINES

American Specialty Health – Specialty (ASH) considers services consisting of CPT® Code 27650, 27652, or 27654 to be medically necessary for the treatment of Achilles tendon rupture ICD-10 Codes S86.011A – S86.019S.

For services consisting of CPT® code 27652, should a graft be medically necessary, a synthetic (as opposed to auto) graft requires verification of medical necessity prior to the services being performed given high cost and experimental and investigational status for this procedure.

Should an autogenous graft be medically necessary for the treatment of chronic Achilles tendon rupture, procedure code 20924 may be utilized. This procedure consists of autogenous graft through separate tendon incision. CPT® code 20924 should be billed separately unless the code descriptor references the harvesting of the graft or implant (e.g., includes obtaining graft).

CPT® Codes and Descriptions

CPT®Code	CPT® Code Description
20924	Tendon graft, from a distance (e.g., palmaris, toe extensor, plantaris)
27650	Repair, primary, open or percutaneous, ruptured Achilles tendon
27652	Repair, primary, open or percutaneous, ruptured Achilles tendon, with graft (includes obtaining graft)
27654	Repair, secondary, Achilles tendon, with or without graft

BACKGROUND

While the Achilles tendon is stronger than any other in the body, it also is the most frequently ruptured (Rosenzweig and Azar, 2009). Treatment options for acute Achilles tendon rupture either include conservative and operative procedures. The selected course of treatment is determined by the patient history. For example, cases of delayed diagnosis

1 may not lend to conservative management due to lack of apposition of the tendon ends due
2 to scarring and retraction. Cases of chronic rupture of the tendo-achilles will not respond
3 to conservative treatment and will require operative repair – and may additionally require
4 tendon graft. Conservative treatment options for Achilles tendon rupture may include
5 casting in plantarflexion (aka equinus). Historically, this would include rest, pain control,
6 serial casting, and eventually rehabilitation to maximize function. For example, long leg
7 casting for 2-3 weeks, followed by short leg casting for another 8 weeks with non-weight
8 bearing advised for the first 6 weeks. However, more recent protocols include functional
9 bracing with immediate weight bearing up to full weight in a functional brace or
10 prefabricated boot. Patients typically begin with the ankle plantar flexed up to 45° and
11 systematically reduced to neutral over 6 to 12 weeks. This approach often includes active
12 plantarflexion movements with limited dorsiflexion, gradually progressing to more
13 aggressive strengthening exercises (Lu et al., 2019).

14
15 Surgical approaches to repair a ruptured Achilles tendon vary. The classic open approach
16 involves a longitudinal incision exposing the ruptured tendon and suturing it directly. The
17 more popular percutaneous (minimally invasive) approach uses a smaller incision with a
18 clamp and sutures passed percutaneously through both proximal and distal portions of the
19 ruptured tendon. In addition, the limited open techniques are a hybrid of the other two
20 techniques to minimize tissue disruption.

21
22 Systematic reviews of randomized trials with pooled results evaluated various protocols to
23 repair acute Achilles tendon rupture. The studies indicated that patients treated with a
24 surgical approach were less likely to re-rupture their Achilles tendon. However, the same
25 surgical group had a greater risk of complications including infection, nerve
26 entrapment/injury, and fibrotic adhesions compared to those who received nonsurgical
27 treatment.

28
29 Ochen et al. (2019) compared re-rupture rate, complication rate, and functional outcome
30 after operative versus nonoperative treatment of Achilles tendon ruptures; to compare re-
31 rupture rate after early and late full weight bearing; to evaluate re-rupture rate after
32 functional rehabilitation with early range of motion; and to compare effect estimates from
33 randomized controlled trials and observational studies in a systematic review and meta-
34 analysis. Twenty-nine studies were included 10 randomized controlled trials and 19
35 observational studies. The 10 trials included 944 (6%) patients, and the 19 observational
36 studies included 14,918 (94%) patients. A significant reduction in re-ruptures was seen
37 after operative treatment (2.3%) compared with nonoperative treatment (3.9%). Operative
38 treatment resulted in a significantly higher complication rate than nonoperative treatment.
39 The main difference in complication rate was attributable to the incidence of infection
40 (2.8%) in the operative group. A similar reduction in re-rupture rate in favor of operative
41 treatment was seen after both early and late full weight bearing. No significant difference
42 in re-rupture rate was seen between operative and nonoperative treatment in studies that

