

1 **Clinical Practice Guideline: Superficial Heat and Cold**

2

3 **Date of Implementation: June 16, 2016**

4

5 **Product: Specialty**

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Related Policies:
CPG 121: Passive Physiotherapy (Therapeutic) Modalities
CPG 135: Physical Therapy Medical Policy/Guidelines
CPG 155: Occupational Therapy Medical Policy/Guidelines
CPG 264: Acupuncture Services Medical Policy/Guidelines
CPG 278: Chiropractic Services Medical Policy/Guidelines

13 **Table of Contents**

14 GUIDELINES 1

15 DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND 4

16 Cryotherapy 4

17 Cryotherapy Contraindications and Precautions..... 5

18 Thermotherapy 5

19 Thermotherapy Contraindications and Precautions 7

20 EVIDENCE REVIEW 7

21 Cryotherapy and Hydrocollator Packs 7

22 Paraffin Bath.....16

23 Fluidized Therapy (Fluidotherapy).....18

24 PRACTITIONER SCOPE AND TRAINING20

25 References20

26

27 **GUIDELINES**

28 A. American Specialty Health – Specialty (ASH) considers the proper application of

29 hot or cold packs performed with other therapeutic procedures to be clinically

30 appropriate for many patients with musculoskeletal disorders who have reported

31 pain, edema, inflammation, or documented loss of mobility. The use of hot or cold

32 packs as stand-alone treatments is rarely therapeutic, and thus not required or

33 indicated as the sole treatment approach to a patient’s condition.

1 **Circulating and noncirculating cooling devices, with or without compression, used**
 2 **in the outpatient setting are considered not medically necessary.**

3 **Notes Related to the Above Guideline**

- 4 • The stand-alone application of hot or cold packs does not typically require the skills
 5 of a licensed health care professional and can be safely self-administered in
 6 accordance with provider instructions.
- 7 ○ Services which do not require the skills of a licensed health care professional
 8 are considered not medically necessary.
- 9 • Cold and heat are believed to have therapeutic benefits to modify the disease
 10 processes (e.g., cold to reduce acute inflammation and swelling, and heat to speed
 11 healing through increased blood supply).
- 12 • Typical use involves application of cold for the first few days after onset of
 13 symptoms and thereafter application of heat.
- 14 • Use of ice packs and various bandages and wraps following surgery or
 15 musculoskeletal and soft tissue injury is common. It is medically reasonable to use
 16 hot/cold therapy for any musculoskeletal disorder, in which there may be
 17 inflammation (e.g., strains, sprains, tendinitis, tenosynovitis, contusions, fractures,
 18 epicondylitis, carpal tunnel syndrome, and osteoarthritis), or post-surgery.
- 19 ○ The standard postoperative treatment for musculoskeletal surgeries consists of
 20 cryotherapy (cold therapy) and various types of compressive wraps. Both ice
 21 packs (with or without additives to maintain temperature) and cooling devices
 22 can provide cryotherapy. Circulating cooling devices are designed to provide a
 23 constant low temperature, which might provide additional benefit compared
 24 with the more variable temperature achieved with the intermittent replacement
 25 of ice packs. Noncirculating cooling devices might also allow less variable
 26 cooling due to the larger volume of ice stored in the insulated tank and the use
 27 of circulated ice water.

28
 29 C. ASH considers use of paraffin baths as medically necessary when ALL of the
 30 following criteria are met:

- 31 • Treatment of pain and/or limited mobility of the distal extremities (hands and feet)
 32 (e.g., non-acute, chronic, or post-traumatic inflammatory conditions such as
 33 arthritis); and
- 34 • Applied prior to performance of a primary therapeutic procedure designed to
 35 increase mobility which enhances the ability to perform usual activities of daily
 36 living (e.g., combined with therapeutic exercise or manual therapy for a patient who
 37 has reported pain and/or documented limited mobility); and
- 38 • Patient is free of contraindications; and

- Documentation of a reduction in the patient’s pain and/or an improved mobility and ability to perform age-appropriate usual activities of daily living within the initial stages of treatment (i.e., 3 weeks).

Notes Related to this Entire Guideline:

- General Medical Necessity Criteria from CPGs 135, 155, 264, and 278 must also be met. See policy *Physical Therapy Medical Policy/Guidelines (CPG 135 – S)*, *Occupational Therapy Medical Policy/Guidelines (CPG 155– S)*, *Acupuncture Services Medical Policy/Guidelines (CPG 264– S)*, *Chiropractic Services Medical Policy/Guidelines (CPG 278– S)* for information.
- Modalities should be selected based on the most effective and efficient means of achieving the patient’s functional goals. Seldom should a patient require more than one (1) or two (2) passive therapeutic modalities to the same body part during the therapy session. Use of more than two (2) passive therapeutic modalities on a single visit date and for a prolonged period is unusual and should be justified in the documentation for consideration of medical necessity.
- The use of modalities as stand-alone treatment is rarely therapeutic, and thus not required or indicated as the sole treatment approach to a patient’s condition. Therefore, a treatment plan should not consist solely of passive therapeutic modalities but should also include skilled therapeutic procedures [for example, chiropractic manipulation, manual therapy {CPT 97140}, therapeutic exercise, acupuncture, etc.].
- Multiple heating modalities should not be used on the same day. Exceptions are rare and usually involve musculoskeletal pathology/injuries in which both superficial and deep structures are impaired. Documentation must support the use of multiple modalities as contributing to the patient’s progress and restoration of function.
- When the symptoms that required the use of passive modalities begin to subside and function improves, the medical record should reflect the discontinuation of those modalities, so as to determine the patient’s ability to self-manage any residual symptoms. As the patient improves, the medical record should reflect a progression of the other procedures of the treatment program (therapeutic exercise, therapeutic activities, etc.). In all cases, the patient and/or caregiver should be taught aspects of self-management of his/her condition from the start of therapy.

1 **CPT® Codes and Descriptions**
 2 **(HCPCS codes for DME are not relevant to this CPG)***

CPT® Code	CPT® Code Description
97010	Application of a modality to 1 or more areas; hot or cold packs
97018	Application of a modality to 1 or more areas; paraffin bath

3 *Fluidized Therapy does not have a specific CPT® code

4 NOTE: It is not appropriate to bill for vasopneumatic device CPT® code 97016 for use of
 5 any circulating and noncirculating cooling devices with compression for purposes of
 6 superficial cold application.

7

8 **DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND**

9 **Cryotherapy**

10 Cryotherapy is the therapeutic use of cold in a superficial manner. In rehabilitation settings,
 11 it is used to control pain and inflammation, edema, reduce spasticity and to facilitate
 12 movement (Cameron, 2022). Cryotherapy influences hemodynamic, neuromuscular, and
 13 metabolic systems. Initially vasoconstriction occurs (first 15-20 minutes) followed by
 14 vasodilation if the cold is applied for longer periods of time or when the tissue temperature
 15 reaches less than 10° C. Cold application also decreases nerve conduction velocity,
 16 increases pain threshold, and may also alter muscle strength. Cryotherapy has also been
 17 shown to reduce spasticity temporarily (Cameron, 2022). Both conventional cryotherapy
 18 and the passive cooling devices are essentially designed to provide cold therapy, with the
 19 primary difference being that water recirculation is more convenient with passive cooling
 20 devices. Examples of passive cold therapy units are those devices in which fluid flows
 21 through a blanket or cuff, providing immediate cooling to an affected area. The CryoCuff®
 22 uses an insulated jug filled with cold water attached to a cuff. Elevating the jug fills and
 23 pressurizes the cuff. Compression is controlled by gravity and is proportional to the
 24 elevation of the cooler. When body heat warms the water, it is re-chilled simply by
 25 lowering the cooler. Another passive cold compression therapy unit is the Polar Care Cub
 26 unit. In contrast, active cooling devices are designed to provide a steady low temperature,
 27 which might provide a unique benefit compared to the more variable temperature achieved
 28 with ice packs or passive cooling devices. These more complicated cold therapy units may
 29 employ mechanical pumps and refrigerators that are powered by battery or electricity. The
 30 Game Ready™ Accelerated Recovery System is an example of an active cooling device
 31 that combines cold and intermittent pneumatic compression therapies. The system consists
 32 of a wrap, a connector hose, and a control unit. The wrap contains two internal chambers,
 33 one for air and the other for cooling water. The microprocessor control unit features various
 34 adjustable compression cycles and temperature controls. Another active system is the
 35 AutoChill® device, which may be used with a CryoCuff®, consists of a pump that
 36 automatically exchanges water from the cuff to the cooler, eliminating the need for manual

1 water recycling. The Hot/Ice Thermal Blanket is another circulating cooling device. It
 2 consists of 2 rubber pads connected by a rubber hose to the main cooling unit. Fluid is
 3 circulated via the hose through the thermal blankets. The temperature of the fluid is
 4 controlled by the main unit and can be either hot or cold. The HiloTherm® Clinic circulates
 5 cooled water through preshaped thermoplastic polyurethane facial masks for use after
 6 different types of facial surgery. ThermaZone® provides thermal therapy with pads
 7 specific to various joints as well as different areas of the head (front, sides, back, eyes).
 8 CTM™ 5000 and cTreatment are computer-controlled devices that provide cooling at a
 9 specific (11°C, or 52°F) and continuous temperature. However, there is no evidence that
 10 these more complicated cold therapy units provide any additional benefit over the
 11 CryoCuff or conventional ice bags or packs.

