Policy Number	**SUR705.027**
Policy Effective Date	**08/15/2025**

Subtalar Arthroereisis

Table of Contents

Related Policies (if applicable)
None

Disclaimer

Carefully check state regulations and/or the member contract.
Each benefit plan, summary plan description or contract defines which services are covered, which services are excluded, and which services are subject to dollar caps or other limitations, conditions or exclusions. Members and their providers have the responsibility for consulting the member's benefit plan, summary plan description or contract to determine if there are any exclusions or other benefit limitations applicable to this service or supply. **If there is a discrepancy between a Medical Policy and a member's benefit plan, summary plan description or contract, the benefit plan, summary plan description or contract will govern.**

Coverage

Subtalar arthroereisis **is considered experimental, investigational and/or unproven**.

Policy Guidelines

This policy does not address subtalar arthrodesis.

Description

Arthroereisis is a surgical procedure that purposely limits movement across a joint. Subtalar arthroereisis or extraosseous talotarsal stabilization is designed to correct excessive talar displacement and calcaneal eversion by reducing pronation across the subtalar joint. Extraosseous talotarsal stabilization is also being evaluated as a treatment of talotarsal joint dislocation. It is performed by placing an implant in the sinus tarsi, which is a canal located between the talus and the calcaneus.

Background

Subtalar arthroereisis has been performed for more than 50 years, with a variety of implant designs and compositions. The Maxwell-Brancheau Arthroereisis implant is the most frequently reported, although other devices such as the HyProCure, subtalar arthroereisis peg, and Kalix are also described in the medical literature. The Maxwell-Brancheau Arthroereisis implant is described as reversible and easy to insert, with the additional advantage that it does not require bone cement. In children, insertion of the Maxwell-Brancheau Arthroereisis implant may be offered as a stand-alone procedure, although children and adults often require adjunctive surgical procedures on bone and soft tissue to correct additional deformities.

Regulatory Status

A number of implants have been cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration through the 510(k) process, a sampling of which are summarized in Table 1. In general, these devices are indicated for insertion into the sinus tarsi of the foot, allowing normal subtalar joint motion while blocking excessive pronation. FDA Product Code: HWC.

Table 1. Representative Subtalar Implant Devices Cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration[a]

Device	Manufacturer	Date Cleared	510(k) Number
Subtalar MBA®	Integra LifeSciences	07/96	K960692
OsteoMed Subtalar Implant System	OsteoMed	08/03	K031155
BioPro Subtalar Implant	BioPro	09/04	K041936
HyProCure Subtalar Implant System	Graham Medical Technologies	09/04	K042030
MBA Resorb Implant	Kinetikos Medical	09/05	K051611
Metasurg Subtalar Implant	Metasurg	05/07	K070441
Subtalar Implant	Biomet Sports Medicine	07/07	K071498
Arthrex ProStop Plus Arthroereisis Subtalar Implant	Arthrex	01/08	K071456
Trilliant Surgical Subtalar Implant	Trilliant Surgical	02/11	K103183
Metasurg Subtalar Implant	Metasurg	08/11	K111265
NuGait™ Subtalar Implant System	Ascension Orthopedic	08/11	K111799
Disco Subtalar Implant	Trilliant Surgical	12/11	K111834
OsteoSpring FootJack Subtalar Implant System	OsteoSpring Medical	12/11	K112658
IFS Subtalar Implant	Internal Fixation Systems	12/11	K113399

The Life Spine Subtalar Implant System	Life Spine	06/16	K160169
Incore Subtalar System	Nextremity Solutions, Inc.	12/21	K213301
Bioplan subtalar implant	BRM Extremitites	12/22	K222820

[a] FDA 510(k) database search product code HWC.

Rationale

Medical policies assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are the length of life, quality of life, and ability to function, including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance, and quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent 1 or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. Randomized controlled trials are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

Flatfoot

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of subtalar arthroereisis in individuals who have flatfoot is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

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

Populations

The relevant population(s) of interest is individuals with flatfoot.

Flexible flatfoot is a common disorder, anatomically described as excessive pronation during weight-bearing due to anterior and medial displacement of the talus. It may be congenital, or it may be acquired in adulthood due to posterior tibial tendon dysfunction, which in turn may be

caused by trauma, overuse, inflammatory disorders, and other factors. Symptoms include dull, aching and throbbing, cramping pain, which in children may be described as growing pains. Additional symptoms include refusal to participate in athletics or walking long distances.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is subtalar arthroereisis.