1 used accelerated functional rehabilitation with early range of motion. Authors concluded
2 that operative treatment of Achilles tendon ruptures reduces the risk of re-rupture compared
3 with nonoperative treatment. However, re-rupture rates are low and differences between
4 treatment groups are small. Operative treatment results in a higher risk of other
5 complications. The final decision on the management of acute Achilles tendon ruptures
6 should be based on patient specific factors and shared decision making. Lu et al. (2019)
7 investigated the role of early functional rehabilitation in acute Achilles tendon ruptures.
8 Fourteen randomized controlled trials were identified. Pooled data demonstrated no
9 difference in the complication rates, time taken to return to sports, total number of patients
10 returning to work or sports, and satisfaction rate between the early functional rehabilitation
11 and conventional cast immobilization groups. Early functional rehabilitation significantly
12 decreased the time taken to return to work. Early functional rehabilitation for acute Achilles
13 tendon ruptures appeared to be related to a shorter time taken to return to work; however,
14 it did not affect the other variables between the groups.

15
16 Jaing et al. (2012) performed a meta-analysis comparing the efficacy of surgical vs. non-
17 surgical treatment for acute Achilles tendon rupture. Among the ten RCTs meeting
18 inclusion criteria (894 patients) the operation treatment group had superior outcomes to the
19 non-operative treatment group for lower risk of re-rupture, and returned to work more
20 quickly, but had a greater risk of complications (i.e., scar adhesions, superficial infection
21 and nerve sensation disturbance). In addition, Wilkins et al. (2012) performed a meta-
22 analysis of seven trials (677 patients) which found open surgical repair correlated with a
23 significantly lower rate of re-rupture compared to those who received nonoperative
24 treatment. Although, the occurrence of surgical complications (i.e., deep infections, scar
25 complaints, and sural nerve sensory disturbances) were all significantly greater among the
26 surgical patients ($P=0.113$, $P<0.001$, and $P<0.001$, respectively).

27
28 With regard to the issue of tendon re-rupture, a stratified meta-analysis of 10 randomized
29 controlled trials (RCTs) involving a total of 826 patients concluded that when functional
30 rehabilitation with early range of motion was implemented, tendon re-rupture rates were
31 comparable comparing surgical to nonsurgical patients (risk difference = 1.7%, $p = 0.45$).
32 While surgical patients returned to work 19.16 days sooner ($p = 0.0014$), surgery was
33 associated with an absolute risk increase of 15.8% ($p = 0.016$ in favor of nonoperative
34 treatment) for complications other than re-rupture (Soroceanu et al., 2012).

35
36 According to McMahon et al. (2011) a systematic review and meta-analysis of 6 RCTs
37 (277 patients) reported that percutaneous minimally invasive surgery (136 cases) decreased
38 the likelihood of superficial wound infection and increased patient satisfaction when
39 compared to conventional open surgical repair (141 cases). Further, no differences were
40 observed between these two surgical methods based on re-rupture rates, incidence of tissue
41 adhesion, or reported sural nerve injury.

1 Meta-analyses performed by Suchak et al. (2006) identified 6 studies (315 patients)
2 meeting inclusion criteria. Among these postoperative patients, when early functional
3 treatment protocols were implemented (e.g., ankle mobilization and full weight-bearing
4 with an orthosis), patients reported more “excellent” subjective responses to treatment
5 compared to those who received postoperative immobilization (e.g., casting). Further, this
6 aggressive functional rehabilitative approach had no negative impact on re-rupture rates.

7
8 Willits et al. (2010) conducted an RCT comparing operative and nonoperative treatment in
9 144 patients with acute Achilles tendon rupture. Both groups received accelerated
10 functional rehabilitation that included early weight-bearing and early range of motion
11 exercises. There was no clinically significant difference between these groups in re-rupture
12 rates, range of motion, strength, Leppilahti score or calf circumference. A Cochrane review
13 noted the method of rehabilitation may also play an important role in the outcome of
14 ruptured Achilles tendon treatment. The evidence points to the use of early functional (e.g.,
15 weight-bearing) rehabilitation, regardless of operative or non-operative management
16 (Kearney & Costa, 2012).