12 **Cryotherapy Contraindications and Precautions**

13 The use of cryotherapy is contraindicated for the following:

- 14 • Cold hypersensitivity
- 15 • Cold intolerance
- 16 • Cryoglobulinemia
- 17 • Paroxysmal cold hemoglobinuria
- 18 • Raynaud disease or phenomenon
- 19 • Over regenerating peripheral nerves
- 20 • Over an area with circulatory compromise or peripheral vascular disease

21 Precautions for cryotherapy include:

- 22 • Over the superficial branch of a nerve
- 23 • Over an open wound
- 24 • Hypertension
- 25 • Impaired or insufficient sensation or mentation or for pediatric patients unable to
 26 provide proper feedback for safe application.

27 **Thermotherapy**

28 Thermotherapy is the application of superficial heat. Within the rehabilitation environment,
 29 superficial heat is used to control pain, increase soft tissue extensibility and circulation,
 30 and accelerate healing. It also has hemodynamic, neuromuscular, and metabolic effects.
 31 Heat causes vasodilation with resultant increases in blood flow. Superficial heat agents do
 32 not heat to the level of most muscle tissue. Deep heating modalities such as ultrasound or
 33 diathermy are used for that purpose. Increased tissue temperature increases nerve
 34 conduction velocity and firing rates. Some studies have also found that heat will increase
 35 pain thresholds and reduce muscle strength (initial 30 minutes following heat application).
 36 Heat will also increase the metabolic rate, thus any heating agents should be avoided or
 37 used with caution in patients with acute inflammation (Cameron, 2022).
 38
 39

1 Hot packs, also known as hydrocollator packs, warm tissue by conduction. They typically
2 consist of canvas bags filled with silicon dioxide that absorbs many times its own weight
3 in water. Hot packs are immersed in a hot water bath, and are removed from the bath when
4 needed, wrapped in 6 to 8 layers of toweling or an insulating cover, and applied to the
5 patient. They are often used to heat the body part prior to rehabilitation/therapy. To avoid
6 scalding, excess water should be drained from the pack and the covering towels or pad
7 should be checked for excessive dampness. The packs cool slowly and can remain warm
8 for 30 or more minutes. Medicare considers hydrocollator units as non-covered
9 institutional equipment. Air-activated wearable heat wraps are another form of superficial
10 heat that are commercially available and can be worn for up to 8 hours. They are made of
11 cloth embedded with multiple discs made of iron powder, activated charcoal, sodium
12 chloride and water. When the wrap is removed from the plastic and exposed to oxygen, the
13 discs oxidize producing an exothermic reaction and thus heat. General indications for
14 therapeutic heat include pain, muscle spasm, contracture, tension myalgia, hematoma
15 resolution, bursitis, tenosynovitis, fibrositis, fibromyalgia, superficial thrombophlebitis,
16 and collagen vascular diseases.

17
18 A paraffin bath is a modality designed to apply heat to the hands or feet through the use of
19 paraffin wax. Paraffin baths are a device that delivers heat to a distal extremity by the use
20 of melted paraffin and mineral oil, for the purpose of treating the extremity by creating a
21 transient tissue temperature rise through heat conduction. Paraffin baths are primarily used
22 to treat contractures or loss of mobility, particularly for patients with osteoarthritis,
23 rheumatoid arthritis, hand contractures, or scleroderma. It can be used post surgically as
24 well once surgical incisions are healed. It is applied prior to performing other therapeutic
25 procedures designed to increase mobility which enhances the ability to perform usual
26 activities of daily living. The typical paraffin bath consists of a container filled with
27 approximately a 1:7 mixture of mineral oil and paraffin maintained at 52°C to 54°C. The
28 patient may either continuously immerse the treated part for 20 to 30 mins or may
29 repetitively dip and remove the treated area from the paraffin.

30
31 Fluidized therapy (fluidotherapy) is a high intensity heat modality consisting of a dry
32 whirlpool of finely divided solid particles suspended in a heated air stream, the mixture
33 having the properties of a liquid. It heats via convection. Warm air is circulated through
34 the bottom of a bed of finely divided cellulose particles in a container. The combination of
35 air flowing around the high surface area of the finely divided particles and the bulk
36 movements of solids produces high heat fluxes and uniform temperatures throughout thus
37 providing a strong massaging action, sensory stimulation, and levitation. Both temperature
38 and amount of agitation can be adjusted. Temperatures for intervention typically range
39 from 102° F to 118° F. The lower ranges are recommended for patients with edema
40 formation and are used in the initial treatments. Patients can also do exercises while they
41 are using fluidized therapy. The indications for fluidized therapy are similar to paraffin
42 baths and whirlpool. Use of fluidized therapy dry heat is an acceptable alternative to other

1 heat therapy modalities in reducing pain, edema, and muscle spasm from acute or subacute
2 traumatic or non-traumatic musculoskeletal disorders of the extremities.

4 **Thermotherapy Contraindications and Precautions**

5 The use of thermotherapy is contraindicated for the following:

- 6 • Recent or potential hemorrhage
- 7 • Thrombophlebitis
- 8 • Impaired sensation
- 9 • Impaired mentation or for pediatric patients unable to provide proper feedback for safe application.
- 10 Malignant tumor
- 11 • IR irradiation of the eyes

12
13 Precautions for use of thermotherapy include:

- 14 • Acute injury or inflammation
- 15 • Pregnancy
- 16 • Impaired circulation
- 17 • Poor thermal regulation
- 18 • Edema
- 19 • Cardiac insufficiency
- 20 • Metal in the area
- 21 • Over an open wound
- 22 • Over areas where topical counterirritants have recently been applied
- 23 • Demyelinated nerve

25 **EVIDENCE REVIEW**

26 **Cryotherapy and Hydrocollator Packs**

27 The Philadelphia Panel Practice Guidelines did not support the use of thermotherapy for
28 knee pain (Philadelphia Panel Practice Guidelines, 2001). Brosseau et al. (2003) sought to
29 determine the effectiveness of thermotherapy in the treatment of OA of the knee. The
30 outcomes of interest were relief of pain, reduction of edema, and improvement of flexion
31 or range of motion (ROM) and function. Randomized and controlled clinical trials
32 including participants with clinical or radiographical confirmation of OA of the knee; and
33 interventions using heat or cold compared to standard treatment or placebo were considered
34 for inclusion. Three randomized controlled trials, involving 179 patients, were included in
35 this review. The included trials varied in terms of design, outcomes measured, cryotherapy
36 or thermotherapy treatments and overall methodological quality. In one trial,
37 administration of 20 minutes of ice massage, 5 days per week, for 3 weeks, compared to
38 control demonstrated a clinically important benefit for knee OA on increasing quadriceps
39 strength. There was also a statistically significant improvement, but no clinical benefit in
40 improving knee flexion ROM and functional status. Another trial showed that cold packs

1 decreased knee edema. Authors concluded that ice massage compared to control had a
2 statistically beneficial effect on ROM, function and knee strength. Cold packs decreased
3 swelling. Hot packs had no beneficial effect on edema compared with placebo or cold
4 application. Ice packs did not affect pain significantly compared to control in patients with
5 OA. More well designed studies with a standardized protocol and adequate number of
6 subjects are needed to evaluate the effect of thermotherapy in the treatment of OA of the
7 knee.

8
9 A Cochrane review by Robinson et al. (2002) evaluated the effectiveness of different
10 thermotherapy applications on objective and subjective measures of disease activity in
11 patients with rheumatoid arthritis (RA). Comparative controlled studies, such as
12 randomized controlled trials, controlled clinical trials, cohort studies or case/control
13 studies, of thermotherapy compared to control or active interventions in patients with RA
14 were eligible. No language restrictions were applied. Abstracts were accepted. Seven
15 studies (n=328 subjects) met the inclusion criteria. The results of this systematic review of
16 thermotherapy for RA found that there was no significant effect of hot and ice packs
17 applications, cryotherapy and faradic baths on objective measures of disease activity
18 including joint swelling, pain, medication intake, range of motion (ROM), grip strength,
19 hand function compared to a control (no treatment) or active therapy. There is no
20 significant difference between paraffin wax and therapeutic ultrasound as well as between
21 paraffin wax and faradic bath combined to ultrasound for all the outcomes measured after
22 1, 2 or 3 week(s) of treatment. There was no difference in patient preference for all types
23 of thermotherapy. No harmful effects of thermotherapy were reported. Authors concluded
24 that superficial moist heat and cryotherapy can be used as a palliative therapy. Paraffin wax
25 baths combined with exercises can be recommended for beneficial short-term effects for
26 arthritic hands. These conclusions are limited by methodological considerations such as
27 the poor quality of trials. The Ottawa Panel Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines
28 (2004) reviewed the available literature for the effectiveness of thermotherapy for
29 rheumatoid arthritis and concluded that hot paraffin wax plus exercise was more effective
30 than a control treatment for increasing finger mobility. There were also “clinically
31 important” improvements in pain and stiffness that did not reach statistical significance,
32 suggesting the study was underpowered (n=13 per group).

