

Clinical Practice Guideline: Metatarsal or Tarsal Nonunion/Malunion Repair

Date of Implementation: September 17, 2015

Product: Specialty

GUIDELINES

American Specialty Health – Specialty (ASH) considers procedures consisting of CPT Codes 28320 and 28322 to be medically necessary for the repair of metatarsal or tarsal nonunion/malunion **upon meeting ALL of the following criteria:**

Diagnosis indicates **ALL of the following:**

- Patient has a malunion or nonunion (ICD-10 codes for fracture with malunion or nonunion of tarsal and metatarsal: S92.201K – S92.256P, S92.301K – S92.356P)
- Patient reports pain, instability, or deformity at the site of a previous fracture
- Confirmation of malunion or nonunion (non-union can be defined as non-evidence of healing after a certain amount of time, e.g., 4-6 months) by x-rays, bone scan, or other imaging studies
- Differential diagnosis has been considered and ruled out

CPT CODES AND DESCRIPTIONS

CPT® Code	CPT® Code Description
28320	Repair, nonunion or malunion; tarsal bones
28322	Repair, nonunion or malunion; metatarsal, with or without bone graft (includes obtaining graft)

BACKGROUND

CPT codes 28320 and 28322 describe procedures involving the fusion of bones for the treatment of nonunions or malunions. CPT Code 28322 includes osteotomy with alignment and stabilization of the bones either with or without bone graft.

Incomplete healing of a fracture where the cortices of the bone fragments do not reconnect is called a nonunion. A fracture that heals with a deformity (e.g., angulation, rotation, incongruent joint surface) is considered a malunion.

To diagnose a nonunion, the specialist uses imaging studies that provide detailed pictures of the bone and surrounding soft tissues. Depending on which bone is involved, these tests may include x-rays, computed tomography (CT) scans, bone scans, and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Furthermore, the patient medical history may indicate a nonunion if the specialist finds one or more of the following: persistent pain at the fracture site, a persistent gap with no bone spanning the fracture site, no progress in bone healing

1 when repeated imaging studies are compared over several months, and/or inadequate
2 healing in a time period that is usually enough for normal healing.

3
4 Common reasons for nonunion and malunion include an inadequate blood supply to the
5 fractured bone (e.g., scaphoid, proximal fifth metatarsal), behaviors that interfere with bone
6 healing (e.g., smoking), poor bone fixation (i.e., excessive movement at the fracture site),
7 poor apposition of bone fragments (i.e., fragment ends too far from one another), and
8 infection. Fractures sustained during high energy trauma, particularly open fractures and
9 those associated with severe soft tissue injury, are at an increased risk for nonunion (Howe,
10 2021).

11
12 Nonunions commonly present with persistent pain, swelling, or instability beyond the time
13 when healing should normally have occurred. Some symptomatic nonunions can be treated
14 nonsurgically. However, due to the high demand of athletic and active patients, surgery is
15 often recommended for specific injuries (Saxena et al., 2012). The most common
16 nonsurgical treatment is a bone stimulator. This treatment must be used every day to be
17 effective. Surgery is needed when nonsurgical methods fail or are not suitable for a specific
18 injury. Surgical options may include bone graft and/or bone graft substitute, internal
19 fixation, and/or external fixation.

20
21 Stress fractures of the fifth metatarsal result from chronic and repetitive microtrauma,
22 predominantly in younger athletes. They occur much less often than traumatic fractures.
23 Despite their infrequency, they require special attention because they frequently result in
24 delayed union and nonunion compared with other proximal fifth metatarsal fractures and
25 stress fractures of other metatarsals. Type III fractures of the fifth metatarsal are considered
26 nonunions. Patient medical history reveals pain with recurrent symptoms, likely
27 representing repetitive insults, and on plain films, the fracture line is widened with
28 medullary canal replaced by sclerosis. Initial treatment recommendations for Type III
29 injuries are curettage and bone grafting (Mayer et al., 2014).

30
31 Fractures of the proximal fifth metatarsal metaphysis (i.e., the Jones fracture) can be
32 problematic in the elite athlete because of a high incidence of nonunion and re-fracture
33 with nonoperative treatment. Although these fractures are not common, athletes can suffer
34 refracture or nonunion of a Jones fracture despite operative stabilization due to hardware
35 of insufficient strength, aggressive postoperative rehabilitation, or biologic insufficiency
36 at the fracture site. Hunt et al. (2011) carried out a retrospective review of the results of
37 revision intramedullary screw fixation with cancellous autologous bone grafting or bone-
38 marrow aspirate combined with demineralized bone matrix after re-fracture or nonunion
39 of Jones fractures in elite athletes ($N=21$). All patients underwent intramedullary screw
40 fixation with autologous bone graft (12 patients), bone-marrow aspirate (BMA) and
41 demineralized bone matrix (DBM) (8 patients), or no bone graft (1 patient). The results
42 showed that all athletes were able to return to their previous level of athletic competition

1 at an average of 12.3 weeks. All fractures showed clinical and radiographic evidence of
 2 compete cortical healing. The authors concluded that revision fixation with a large, solid
 3 screw (5.5 mm or larger) and autologous bone grafting for symptomatic re-fractures and
 4 nonunions of the proximal fifth metatarsal is effective treatment for elite athletes.