17
18 McCormack & Bovard (2015) conducted a meta-analysis to evaluate postoperative
19 rehabilitation options following surgical repair of acute Achilles tendon rupture measured
20 against primary outcomes of patient safety and satisfaction. Randomized controlled trials
21 comparing clinical and/or patient-reported outcomes between patients receiving early
22 functional postoperative ankle motion and weight bearing (bracing group), and traditional
23 ankle immobilization with a non-weight bearing rigid cast (cast group) were eligible for
24 inclusion. Fourteen articles were identified as potentially eligible; 10 sufficient-quality
25 randomized controlled trials involving 570 patients were included for meta-analysis. Five
26 of the six trials measuring the time interval showed a faster return to prior sporting level in
27 the bracing group. Subjective patient outcomes were significantly better in the bracing
28 group (for good and excellent results, $p=0.01$; OR, 3.13; 95% CI 1.30 to 7.53). There was
29 no difference in major complications between the two groups ($p=0.21$; RD, -0.03; 95% CI
30 -0.06 to 0.01). Dynamometry and anthropometry measurements favored functional
31 rehabilitation at 6-12 weeks postoperative; however, by 6 months postoperative, the
32 differences were negligible. The authors concluded that early dynamic functional
33 rehabilitation results in higher patient satisfaction and is as safe as traditional ankle
34 immobilization with a non-weight bearing cast following surgical repair of acute Achilles
35 tendon rupture.

36
37 Patients who may not be candidates for surgical repair of a ruptured Achilles tendon
38 include those with poorly controlled systematic diseases (e.g., diabetes) and those with
39 vascular compromise or nerve problems involving the foot (Kou, 2010). In addition,
40 surgery performed exclusively for cosmetic or aesthetic reasons would not be considered
41 medically necessary (ACAFS, 2020).

1 **PRACTITIONER SCOPE AND TRAINING**

2 Practitioners should practice only in the areas in which they are competent based on their
3 education, training and experience. Levels of education, experience, and proficiency may
4 vary among individual practitioners. It is ethically and legally incumbent on a practitioner
5 to determine where they have the knowledge and skills necessary to perform such services
6 and whether the services are within their scope of practice.

7
8 It is best practice for the practitioner to appropriately render services to a member only if
9 they are trained, equally skilled, and adequately competent to deliver a service compared
10 to others trained to perform the same procedure. If the service would be most competently
11 delivered by another health care practitioner who has more skill and training, it would be
12 best practice to refer the member to the more expert practitioner.

13
14 Best practice can be defined as a clinical, scientific, or professional technique, method, or
15 process that is typically evidence-based and consensus driven and is recognized by a
16 majority of professionals in a particular field as more effective at delivering a particular
17 outcome than any other practice (Joint Commission International Accreditation Standards
18 for Hospitals, 2020).

19
20 Depending on the practitioner’s scope of practice, training, and experience, a member’s
21 condition and/or symptoms during examination or the course of treatment may indicate the
22 need for referral to another practitioner or even emergency care. In such cases it is prudent
23 for the practitioner to refer the member for appropriate co-management (e.g., to their
24 primary care physician) or if immediate emergency care is warranted, to contact 911 as
25 appropriate. See the *Managing Medical Emergencies (CPG 159 – S)* clinical practice
26 guideline for information.

27
28 **References**

29
30 American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons (ACFAS) Cosmetic Surgery Position
31 Statement (2020). Retrieved on December 20, 2023 from:
32 [https://www.acfas.org/policy-advocacy/policy-position-statements/acfas-position-](https://www.acfas.org/policy-advocacy/policy-position-statements/acfas-position-statement-on-cosmetic-surgery)
33 [statement-on-cosmetic-surgery](https://www.acfas.org/policy-advocacy/policy-position-statements/acfas-position-statement-on-cosmetic-surgery)

34
35 American Medical Association. (current year). Current Procedural Terminology (CPT)
36 Current year (rev. ed.). Chicago: AMA

37
38 American Medical Association. (current year). ICD-10-CM. American Medical
39 Association