33
34 In a review of the evidence for the treatment of low back pain (LBP), Chou and Huffman
35 (2007) found that superficial heat was effective in the treatment of acute LBP (good
36 evidence with moderate benefit). No evidence supported its use for chronic LBP. In another
37 Cochrane Collaboration systematic review (French et al., 2006), superficial heat or cold
38 was assessed for its effectiveness in treating LBP. Nine trials were included in this review.
39 Authors concluded that the available evidence is limited to support the use of ice or heat
40 for LBP. Some studies did report that over-the-counter heat wraps significantly reduced
41 pain over the short-term. In a review by Poitras and Brosseau (2008), no studies were found
42 eligible to support or refute the use of hot, cold, or ice packs for chronic LBP.

1 Graham et al. (2013) completed a systematic review on physical modalities for acute to
2 chronic neck pain. Of 103 reviews eligible, 20 were included and 83 were excluded. No
3 benefit was noted for infrared light over placebo for whiplash associated disorder (WAD),
4 Moderate evidence of no benefit: infrared light was no better than placebo for acute
5 whiplash associated disorder, chronic myofascial neck pain or subacute to chronic neck
6 pain. No added benefit was noted when hot packs were combined with mobilization,
7 manipulation, or electrical muscle stimulation for chronic neck pain. Improved design and
8 long term follow up were suggested for future research.

9
10 Raynor et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis of studies investigating the use of
11 cryotherapy following anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) reconstruction. The authors
12 identified six studies that met criteria and that were included in the analysis. They
13 concluded that, while some individual studies did find significant impact on pain, drainage,
14 or range of motion (ROM), the pooled analysis did not when controlling for data quality.
15 In addition, the studies included in the analysis involved mostly small study populations
16 and multiple groups, diluting the power of the findings. A study addressing the use of a
17 passive cooling device was published in 2015 by Yu and colleagues investigated the effect
18 of cryotherapy after elbow arthrolysis on elbow pain, blood loss, analgesic consumption,
19 range of motion, and long-term elbow function. Patients were randomly assigned into a
20 cryotherapy group ($n=31$, cryotherapy plus standard care) or a control group ($n=28$,
21 standard care). For postoperative days 1 through 7, visual analog scale scores of pain both
22 at rest and in motion indicated significantly better pain control in the cryotherapy group
23 ($p<0.05$). There were no significant differences between the 2 groups in VAS scores at 2
24 weeks and 3 months after surgery. Less medication was consumed by the cryotherapy
25 group than the control group for pain relief ($P<.01$). Authors concluded that cryotherapy
26 was effective in relieving pain and reducing analgesic consumption for patients received
27 elbow arthrolysis and that the application of cryotherapy will not affect blood loss, ROM,
28 or elbow function.

29
30 Ruffilli et al. (2015) compared two homogeneous groups of patients, one receiving
31 traditional icing regimen and the other a temperature-controlled continuous cold flow
32 device, in post-operative setting after ACL reconstruction. The Hilotherm group resulted
33 in lower pain perception (NRS), blood loss, knee volume increase at the patellar apex and
34 10 cm proximal to the superior patellar pole, and higher range of motion ($p < 0.05$) in the
35 first post-operative day. No difference in pain killers' consumption was noted. Authors
36 concluded that the Hilotherm group showed significant better results in first post-operative
37 day. Further studies with higher number of patients and longer follow-up are required to
38 assess the beneficial effects on rehabilitation and the cost-effectiveness of the routinely use
39 of this device. Kraeutler et al. (2015) compared the effect of compressive cryotherapy (CC)
40 vs. ice on postoperative pain in patients undergoing shoulder arthroscopy for rotator cuff
41 repair or subacromial decompression. A commercial device was used for postoperative CC.
42 A standard ice wrap (IW) was used for postoperative cryotherapy alone. Forty-six patients

1 completed the study and were available for analysis; 25 patients were randomized to CC
2 and 21 patients were randomized to standard IW. No significant differences were found in
3 average pain, worst pain, or morphine equivalent dosage on any day. Authors concluded
4 that there does not appear to be a significant benefit to use of CC over standard IW in
5 patients undergoing shoulder arthroscopy for rotator cuff repair or subacromial
6 decompression. Further study is needed to determine if CC devices are a cost-effective
7 option for postoperative pain management in this population of patients.
8

9 Ruffilli et al. (2017) completed a similar study on patients with total knee arthroplasty
10 (TKA). The study was a prospective randomized controlled study, involving 50 patients
11 after primary TKA. The two groups were homogenous for preoperative and intraoperative
12 features. The groups showed no statistically significant differences in all the evaluated
13 parameters. Results demonstrated that continuous cold flow device in the acute
14 postoperative setting after TKA did not show superiority in reducing edema, pain, and
15 blood loss, compared with traditional icing regimen. Thus, due to the costs, it should be
16 reserved to selected cases. Gatewood et al. (2017) investigated the efficacy of device
17 modalities used following arthroscopic knee surgery. Twenty-five studies were included in
18 this systematic review, nineteen of which found a significant difference in outcomes. For
19 alleviating pain and decreasing narcotic consumption following arthroscopic knee surgery,
20 cryocompression devices are more effective than traditional icing alone, though not more
21 than compression alone. CPM does not affect post-operative outcomes. Authors concluded
22 that cryotherapy is recommended for inclusion into rehabilitation protocols following
23 arthroscopic knee surgery to assist with pain relief, recovery of muscle strength and knee
24 function, which are all essential to accelerate recovery.
25

26 Despite limited understanding of the response to heat, cold, or contrast modalities in the
27 management of knee OA, the application of superficial heat or cold is very common, often
28 self-initiated, and is considered a component of a “first-line” intervention in the
29 management of knee pain in older adults. Porcheret et al. (2007) reported that of 201 older
30 patients with knee pain surveyed, 84% reported applying superficial heat or cold, and most
31 reported this treatment as a self-initiated intervention. Additionally, Cetin et al. (2008)
32 reported that the use of superficial heat or cold in conjunction with diathermy, TENS or
33 ultrasound led to varying levels of symptom relief and functional improvements in patients
34 with knee OA. Denegar et al. (2010) assessed preferences for, and effects of, 5 days of
35 twice daily superficial heat, cold, or contrast therapy applied with a commercially available
36 system permitting the circulation of water through a wrap-around garment, use of an
37 electric heating pad, or rest for patients with level II-IV osteoarthritis (OA) of the knee.
38 Treatment with the device set to warm was preferred by 48% of subjects. Near equal
39 preferences were observed for cold (24%) and contrast (24%). Pain reduction and
40 improvements in KOOS subscale measures were demonstrated for each treatment but
41 responses were ($P < 0.05$) greater with preferred treatments. Most patients preferred
42 treatment with the water circulating garment system over a heating pad. Authors

1 recommend that when superficial heat or cold is considered in the management of knee
 2 OA that patients experiment to identify the intervention that offers them the greatest relief
 3 and that contrast is a treatment option. In summary, the available scientific literature is
 4 insufficient to document that the use of passive cooling systems is associated with a greater
 5 likelihood of incremental benefit compared to standard ice packs. Many of the published
 6 randomized studies failed to include the relevant control group of standard ice packs.
 7 Studies that did include a control group of standard ice packs reported inconsistent results
 8 (Healy et al., 1994), and some studies reported no significant benefit of passive cooling
 9 devices compared to no cold therapy (Edwards et al., 1996). Several studies support the
 10 use of heat wraps for improvement of mobility and pain (Bellew et al., 2016).