Arthroereisis is a surgical procedure that limits movement across a joint. Subtalar arthroereisis (also called extraosseous talotarsal stabilization) is designed to correct excessive talar displacement and calcaneal eversion by reducing pronation across the subtalar joint. The stabilization procedure is performed by placing an implant in the sinus tarsi, which is a canal located between the talus and the calcaneus.

Comparators
Surgical approaches for painful flatfoot deformities include tendon transfers, osteotomy, and arthrodesis. Conservative treatments include orthotics or shoe modifications.

Outcomes
The outcomes of interest are symptoms, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The average length of follow-up was 18 to 24 months.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

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

Literature searches on subtalar arthroereisis have identified few published studies, primarily consisting of single-institution case series and individual case reports, reporting on success rates following this procedure. There is a small, controlled trial that has compared subtalar arthroereisis with alternative treatments.

Systematic Review
Galan-Olleros et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of children who received subtalar arthroereisis (the Calcaneo-stop procedure) for symptomatic flexible flatfoot. (1) Twenty studies were included (N=1415 patients, N=2394 feet). Mean patient age at the time of the procedure was 11.2 years. Improved pain was observed in 93.5% of patients (95% confidence interval [CI], 89 to 97.99; I^2=79%). Heel valgus correction was observed in 95.21% of patients (95% CI, 91.14 to 99.28; I^2=88%). Almost all patients (94.83%) reported high satisfaction following the procedure (I^2=2%). The overall rate of complications was 7.8%.

Metcalfe et al. (2011) published a systematic review of the literature on subtalar arthroereisis for pediatric flexible flatfoot. (2) Seventy-six case series (none controlled) or case reports were identified. Ten of the studies (756 feet) provided a clinician-based assessment of the surgical result graded from "excellent to poor" with follow-up between 36 and 240 months. Six studies (212 feet) included estimates of overall patient satisfaction using nonvalidated outcome measures, while 1 study (16 feet) found significant improvement using a validated foot-specific patient outcome measure. Data from 15 studies that reported radiographic values were combined for analysis. Although 8 of 9 radiographic parameters showed statistically significant improvements following arthroereisis procedures, the relation between radiographic and clinical outcomes is uncertain. The procedure was associated with a number of complications including sinus tarsi pain, device extrusion, and undercorrection. Complication rates ranged from 4.8% to 18.6%, with unplanned removal rates between 7.1% and 19.3% across all device types. The influence of adjunctive procedures on outcomes was not addressed in this policy review.

Nonrandomized Clinical Trial

Chong et al. (2015) reported on a small prospective nonrandomized trial that compared subtalar arthroereisis with lateral column calcaneal lengthening for the treatment of 24 painful flatfeet in children. (3) Seven children (13 feet) enrolled at a children's medical center were treated with arthroereisis and 8 children (11 feet) enrolled at another children's hospital were treated with lateral column lengthening. Children who underwent subtalar arthroereisis received a subdermal implant and were placed in below-knee walking casts for 3 weeks. Children treated with lateral column lengthening had an opening wedge osteotomy with the insertion of a wedge of cadaveric bone and were placed in non-weight-bearing casts for 1 month and "walker boots" for another month. Outcomes at a mean of 12.7 months after surgery included radiographs, foot pressure, kinematic analysis, and the Oxford Ankle-Foot Questionnaire for Children. The 2 groups showed similar improvements in the lateral talo-first metatarsal angle and talonavicular coverage and kinematics. Both groups showed statistically significant lateralization of the hindfoot and midfoot center of pressure ($p<.01$). There were no between-group differences for any clinical or functional outcomes. On within-group comparison, only the subtalar arthroereisis group had a statistically significant reduction in time on the hindfoot ($p=.01$). Both groups had improvements in the parental and child scores on the Oxford questionnaire, but only the subtalar arthroereisis group had a statistically significant improvement in this small sample. There were 2 complications in each group, with the removal of the hardware in 1 patient and removal of the implant in 2 patients. The improvement in pain and foot position was retained following implant removal.

Case Series and Reports

Silva et al. (2025) reported the results of a single-center retrospective study of 336 pediatric patients (N=644 feet) with idiopathic flexible flatfoot who received subtalar arthroereisis. (4) Mean age at implantation was 11.7 years. Implants were removed after at least 2 years or after the foot had grown by 2 sizes (mean duration, 26.8 months). Mean follow-up after the implant removal was 41.3 months. A successful outcome was achieved in 94% of patients (defined as

lack of pain, corrected foot, and patient satisfaction). Failure was observed in 35 feet (20 patients), most commonly ongoing pain (in 27 feet). Activity levels after implant removal returned to baseline but did not increase beyond baseline levels. Application of these results is limited by lack of a control group.