- 1 Gulati, V., Jaggard, M., Al-Nammari, S. S., Uzoigwe, C., Gulati, P., Ismail, N., . Gupte, C.
2 (2015). Management of achilles tendon injury: A current concepts systematic review.
3 *World Journal of Orthopedics*, 6(4), 380-386. doi: 10.5312/wjo.v6.i4.380
4
- 5 Jiang, N., Wang, B., Chen, A., Dong, F., & Yu, B. (2012). Operative versus nonoperative
6 treatment for acute Achilles tendon rupture: a meta-analysis based on current evidence.
7 *International Orthopaedics*, 36(4), 765-773
8
- 9 Joint Commission International. (2020). Joint Commission International Accreditation
10 Standards for Hospitals (7th ed.): Joint Commission Resources
11
- 12 Kearney, R. S., & Costa, M. L. (2012). Current concepts in the rehabilitation of an acute
13 rupture of the tendo Achillis. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. British Volume*,
14 94(1), 28-31
15
- 16 Kou J. (2010). AAOS Clinical Practice Guideline: acute Achilles tendon rupture. *The*
17 *Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons*, 18(8), 511–513.
18 <https://doi.org/10.5435/00124635-201008000-00008>
19
- 20 Lu, J., Liang, X., & Ma, Q. (2019). Early Functional Rehabilitation for Acute Achilles
21 Tendon Ruptures: An Update Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *The*
22 *Journal of foot and ankle surgery : official publication of the American College of Foot*
23 *and Ankle Surgeons*, 58(5), 938–945. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jfas.2018.12.014>
24
- 25 McCormack, R., & Bovard, J. (2015). Early functional rehabilitation or cast immobilisation
26 for the postoperative management of acute Achilles tendon rupture? A systematic
27 review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *British journal of sports*
28 *medicine*, 49(20), 1329–1335. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-094935>
29
- 30 McMahon, S. E., Smith, T. O., & Hing, C. B. (2011). A meta-analysis of randomized
31 controlled trials comparing conventional to minimally invasive approaches for repair
32 of an Achilles tendon rupture. *Foot and Ankle Surgery*, 17(4), 211-7
33
- 34 Naldo, J., Agnew, P., Brucato, M., Dayton, P., & Shane, A. (2021). ACFAS Clinical
35 Consensus Statement: Acute Achilles Tendon Pathology. *The Journal of foot and ankle*
36 *surgery : official publication of the American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons*,
37 60(1), 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jfas.2020.02.006>
38
- 39 Ochen, Y., Beks, R. B., van Heijl, M., Hietbrink, F., Leenen, L. P. H., van der Velde, D,
40 Houwert, R. M. (2019). Operative treatment versus nonoperative treatment of Achilles
41 tendon ruptures: systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Medical Journal*. 364,
42 k5120

- 1 Rosenzweig, S., & Azar, F. M. (2009). Open repair of acute Achilles tendon ruptures. *Foot*
2 *and Ankle Clinics*, 14(4):699-709
3
- 4 Soroceanu, A., Sidhwa, F., Aarabi, S., Kaufman, A., & Glazebrook, M. (2012). Surgical
5 versus nonsurgical treatment of acute Achilles tendon rupture: a meta-analysis of
6 randomized trials. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume*,
7 94(23):2136-2143
8
- 9 Suchak, A. A., Spooner, C., Reid, D. C., & Jomha, N. M. (2006). Postoperative
10 rehabilitation protocols for Achilles tendon ruptures: a meta-analysis. *Clinical*
11 *Orthopaedics and Related Research*, 445, 216-221
12
- 13 Wilkins, W. R., & Bisson, L. J. (2012). Operative versus nonoperative management of
14 acute Achilles tendon ruptures: a quantitative systematic review of randomized
15 controlled trials. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 40(9), 2154-2160
16
- 17 Willits, K., Amendola, A., Bryant, D., Mohtadi, N. G., Giffin, J. R., Fowler, P., Kirkley,
18 A. (2010). Operative versus nonoperative treatment of acute achilles tendon ruptures:
19 a multicenter randomized trial using accelerated functional rehabilitation. *The Journal*
20 *of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume*, 92(17), 2767-2775