11
 12 Essentially, the evidence does not support the isolated use of hot packs, infrared light, for
 13 non-specific neck pain. There is moderate evidence to support the use of superficial heat
 14 for temporary reduction of pain and disability in the treatment of acute and sub-acute LBP.
 15 Although there were some adverse events reported, the literature precludes reliable and
 16 valid estimates of the risk of major and minor harm associated with these modalities.
 17 According to the AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness publication on Non-Invasive
 18 Treatments for Low Back Pain (2016), the following key points were reported for
 19 superficial heat and cold:

- 20 • For acute or subacute low back pain, a systematic review found a heat wrap more
 21 effective than placebo for pain relief at 5 days. Two subsequent trials also found a
 22 heat wrap associated with decreased pain intensity at 3 to 4 days or increased pain
 23 relief at 8 hours. Another trial found a heat wrap during emergency transport
 24 associated with substantially lower pain intensity versus an unheated blanket upon
 25 arrival to the hospital.
- 26 • For acute low back pain, one higher-quality trial found heat plus exercise associated
 27 with greater pain relief at day seven and on the RDQ versus exercise without heat.
- 28 • One fair-quality trial found heat plus an NSAID associated with better pain scores
 29 versus an NSAID without heat at day 15, based on the McGill Pain Questionnaire.
- 30 • For acute or subacute low back pain, a systematic review included one trial that
 31 found heat more effective for pain relief than acetaminophen or ibuprofen after 1
 32 to 2 days of treatment; the heat wrap was also associated with greater improvement
 33 on the RDQ respectively.
- 34 • For acute low back pain, a systematic review included one trial that found no clear
 35 differences between heat versus exercise in pain relief or function.
- 36 • No study compared superficial cold versus placebo or no cold treatment.
- 37 • For acute low back pain, one small trial with methodological shortcomings found
 38 cold plus naproxen associated with better pain scores versus naproxen alone, based
 39 on the McGill Pain Questionnaire.
- 40 • There was insufficient evidence from three trials to determine effects of heat versus
 41 cold, due to methodological limitations and imprecision.

- Heat was not associated with increased risk of skin flushing versus no heat or placebo in two trials; no serious adverse events were reported with use of heat.

According to the 2017 American College of Physicians (ACP) clinical practice guideline on noninvasive treatments for acute, subacute, and chronic low back pain, Moderate-quality evidence showed that a heat wrap moderately improved pain relief (at 5 days) and disability (at 4 days) compared with placebo. Low quality evidence showed that a combination of heat plus exercise provided greater pain relief and improved Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire (RDQ) scores at 7 days compared with exercise alone in patients with acute pain. Low-quality evidence showed that a heat wrap provided more effective pain relief and improved RDQ scores compared with acetaminophen or ibuprofen after 1 to 2 days. Low-quality evidence showed no clear differences between a heat wrap and exercise in pain relief or function. Superficial heat is supported as a second-line or adjunctive treatment option for acute low back pain of less than 6 weeks in duration (Foster et al., 2018).

Szekeres et al. (2018) investigated the immediate effects of using a moist hot pack (MHP) vs therapeutic whirlpool bath (WB) for improving wrist ROM during a therapy session for patients with distal radius fracture. About 60 adult patients, with a mean age of 54 years in the MHP group and 53 years in the WB group, with healed distal radius fracture were randomized into 2 groups of 30. Patients in group 1 were placed in an MHP for 15 minutes during therapy. Patients in group 2 had their arm placed in a WB and were asked to perform active wrist ROM exercises for the same period. This occurred for 3 consecutive therapy visits, with wrist and forearm ROM being measured before and after heat during each visit. Both WB and MHP improved wrist ROM during therapy sessions in this study, making both these acceptable options for clinical use when the goal is to precondition a patient for other treatments. Authors concluded that individuals who received WB showed a statistically greater increase in wrist ROM than those receiving MHP during a therapy session, although the difference between groups may or may not be clinically important considering the small changes in ROM observed in this study.

Freiwald et al. (2018) studied the effects of supplemental heat therapy in multimodal treated chronic low back pain patients on strength and flexibility. Within a multimodal treatment concept, 176 patients with chronic low back pain were treated either with or without supplemental heat wrap therapy. The range of movement and strength parameters of the trunk in flexion, extension, lateral flexion and rotation were measured before and after 12 weeks of treatment. The range of movement as well as strength parameters of the trunk improved on average within the multimodal treatment. Patients receiving additional thermotherapy supplemental to basic multimodal treatment showed a further improvement of strength parameters regarding extension, rotation to the right and rotation to the left in comparison to those conducting only the multimodal treatment. No group differences were detected in flexibility. Authors concluded that the implementation of thermotherapy for

1 several hours a day (heat wrap therapy) in daily clinical practice in addition to an
2 individualized, evidence-based multimodal treatment concept can be recommended to
3 enhance strength parameters.

4
5 Kwiecien and McHugh (2021) authored a paper on cryotherapy. Traditionally, ice is used
6 in the treatment of musculoskeletal injury while cold water immersion or whole-body
7 cryotherapy is used for recovery from exercise. In humans, the primary benefit of
8 traditional cryotherapy is reduced pain following injury or soreness following exercise.
9 Cryotherapy-induced reductions in metabolism, inflammation, and tissue damage have
10 been demonstrated in animal models of muscle injury; however, comparable evidence in
11 humans is lacking. This absence is likely due to the inadequate duration of application of
12 traditional cryotherapy modalities. Traditional cryotherapy application must be repeated to
13 overcome this limitation. Recently, the novel application of cooling with 15° C phase
14 change material (PCM), has been administered for 3-6 h with success following exercise.
15 Although evidence suggests that chronic use of cryotherapy during resistance training
16 blunts the anabolic training effect, recovery using PCM does not compromise acute
17 adaptation. Therefore, following exercise, cryotherapy is indicated when rapid recovery is
18 required between exercise bouts, as opposed to after routine training. Ultimately, the
19 effectiveness of cryotherapy as a recovery modality is dependent upon its ability to
20 maintain a reduction in muscle temperature and on the timing of treatment with respect to
21 when the injury occurred, or the exercise ceased. Therefore, according to authors, to limit
22 the proliferation of secondary tissue damage that occurs in the hours after an injury or a
23 strenuous exercise bout, it is imperative that cryotherapy be applied in abundance within
24 the first few hours of structural damage.

25
26 Miranda et al. (2021) investigated the effectiveness of cryotherapy on pain intensity,
27 swelling, range of motion, function, and recurrence in acute ankle sprain. Only 2 RCTs
28 with high risk of bias were included. Both evaluated the additional effects of cryotherapy,
29 comparing cryotherapy combined with other intervention versus other intervention stand-
30 alone. Uncertain evidence shows that cryotherapy does not enhance effects of other
31 intervention on swelling, pain intensity and range of motion. Authors concluded that
32 current literature lacks evidence supporting the use of cryotherapy on management of acute
33 ankle sprain. There is an urgent call for larger high-quality randomized controlled trials.

34
35 Klintberg and Larsson (2021) evaluated the certainty of evidence for the use of cryotherapy
36 in patients with musculoskeletal disorders. Eight SRs and 50 RCTs from a total of 6,027
37 (+839) were included. In total 34 studies evaluated cryotherapy in surgical procedures, 12
38 evaluated cryotherapy use in acute pain or injury and twelve studies evaluated cryotherapy
39 in long-term pain and dysfunction. The certainty of evidence is moderate (GRADE III)
40 after surgical procedures to reduce pain, improve ROM, for patient satisfaction and few
41 adverse events are reported. Cryotherapy in acute pain and injury or long-term pain and
42 dysfunction show positive effects but have a higher number of outcomes with low certainty

1 of evidence (GRADE II). Authors concluded that cryotherapy may safely be used in
2 musculoskeletal injuries and dysfunctions. It is well tolerated by patients. More advanced
3 forms of cryotherapy may accentuate the effect. Future research is needed where timing,
4 temperature for cooling, dose (time) and frequency are evaluated.

5
6 Mendes et al. (2022) analyzed the effect of cryotherapy on pain intensity in the immediate
7 post-operative period of ACL reconstruction. Fifteen studies were included in this review.
8 Authors concluded that cryotherapy is effective in reducing pain intensity because there
9 were reductions in the scores of subjective pain scales in the immediate post-operative
10 period of ACL reconstruction. Cryo-compression was shown to be superior to conventional
11 cryotherapy. Glatke et al. (2022) evaluated the efficacy of various rehabilitative modalities
12 for ACL reconstruction. A total of 824 articles from 2012 to 2020 were identified using
13 multiple search engines. Fifty Level-I or II studies met inclusion criteria and were
14 evaluated. Authors note that cryotherapy is an effective analgesic when used
15 perioperatively. Ruiz-Sánchez et al. (2022) reviewed the current clinical practice
16 guidelines on management and treatment of ankle sprains, assess their quality, analyze the
17 levels of evidence, and summarize the grades of recommendation. Seven clinical practice
18 guides were included in this review. Seventeen recommendations were extracted and
19 summarized. Six of the recommendations analyzed present enough evidence to be applied
20 in clinical practice and are highly recommended for ankle sprain management: Ottawa
21 rules, manual therapy, cryotherapy, functional supports, early ambulation, short term
22 NSAIDs and rehabilitation.