6 **PRACTITIONER SCOPE AND TRAINING**

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

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

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

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

33 **References**

34 American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons (ACFAS) Cosmetic surgery position
 35 statement (2020). Retrieved on May 11, 2023 from: <https://www.acfas.org/policy-advocacy/policy-position-statements/acfas-position-statement-on-cosmetic-surgery>

38 American Medical Association. (current year). *Current Procedural Terminology (CPT)*
 39 Current year (rev. ed.). Chicago: AMA

41 American Medical Association. (current year). *ICD-10-CM*. American Medical
 42 Association

- 1 Becker, A. (2009). First metatarsal malunion. *Foot and Ankle Clinics*, 14(1), 77-90. doi:
2 10.1016/j.fcl.2008.11.006
3
- 4 Chen, S. B., Zhang, C. Q., Jin, D. X., Cheng, X. G., Sheng, J. G., & Zeng, B. F. (2009).
5 Treatment of aseptic nonunion after intramedullary nailing fixation with locking plate.
6 *Orthopaedic Surgery*, 1(4), 258-263. doi: 10.1111/j.1757-7861.2009.00040.x
7
- 8 Cothran, V. E., (2019). Metatarsal Stress Fracture Treatment & Management Retrieved on
9 May 11, 2023 from <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/85746-treatment>
10
- 11 Hatch, R. L., Alsobrook, J. A., & Clugston, J. R. (2007). Diagnosis and management of
12 metatarsal fractures. *American Family Physician*, 76(6), 817-826
13
- 14 Howe, A. S. (2021). General principles of fracture management: Early and late
15 complications. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from
16 [http://www.uptodate.com/contents/general-principles-of-fracture-management-early-](http://www.uptodate.com/contents/general-principles-of-fracture-management-early-and-late-complications)
17 [and-late-complications](http://www.uptodate.com/contents/general-principles-of-fracture-management-early-and-late-complications)
18
- 19 Hunt, K. J., & Anderson, R. B. (2011). Treatment of Jones fracture nonunions and
20 refractures in the elite athlete: outcomes of intramedullary screw fixation with bone
21 grafting. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 39(9), 1948-1954. doi:
22 10.1177/0363546511408868
23
- 24 Joint Commission International. (2020). Joint Commission International Accreditation
25 Standards for Hospitals (7th ed.): Joint Commission Resources
26
- 27 Mayer, S. W., Joyner, P. W., Almekinders, L. C., & Parekh, S. G. (2014). Stress Fractures
28 of the Foot and Ankle in Athletes. *Sports Health: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, 6(6),
29 481-491. doi: 10.1177/1941738113486588
30
- 31 Murphy, R., & Fallat, L. M. (2012). Surgical correction of metatarsal malunion. *The*
32 *Journal of Foot and Ankle Surgery*, 51(6), 801-805. doi: 10.1053/j.jfas.2012.06.016
33
- 34 Niu, Y., Bai, Y., Xu, S., Liu, X., Wang, P., Wu, D., Li, M. (2011). Treatment of lower
35 extremity long bone nonunion with expandable intramedullary nailing and autologous
36 bone grafting. *Archives of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery*, 131(7), 885-891. doi:
37 10.1007/s00402-010-1226-9
38
- 39 Ramponi, D. R. (2013). Proximal fifth metatarsal fractures. *Advanced Emergency Nursing*
40 *Journal*, 35(4), 287-292. doi: 10.1097/TME.0b013e3182aa057b

- 1 Saxena, A., Liu, G., Fullem, B., & Allen, M. (2012). Stress Fractures of the Foot and Ankle
2 in Athletes. In *Sports Medicine and Arthroscopic Surgery of the Foot and Ankle* (pp.
3 235-251): Springer London
4
- 5 Solan, M., & Davies, M. (2014). Nonunion of fifth metatarsal fractures. *Foot and Ankle*
6 *Clinics*, 19(3), 499-519. doi: 10.1016/j.fcl.2014.06.009
7
- 8 Sugaya, H., Mishima, H., Aoto, K., Li, M., Shimizu, Y., Yoshioka, T., Yamazaki, M.
9 (2014). Percutaneous autologous concentrated bone marrow grafting in the treatment
10 for nonunion. *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery & Traumatology*, 24(5), 671-
11 678. doi: 10.1007/s00590-013-1369-9
12
- 13 Thomas, J. L., & Davis, B. C. (2011). Treatment of Jones fracture nonunion with isolated
14 intramedullary screw fixation. *The Journal of Foot and Ankle Surgery*, 50(5), 566-568