23
24 Aggarwal et al. (2023) evaluated the effect of cryotherapy in the acute phase after total
25 knee replacement (TKR) (within 48 hours after surgery) on blood loss, pain, transfusion
26 rate, range of motion, knee function, adverse events, and withdrawals due to adverse
27 events. Randomized controlled trials or controlled clinical trials comparing cryotherapy
28 with or without other treatments (such as compression, regional nerve block or continuous
29 passive motion) to no treatment, or the other treatment alone, following TKR for
30 osteoarthritis were included. Major outcomes were blood loss, pain, transfusion rate, knee
31 range of motion, knee function, total adverse events, and withdrawals from adverse events.
32 Minor outcomes were analgesia use, knee swelling, length of stay, quality of life, activity
33 level and participant-reported global assessment of success. Twenty-two (20 randomized
34 trials and 2 controlled clinical trials) trials met inclusion criteria, with 1,839 total
35 participants. The mean ages reflected the TKR population, ranging from 64 to 74 years.
36 Cryotherapy with compression was compared to no treatment in 4 studies, and to
37 compression alone in 9 studies. Cryotherapy without compression was compared to no
38 treatment in eight studies. One study compared cryotherapy without compression to control
39 with compression alone. All control interventions in the primary analysis were combined.
40 Certainty of evidence was low for blood loss (downgraded for bias and inconsistency), pain
41 (downgraded twice for bias) and range of motion (downgraded for bias and indirectness).
42 It was very low for transfusion rate (downgraded for bias, inconsistency, and imprecision),

1 function (downgraded twice for bias and once for inconsistency), total adverse events
2 (downgraded for bias, indirectness, and imprecision) and withdrawals from adverse events
3 (downgraded for bias, indirectness, and imprecision). The nature of cryotherapy made
4 blinding difficult, and most studies had a high risk of performance and detection bias. Low-
5 certainty evidence from 12 trials (956 participants) shows that cryotherapy may reduce
6 blood loss at one to 13 days after surgery. Blood loss was 825 mL with no cryotherapy and
7 561 mL with cryotherapy: mean difference (MD) 264 mL less. Low-certainty evidence
8 from six trials (530 participants) shows that cryotherapy may slightly improve pain at 48
9 hours on a 0- to 10-point visual analogue scale (lower scores indicate less pain). Pain was
10 4.8 points with no cryotherapy and 3.16 points with cryotherapy: MD 1.6 points lower.
11 Authors were uncertain whether cryotherapy improves transfusion rate at zero to 13 days
12 after surgery. The transfusion rate was 37% with no cryotherapy and 79% with cryotherapy
13 (risk ratio (RR) 2.13; 2 trials, 91 participants; very low-certainty evidence). Low-certainty
14 evidence from three trials (174 participants) indicates cryotherapy may improve range of
15 motion at discharge: it was 62.9 degrees with no cryotherapy and 71.2 degrees with
16 cryotherapy: MD 8.3 degrees greater. Authors were uncertain whether cryotherapy
17 improves function two weeks after surgery. Function was 75.4 points on the 0- to 100-point
18 Dutch Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Arthritis Index (WOMAC) scale (lower
19 score indicates worse function) in the control group and 88.6 points with cryotherapy (MD
20 13.2 points better; 4 trials, 296 participants; very low-certainty evidence). Authors were
21 uncertain whether cryotherapy reduces total adverse events: the risk ratio was 1.30 (16
22 trials, 1,199 participants; very low-certainty evidence). Adverse events included
23 discomfort, local skin reactions, superficial infections, cold-induced injuries, and
24 thrombolytic events. They were also uncertain whether cryotherapy reduces withdrawals
25 from adverse events (RR 2.71; 19 trials, 1347 participants; very low-certainty evidence).
26 No significant benefit was found for secondary outcomes of analgesia use, length of stay,
27 activity level or quality of life. Evidence from seven studies (403 participants) showed
28 improved mid-patella swelling between two and six days after surgery (MD 7.32 mm less),
29 though not at six weeks and three months after surgery. The included studies did not assess
30 participant-reported global assessment of success. Authors concluded that the certainty of
31 evidence was low for blood loss, pain, and range of motion, and very low for transfusion
32 rate, function, total adverse events, and withdrawals from adverse events. Uncertainty
33 existed whether cryotherapy improves transfusion rate, function, total adverse events or
34 withdrawals from adverse events. They downgraded evidence for bias, indirectness,
35 imprecision and inconsistency. Hence, the potential benefits of cryotherapy on blood loss,
36 pain and range of motion may be too small to justify its use. More well-designed
37 randomized controlled trials focusing especially on clinically meaningful outcomes, such
38 as blood transfusion, and patient-reported outcomes, such as knee function, quality of life,
39 activity level and participant-reported global assessment of success, are required.

40
41 Wyatt et al. (2023) investigated the effect of various methods of cryotherapy on the
42 following: (1) pain; (2) swelling; (3) postoperative opioid use; and (4) range of motion

1 (ROM) after TKR in a systematic review. The studied outcomes included pain ratings,
2 knee/limb swelling, opioid use, and ROM. Six studies were selected for inclusion in this
3 review. Results noted that opioid use was significantly decreased in cryotherapy groups
4 compared to non-cryotherapy groups within the first postoperative week only ($P < .05$).
5 This effect may be augmented by the use of computer-assisted (temperature regulated)
6 cryotherapy devices, compared to other modalities including ice packs. Pain ratings also
7 decrease, but this decrease may not be clinically relevant. Cryotherapy appears to confer
8 no consistent benefit to ROM and swelling at any time point. Computer-assisted
9 cryotherapy may be associated with decreased opioid consumption after TKA compared to
10 traditional ice packs. Authors concluded that cryotherapy's role after TKA appears to be in
11 decreasing opioid consumption primarily in the first postoperative week. Pain ratings also
12 decrease consistently with cryotherapy use, but this decrease may not be clinically relevant.
13 Study heterogeneity requires further research focusing on optimizing cryotherapy
14 modalities within the first postoperative week, and analyzing cost associated with modern
15 outpatient postoperative TKA protocols.

16 **Paraffin Bath**

17 Chang et al. (2014) compared the efficacy of combining a wrist orthosis with either US
18 therapy or paraffin bath therapy in treating CTS patients. Twice per week, one group
19 underwent paraffin therapy, and the other group underwent ultrasound therapy. Statistical
20 analysis revealed significant improvements in symptom severity scores in both groups.
21 After adjusting for age, gender and baseline data, the analysis of covariance revealed a
22 significant difference in the functional status score between two groups. Authors concluded
23 that the combination of ultrasound therapy with a wrist orthosis may be more effective than
24 paraffin therapy with a wrist orthosis. Rashid et al. (2013) explored differences in the
25 efficacy of mobilization techniques in post-traumatic stiff ankle with and without paraffin
26 wax bath. The inclusion criteria were age range from 20-60 years, pain, loss of ROM, with
27 history of trauma and fracture of ankle. The patients with similar complaints but with
28 surgical treatment were excluded. Group A was given mobilization techniques with
29 paraffin wax bath while group B was treated without paraffin wax bath. Authors concluded
30 that joint mobilization and wax bath therapy is an effective and beneficial tool to improve
31 the symptoms and quality of life in post-traumatic stiff ankle patients. They also noted that
32 joint mobilization techniques combined with wax bath were more effective in the
33 management of post-traumatic stiff ankle as compared to wax therapy alone. Sibtain sought
34 to determine the efficacy of paraffin wax bath with mobilization techniques compared with
35 joint mobilization alone. Authors concluded paraffin wax bath with joint mobilization
36 techniques were more effective than mobilization techniques without paraffin wax bath in
37 the rehabilitation of post traumatic stiff hand. Ordahan and Karahan (2017) investigated
38 the effectiveness of paraffin therapy in patients with CTS. Seventy patients diagnosed with
39 mild or moderate CTS were randomly divided into two groups as splint treatment (during
40 the night and daytime as much as possible for 3 weeks) alone and splint (during the night
41 and day time as much as possible for 3 weeks) + paraffin treatment (five consecutive days
42

1 a week for 3 weeks). Clinical and electrophysiological assessments were performed before
2 and 3 weeks after treatment. The patients were assessed by using visual analog scale (VAS)
3 for pain, electroneuromyography (ENMG), and Boston Carpal Tunnel Syndrome
4 Questionnaire (BCTSQ). The significant improvement was found in VAS scores in both
5 groups when compared with pretreatment values ($p < 0.05$). There was no significant
6 improvement in functional capacity score ($p > 0.05$), whereas a significant improvement
7 was noted in the BCTQ symptom severity scale score in the splint group ($p < 0.05$).
8 Significant improvements were demonstrated in both scorers in the combined treatment
9 group. Similarly, significant improvements were found in the combined treatment group in
10 terms of motor and sensory distal latency, sensory amplitude, and median sensory nerve
11 velocity ($p < 0.05$). There was no significant change in electrophysiologic parameters in
12 the splint group ($p > 0.05$), and the difference in these parameters between the groups was
13 statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). In conclusion, using splinting alone in patients with CTS
14 is an effective treatment for reducing symptoms in the early stages. Paraffin treatment with
15 splint increases the recovery in functional and electrophysiological parameters.

16
17 Dellhag et al. (1992) evaluated the effects of active hand exercise and paraffin bath
18 treatment in 52 subjects with RA. Authors reported that paraffin bath treatment followed
19 by active hand exercise resulted in significant improvements of range of motion (ROM)
20 and grip function. Active hand exercise alone reduced stiffness and pain with non-resisted
21 motion and increased ROM. Paraffin bath alone had no significant effect. Robinson et al.
22 (2002) evaluated the effectiveness of different thermotherapy applications on objective and
23 subjective measures of disease activity in patients with RA. Seven studies ($n=328$ subjects)
24 met the inclusion criteria. The results of this systematic review of thermotherapy for RA
25 found that there was no significant effect of hot and ice packs applications and cryotherapy
26 on objective measures of disease activity including joint swelling, pain, medication intake,
27 range of motion (ROM), grip strength, hand function compared to a control (no treatment)
28 or active therapy. There is no significant difference between wax and therapeutic
29 ultrasound for all the outcomes measured after 1, 2 or 3 week(s) of treatment No harmful
30 effects of thermotherapy were reported. Authors conclude that superficial moist heat and
31 cryotherapy can be used as a palliative therapy. Paraffin wax baths combined with
32 exercises can be recommended for beneficial short-term effects for arthritic hands. They
33 noted that these conclusions were limited by methodological considerations such as the
34 poor quality of trials.

35
36 Dilek et al. (2013) evaluated the efficacy of paraffin bath therapy on pain, function, and
37 muscle strength in patients with hand osteoarthritis. At baseline, there were no significant
38 differences between groups in any of the parameters ($P>.05$). After treatment, the paraffin
39 group exhibited significant improvement in pain at rest and during ADL, ROM of the right
40 hand, and pain and stiffness dimensions of the outcome measures used. The control group
41 showed a significant deterioration in right hand grip and bilateral lateral pinch and right
42 chuck pinch strength, but there was no significant change in the other outcome measures.

1 When the 2 groups were compared, pain at rest, both at 3 and 12 weeks, and the number of
2 painful and tender joints at 12 weeks significantly decreased in the paraffin group. Bilateral
3 hand-grip strength and the left lateral and chuck pinch strength of the paraffin group were
4 significantly higher than the control group at 12 weeks. Authors conclude that paraffin bath
5 therapy seemed to be effective both in reducing pain and tenderness and maintaining
6 muscle strength in hand osteoarthritis and may be regarded as a beneficial short-term
7 therapy option, which is effective for a 12-week period.

8
9 Sandqvist et al. (2004) investigated the effects of treatment with paraffin bath in patients
10 with systemic sclerosis (scleroderma). In 17 patients with scleroderma one hand was
11 treated daily with paraffin bath in combination with hand exercise. The other hand was
12 treated with exercise only and was considered a control. Hand function was estimated
13 before treatment and after 1 month of treatment, concerning hand mobility and grip force,
14 and perceived pain, stiffness, and skin elasticity. At the follow-up, finger flexion and
15 extension, thumb abduction, volar flexion in the wrist, and perceived stiffness and skin
16 elasticity had improved significantly in the paraffin-treated hand compared with the
17 baseline values. In this pilot study, hand exercise in combination with paraffin bath seemed
18 to improve mobility, perceived stiffness, and skin elasticity. Mancuso and Poole (2009)
19 investigated whether the use of paraffin and active hand exercises would improve activity
20 and participation in persons with scleroderma. In this series of 3 single case studies,
21 participants used paraffin and performed active hand exercises daily for 8 weeks. All
22 participants experienced clinically significant improvements in both body
23 function/structure measurements of hand function and in their ability to participate in
24 activities. Significant improvements were found more frequently on body
25 function/structure measures than activity/participation measures. Authors reported that this
26 preliminary study lends support in favor of using paraffin and hand exercises as a treatment
27 to improve hand function related to participation in daily activities in persons with
28 scleroderma. Further research with a larger sample and increased variable control should
29 be performed.

30 **Fluidized Therapy (Fluidotherapy)**

31 Kelly et al. (2005) examined the effects of the superficial heating modality, fluidotherapy,
32 on skin temperature and on sensory nerve action potential (SNAP) conduction latency and
33 amplitude of the superficial radial nerve in healthy individuals. Results demonstrated a
34 significantly elevated superficial skin temperature, while tactile stimulation alone and no
35 treatment (control group) did not bring about a temperature change. As the superficial skin
36 temperature increased, there was an associated decrease in the distal sensory latency of the
37 superficial radial sensory nerve action potential. Authors concluded that these results
38 should be an important consideration for the clinician using superficial heating modalities.
39 Studies comparing its effective heating with that of a paraffin bath and whirlpool have
40 found them to be similar (Borrell et al., 1980). Han and Lee (2017) investigated the effect
41 of fluidotherapy on hand's dexterity and activities of daily living for stroke patients with
42

1 upper limb edema. The objective of the present study was to treat 30 stroke patients with a
2 three-week course of fluidotherapy to investigate the efficacy of such therapy for reduction
3 of edema. Authors conclude that findings suggest that using fluidotherapy can reduce
4 edema, and such a reduction can have a positive effect on activities of daily living.

5
6 Sezgin Ozcan et al. (2019) evaluated whether combining fluidotherapy to conventional
7 rehabilitation program provides additional improvements on pain severity, upper extremity
8 functions, and edema volume in patients with poststroke complex regional pain syndrome
9 (CRPS). Thirty hemiplegic patients with subacute stage CRPS type-1 of the upper
10 extremity were randomly divided into 2 groups. Both groups received a 3-week
11 conventional rehabilitation program (5 days/week, 2-4 hours/day). The experimental group
12 received 15 sessions additional fluidotherapy application to the affected upper extremity
13 (40° C, 20 minutes in continuous mode, 5 sessions/week). At the post-treatment evaluation,
14 significant improvements were revealed regarding to the edema volume, pain visual analog
15 scale, painDETECT and functional independence measure scores, and the Brunnstrom
16 stages of upper extremity and hand in both groups ($P < .05$). But among the parameters
17 mentioned above, only the decrease in edema volume and the painDETECT scores were
18 greater in fluidotherapy group than the control group ($P < .05$). Authors concluded that the
19 addition of the fluidotherapy to the conventional rehabilitation program provides better
20 improvements on neuropathic pain and edema volume in subacute stage poststroke CRPS.
21 Erdinc Gündüz et al. (2019) evaluated the efficacy of dry heat treatment (fluidotherapy) in
22 improving hand function in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. All patients were randomly
23 divided into two groups. Group 1 underwent dry heat treatment (fluidotherapy) and Group
24 2 was a control group. Patients in both groups participated in a joint protection and exercise
25 program. A total of 93 participants were allocated to Group 1 ($n = 47$) and Group 2 ($n = 46$).
26 At baseline, there were no significant differences between the groups in any parameter
27 except significantly poorer Health Assessment Questionnaire score in Group 1 ($P = 0.007$).
28 At week 3, there were no significant differences between the groups in any of the
29 parameters ($P > 0.005$). At week 12, Duruoz Hand Index scores were significantly better
30 in Group 2 ($P = 0.039$). Authors concluded that dry heat treatment (fluidotherapy) was not
31 effective in improving hand function in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Moreover, no
32 positive effect on any other clinical parameters was observed.

33
34 Kanika et al. (2023) reviewed the available literature of physiotherapy treatment for CRPS
35 following a stroke. Out of all 389 studies, only 4 RCT's were included for systematic review
36 and meta-analysis. Mirror therapy, Laser therapy and Fluidotherapy was found to be
37 effective than control in improving pain intensity and functional independence in patients
38 with CRPS following stroke. This review concluded that physiotherapy interventions in
39 the form of exercise therapy and electrotherapy has proven to be effective in treating the
40 symptoms of CRPS following stroke.

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, 2017).

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 policy *Managing Medical Emergencies (CPG 159 – S)* for information.

26
27 **REFERENCES**

28 Aggarwal A, Adie S, Harris IA, Naylor J. Cryotherapy following total knee replacement.
29 Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2023 Sep 14;9(9):CD007911

30
31 Allan R, Malone J, Alexander J, et al. Cold for centuries: a brief history of cryotherapies
32 to improve health, injury and post-exercise recovery. Eur J Appl Physiol.
33 2022;10.1007/s00421-022-04915-5

34
35 Baysal O, Altay Z, Ozcan C, Ertem K, Yologlu S, Kayhan A. Comparison of three
36 conservative treatment protocols in carpal tunnel syndrome. Int J Clin Pract.
37 2006;60(7):820-828

38
39 Bellew JW, Michlovitz SL, Nolan Jr TP. (2016). Michlovitz’s Modalities for Therapeutic
40 Intervention. (6th ed.). F.A. Davis

- 1 Bergman S. (2007). Management of musculoskeletal pain. Best practice & research.
2 Clinical rheumatology, 21(1), 153–166
3
- 4 Borrell RM, Parker R, Henley EJ, Masley D, Repinecz M. Comparison of in vivo
5 temperatures produced by hydrotherapy, paraffin wax treatment, and
6 Fluidotherapy. Phys Ther. 1980;60(10):1273-1276
7
- 8 Borrell RM, Henley EJ, Ho P, Hubbell MK. Fluidotherapy: evaluation of a new heat
9 modality. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 1977;58(2):69-71
10
- 11 Brosseau L, Yonge KA, Robinson V, et al. Thermotherapy for treatment of
12 osteoarthritis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2003;2003(4):CD004522
13
- 14 Cameron MH. (2022) Physical Agents in Rehabilitation: An Evidence-Based Approach to
15 Practice. (6th ed.) Saunders
16
- 17 Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Local Coverage Determination
18 (LCD): OUTPATIENT Physical and Occupational Therapy Services (L33631).
19 Retrieved on March 22, 2024 from [https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-
20 details.aspx?LCDId=33631&ver=51&NCDId=72&ncdver=1&SearchType=Advanc
21 ed&CoverageSelection=Both&NCSelection=NCD%7cTA&ArticleType=Ed%7cKe
22 y%7cSAD%7cFAQ&PolicyType=Final&s=---
23 %7c5%7c6%7c66%7c67%7c9%7c38%7c63%7c41%7c64%7c65%7c44&KeyWord
24 =laser+procedures&KeyWordLookUp=Doc&KeyWordSearchType=And&kq=true
25 &bc=IAAAABAAAA&](https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=33631&ver=51&NCDId=72&ncdver=1&SearchType=Advanced&CoverageSelection=Both&NCSelection=NCD%7cTA&ArticleType=Ed%7cKey%7cSAD%7cFAQ&PolicyType=Final&s=---%7c5%7c6%7c66%7c67%7c9%7c38%7c63%7c41%7c64%7c65%7c44&KeyWord=laser+procedures&KeyWordLookUp=Doc&KeyWordSearchType=And&kq=true&bc=IAAAABAAAA&)
26
27
- 28 Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Local Coverage Determination
29 (LCD): Cold Therapy (L33735). Retrieved on March 22, 2024 from
30 [https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-
33 details.aspx?LCDId=33735&ver=19&Date=&DocID=L33735&bc=iAAAAAgAAA
34 AA&](https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=33735&ver=19&Date=&DocID=L33735&bc=iAAAAAgAAA
31 details.aspx?LCDId=33735&ver=19&Date=&DocID=L33735&bc=iAAAAAgAAA
32 AA&)
35
- 34 Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Local Coverage Determination
35 (LCD): Heating Pads and Heat Lamps (L33784). Retrieved on March 22, 2024 from
36 [https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-
37 details.aspx?LCDId=33784&ContrId=389&ver=21&ContrVer=1&CntrctrSelected=
38 389*1&Cntrctr=389&DocType=2&bc=AAACAAIAAAAA&](https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=33784&ContrId=389&ver=21&ContrVer=1&CntrctrSelected=389*1&Cntrctr=389&DocType=2&bc=AAACAAIAAAAA&)
39
- 40 Cetin N, Aytar A, Atalay A, Akman MN. Comparing hot pack, short-wave diathermy,
41 ultrasound, and TENS on isokinetic strength, pain, and functional status of women

- 1 with osteoarthritic knees: a single-blind, randomized, controlled trial. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2008;87(6):443-451
2
3
- 4 Chamberlain MA, Care G, Harfield B. Physiotherapy in osteoarthrosis of the knees. A
5 controlled trial of hospital versus home exercises. *Int Rehabil Med.* 1982;4(2):101-
6 106
7
- 8 Chang YW, Hsieh SF, Horng YS, Chen HL, Lee KC, Horng YS. Comparative
9 effectiveness of ultrasound and paraffin therapy in patients with carpal tunnel
10 syndrome: a randomized trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2014;15:399. Published
11 2014 Nov 26
12
- 13 Chou R, Huffman LH; American Pain Society; American College of Physicians.
14 Nonpharmacologic therapies for acute and chronic low back pain: a review of the
15 evidence for an American Pain Society/American College of Physicians clinical
16 practice guideline [published correction appears in *Ann Intern Med.* 2008 Feb
17 5;148(3):247-8]. *Ann Intern Med.* 2007;147(7):492-504
18
- 19 Chou R, Qaseem A, Snow V, et al. Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain: a joint
20 clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians and the American
21 Pain Society [published correction appears in *Ann Intern Med.* 2008 Feb
22 5;148(3):247-8]. *Ann Intern Med.* 2007;147(7):478-491
23
- 24 Chou R, Deyo R, Friedly J, et al. *Noninvasive Treatments for Low Back Pain.* Rockville
25 (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); February 2016
26
- 27 Dellhag B, Wollersjö I, Bjelle A. Effect of active hand exercise and wax bath treatment in
28 rheumatoid arthritis patients. *Arthritis Care Res.* 1992;5(2):87-92
29
- 30 Denegar CR, Dougherty DR, Friedman JE, et al. Preferences for heat, cold, or contrast in
31 patients with knee osteoarthritis affect treatment response. *Clin Interv Aging.*
32 2010;5:199-206. Published 2010 Aug 9
33
- 34 Dilek B, Gözümlü M, Şahin E, et al. Efficacy of paraffin bath therapy in hand osteoarthritis:
35 a single-blinded randomized controlled trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*
36 2013;94(4):642-649
37
- 38 Edwards DJ, Rimmer M, Keene GC. The use of cold therapy in the postoperative
39 management of patients undergoing arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament
40 reconstruction. *Am J Sports Med.* 1996;24(2):193-195

- 1 Erdiñç Gündüz N, Erdem D, Kızıl R, et al. Is dry heat treatment (fluidotherapy) effective
2 in improving hand function in patients with rheumatoid arthritis? A randomized
3 controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil.* 2019;33(3):485-493
4
- 5 Foster NE, Anema JR, Cherkin D, et al. Prevention and treatment of low back pain:
6 evidence, challenges, and promising directions. *Lancet.* 2018;391(10137):2368-2383
7
- 8 Freiwald J, Hoppe MW, Beermann W, Krajewski J, Baumgart C. Effects of supplemental
9 heat therapy in multimodal treated chronic low back pain patients on strength and
10 flexibility. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon).* 2018 Aug;57:107-113
11
- 12 French SD, Cameron M, Walker BF, Reggars JW, Esterman AJ. Superficial heat or cold
13 for low back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2006;2006(1):CD004750. Published
14 2006 Jan 25
15
- 16 Gatewood CT, Tran AA, Dragoo JL. The efficacy of post-operative devices following knee
17 arthroscopic surgery: a systematic review. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.*
18 2017;25(2):501-516. doi:10.1007/s00167-016-4326-4
19
- 20 Gay RE, Brault JS. Evidence-informed management of chronic low back pain with traction
21 therapy. *Spine J.* 2008;8(1):234-242
22
- 23 Giombini A, Di Cesare A, Safran MR, Ciatti R, Maffulli N. Short-term effectiveness of
24 hyperthermia for supraspinatus tendinopathy in athletes: a short-term randomized
25 controlled study. *Am J Sports Med.* 2006;34(8):1247-1253
26
- 27 Glatcke KE, Tummala SV, Chhabra A. Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction
28 Recovery and Rehabilitation: A Systematic Review. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.*
29 2022;104(8):739-754
30
- 31 Graham N, Gross AR, Carlesso LC, et al. An ICON Overview on Physical Modalities for
32 Neck Pain and Associated Disorders. *Open Orthop J.* 2013;7:440-460. Published 2013
33 Sep 20
34
- 35 Grana WA. Physical agents in musculoskeletal problems: heat and cold therapy
36 modalities. *Instr Course Lect.* 1993;42:439-442
37
- 38 Gross AR, Goldsmith C, Hoving JL, et al. Conservative management of mechanical neck
39 disorders: a systematic review. *J Rheumatol.* 2007;34(5):1083-1102
40
- 41 Guzman J, Haldeman S, Carroll LJ, et al. Clinical practice implications of the Bone and
42 Joint Decade 2000-2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders: from

- 1 concepts and findings to recommendations. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2008;33(4
2 Suppl):S199-S213
- 3
- 4 Haldeman S, Carroll L, Cassidy JD, Schubert J, Nygren A; Bone and Joint Decade 2000-
5 2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders. The Bone and Joint
6 Decade 2000-2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders: executive
7 summary. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2008;33(4 Suppl):S5-S7
- 8
- 9 Han SW, Lee MS. The effect of fluidotherapy on hand dexterity and activities of daily
10 living in patients with edema on stroke. *J Phys Ther Sci*. 2017;29(12):2180-2183
- 11
- 12 Healy WL, Seidman J, Pfeifer BA, Brown DG. Cold compressive dressing after total knee
13 arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1994;(299):143-146
- 14
- 15 Hogg-Johnson S, van der Velde G, Carroll LJ, et al. The burden and determinants of neck
16 pain in the general population: results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000-2010 Task
17 Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2008;33(4
18 Suppl):S39-S51
- 19
- 20 Huang MH, Yang RC, Lee CL, Chen TW, Wang MC. Preliminary results of integrated
21 therapy for patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2005;53(6):812-820
- 22
- 23 Hurwitz EL, Carragee EJ, van der Velde G, et al. Treatment of neck pain: noninvasive
24 interventions: results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000-2010 Task Force on Neck
25 Pain and Its Associated Disorders. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2008;33(4 Suppl):S123-
26 S152
- 27
- 28 Jamtvedt G, Dahm KT, Christie A, et al. Physical therapy interventions for patients with
29 osteoarthritis of the knee: an overview of systematic reviews. *Phys Ther*.
30 2008;88(1):123-136
- 31
- 32 Joint Commission International. (2020). *Joint Commission International Accreditation*
33 *Standards for Hospitals (7th ed.)*: Joint Commission Resources
- 34
- 35 Kanika, Goyal M, Goyal K. Effectiveness of the physiotherapy interventions on complex
36 regional pain syndrome in patients with stroke: A systematic review and meta-
37 analysis. *J Bodyw Mov Ther*. 2023 Jul;35:175-181
- 38
- 39 Kelly R, Beehn C, Hansford A, Westphal KA, Halle JS, Greathouse DG. Effect of
40 fluidotherapy on superficial radial nerve conduction and skin temperature. *J Orthop*
41 *Sports Phys Ther*. 2005;35(1):16-23

- 1 Kraeutler MJ, Reynolds KA, Long C, McCarty EC. Compressive cryotherapy versus ice-
 2 a prospective, randomized study on postoperative pain in patients undergoing
 3 arthroscopic rotator cuff repair or subacromial decompression. *J Shoulder Elbow*
 4 *Surg.* 2015;24(6):854-859
- 5
- 6 Klintberg IH, Larsson ME. Shall we use cryotherapy in the treatment in surgical
 7 procedures, in acute pain or injury, or in long term pain or dysfunction? - A systematic
 8 review. *J Bodyw Mov Ther.* 2021;27:368-387
- 9
- 10 Kwiecien SY, McHugh MP. The cold truth: the role of cryotherapy in the treatment of
 11 injury and recovery from exercise. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2021;121(8):2125-2142
- 12
- 13 Lehman JF, de Lateur BJ. (1990). Therapeutic heat. *Therapeutic Heat and Cold.* Williams
 14 & Wilkins. 417-581
- 15
- 16 Mancuso T, Poole JL. The effect of paraffin and exercise on hand function in persons with
 17 scleroderma: a series of single case studies. *J Hand Ther.* 2009;22(1):71-78.
 18 doi:10.1016/j.jht.2008.06.009
- 19
- 20 McBeth J, Jones K. Epidemiology of chronic musculoskeletal pain. *Best Pract Res Clin*
 21 *Rheumatol.* 2007;21(3):403-425
- 22
- 23 Mendes IE, Ribeiro Filho JC, Lourini LC, et al. Cryotherapy in Anterior Cruciate
 24 Ligamentoplasty Pain: A Scoping Review. *Ther Hypothermia Temp Manag.*
 25 2022;12(4):183-190
- 26
- 27 Michener LA, Walsworth MK, Burnet EN. Effectiveness of rehabilitation for patients with
 28 subacromial impingement syndrome: a systematic review. *J Hand Ther.*
 29 2004;17(2):152-164
- 30
- 31 Miranda JP, Silva WT, Silva HJ, Mascarenhas RO, Oliveira VC. Effectiveness of
 32 cryotherapy on pain intensity, swelling, range of motion, function and recurrence in
 33 acute ankle sprain: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Phys Ther*
 34 *Sport.* 2021;49:243-249
- 35
- 36 O'Connor D, Marshall S, Massy-Westropp N. Non-surgical treatment (other than steroid
 37 injection) for carpal tunnel syndrome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.*
 38 2003;2003(1):CD003219
- 39
- 40 Ordahan B, Karahan AY. Efficacy of paraffin wax bath for carpal tunnel syndrome: a
 41 randomized comparative study. *Int J Biometeorol.* 2017;61(12):2175-2181

- 1 Ottawa Panel. Ottawa Panel Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines for
2 Electrotherapy and Thermotherapy Interventions in the Management of Rheumatoid
3 Arthritis in Adults. *Phys Ther.* 2004;84(11):1016-1043
4
- 5 Philadelphia Panel. Philadelphia Panel evidence-based clinical practice guidelines on
6 selected rehabilitation interventions for knee pain. *Phys Ther.* 2001;81(10):1675-1700
7
- 8 Philadelphia Panel. Philadelphia Panel evidence-based clinical practice guidelines on
9 selected rehabilitation interventions for shoulder pain. *Phys Ther.* 2001;81(10):1719-
10 1730
11
- 12 Philadelphia Panel. Philadelphia Panel evidence-based clinical practice guidelines on
13 selected rehabilitation interventions for low back pain. *Phys Ther.* 2001;81(10):1641-
14 1674
15
- 16 Porcheret M, Jordan K, Jinks C, Croft P; Primary Care Rheumatology Society. Primary
17 care treatment of knee pain--a survey in older adults. *Rheumatology (Oxford).*
18 2007;46(11):1694-1700
19
- 20 Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, McLean RM, et al. Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and
21 Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of
22 Physicians. *Ann Intern Med.* 2017;166(7):514-530
23
- 24 Rashid S, Salick K, Kashif M, Ahmad A, Sarwar K. To evaluate the efficacy of
25 Mobilization Techniques in Post-Traumatic stiff ankle with and without Paraffin Wax
26 Bath. *Pak J Med Sci.* 2013;29(6):1406-1409
27
- 28 Riddle DL, Schappert SM. Volume and characteristics of inpatient and ambulatory medical
29 care for neck pain in the United States: data from three national surveys. *Spine (Phila
30 Pa 1976).* 2007;32(1):132-141
31
- 32 Robinson V, Brosseau L, Casimiro L, et al. Thermotherapy for treating rheumatoid
33 arthritis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2002;(1):CD002826
34
- 35 Ruffilli A, Buda R, Castagnini F, et al. Temperature-controlled continuous cold flow
36 device versus traditional icing regimen following anterior cruciate ligament
37 reconstruction: a prospective randomized comparative trial. *Arch Orthop Trauma
38 Surg.* 2015;135(10):1405-1410
39
- 40 Ruffilli A, Castagnini F, Traina F, et al. Temperature-Controlled Continuous Cold Flow
41 Device after Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Randomized Controlled Trial Study. *J Knee
42 Surg.* 2017;30(7):675-681

- 1 Ruiz-Sánchez FJ, Ruiz-Muñoz M, Martín-Martín J, et al. Management and treatment of
2 ankle sprain according to clinical practice guidelines: A PRISMA systematic review.
3 *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2022;101(42):e31087
4
- 5 Sandqvist G, Akesson A, Eklund M. Evaluation of paraffin bath treatment in patients with
6 systemic sclerosis. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2004;26(16):981-987
7
- 8 Sezgin Ozcan D, Tatli HU, Polat CS, Oken O, Koseoglu BF. The Effectiveness of
9 Fluidotherapy in Poststroke Complex Regional Pain Syndrome: A Randomized
10 Controlled Study. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2019;28(6):1578-1585
11
- 12 Sibtain F, Khan A, Shakil-Ur-Rehman S. Efficacy of Paraffin Wax Bath with and without
13 Joint Mobilization Techniques in Rehabilitation of post-Traumatic stiff hand. *Pak J*
14 *Med Sci*. 2013;29(2):647-650
15
- 16 Szekeres M, MacDermid JC, Grewal R, Birmingham T. The short-term effects of hot packs
17 vs therapeutic whirlpool on active wrist range of motion for patients with distal radius
18 fracture: A randomized controlled trial. *J Hand Ther*. 2018;31(3):276-281
19
- 20 Verhagen AP, Scholten-Peeters GG, de Bie RA, Bierma-Zeinstra SM. Conservative
21 treatments for whiplash. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2004;(1):CD003338
22
- 23 Waddell G. (1998). The clinical course of low back pain. In: *The Back Pain Revolution*.
24 (pp. 103-17).Churchill Livingstone
25
- 26 Walsh DM. (1997). *TENS: Clinical Applications and Related Theory*. Churchill
27 Livingston
28
- 29 Walsh NE, Brooks P, Hazes JM, et al. Standards of care for acute and chronic
30 musculoskeletal pain: the Bone and Joint Decade (2000-2010). *Arch Phys Med*
31 *Rehabil*. 2008;89(9):1830-1845
32
- 33 Wyatt PB, Nelson CT, Cyrus JW, Goldman AH, Patel NK. The Role of Cryotherapy After
34 Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review. *J Arthroplasty*. 2023 May;38(5):950-
35 956
36
- 37 Yu SY, Chen S, Yan HD, Fan CY. Effect of cryotherapy after elbow arthrolysis: a
38 prospective, single-blinded, randomized controlled study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*.
39 2015;96(1):1-6