Graham et al. (2012) published a case series that was not confounded by adjunctive procedures and had a relatively long follow-up. (5) This study reported mean 51-month follow-up of talotarsal stabilization in 117 feet using the HyProCure device. Patients who received adjunctive procedures affecting the talotarsal joint were excluded from analysis. Adults who met the inclusion and exclusion criteria were invited to participate in the study. Eighty-three patients gave consent to participate, and 78 completed the Maryland Foot Score Questionnaire. Five patients did not complete the questionnaire because they had 7 (6%) implants removed. There were 16 revision surgeries with HyProCure. Nine of the surgeries called for the repositioning of a partially displaced device, or a change in the size of the device altogether. Of the patients who retained the device, 52% reported complete alleviation of foot pain, 69% had no limitations in their foot functional abilities, and 80% reported complete satisfaction with the appearance of their feet. This case series is notable for its assessment of functional outcomes at medium-term follow-up in patients who did not have adjunct procedures.

Moraca et al. (2025) was another case series of subtalar arthroereisis in 37 children (74 feet) with symptomatic flexible flatfeet with extended follow-up (mean follow-up, 10 years). (6) Numeric pain rating scale decreased from a mean of 2.5 to a mean of 0.9 at last follow-up ($p<.01$). Radiographic outcomes all significantly improved after the procedure compared to baseline. Implant intolerance was reported in 11 feet, which resulted in 7 devices being removed. Failure of the implant to correct the flat foot was reported in 3 feet.

Other case series have generally not excluded the use of other adjunctive treatments. For example, Vedantam et al. (1998) reported on a series of 78 children (140 feet) with neuromuscular disease who underwent subtalar arthroereisis with a subtalar arthroereisis-peg. (7) The stem of this implant is placed into the calcaneus with the collar abutting the inferior surface of the lateral aspect of the talus, thus limiting motion. All but 5 of the children had additional procedures to balance the foot. Satisfactory results were reported in 96.4% of patients, although the contribution of the subtalar arthroereisis-peg cannot be isolated. Nelson et al. (2004) reported on 37 patients (67 feet) who received a Maxwell-Brancheau Arthroereisis implant and had an average of 18.4 months of follow-up. (8) While this study reported various improvements in anatomic measurements, there were no data on improvement in symptoms. In another series, Needleman (2006) reported significant improvements in pain and function in 78% of patients (23 patients, 28 feet) with use of a subtalar implant as a component of reconstructive foot and ankle surgery. (9) However, because results were not compared with controls receiving reconstructive surgery without subtalar arthroereisis, the contribution of the implants to these outcomes is unclear. Also, Needleman (2006) reported an overall complication rate of 46%, with surgical removal of 39% of the implants due to sinus tarsi pain; and that postoperative sinus tarsi pain was unpredictable.

Cicchinelli et al. (2008) reported on radiographic outcomes in a retrospective analysis of 28 feet in 20 pediatric patients treated with subtalar arthroereisis combined with gastrocnemius recession or with subtalar arthroereisis combined with gastrocnemius recession and medial column reconstruction. (10) Lucaccini et al. (2008) analyzed clinical and radiographic results of 14 patients (16 feet) with hallux valgus in abnormal pronation syndrome treated with distal osteotomy of the first metatarsal bone and subtalar arthroereisis performed in 1 stage. (11) Scharer et al. (2010) conducted a retrospective radiographic evaluation of 39 patients (68 feet) who received the Maxwell-Brancheau Arthroereisis implant to treat painful pediatric flatfoot deformities. (12) The patients' average age at the time of surgery was 12 years (range, 6 to 16 years). Additional procedures included 12 (18%) gastrocnemius recessions, 6 (9%) Achilles tendon lengthening, and 4 (6%) Kidner procedures. At an average 24-month follow-up (range, 6 to 61 months), there were 10 (15%) complications requiring reoperation, including implant migration, undercorrection, overcorrection, and persistent pain. The implants were exchanged for a larger or a smaller implant. None of these case series permitted comparison with nonsurgical interventions or with other surgical interventions.

An example of a case series with longer follow-up is the retrospective study by Brancheau et al. (2012), which reported on a mean 36-month follow-up (range, 18 to 48 months) in 35 patients (60 feet) after use of the Maxwell-Brancheau Arthroereisis implant with adjunct procedures. (13) The patients' mean age was 14.3 years (range, 5 to 46 years). Significant changes were observed in radiographic measures (talocalcaneal angle, calcaneocuboid angle, first to second intermetatarsal angle, calcaneal inclination angle, talar declination angle). Seventeen percent of patients reported that 9 (15%) implants were removed after the initial surgery. Of the 24 (68.6%) patients who answered a subjective questionnaire (in person or by telephone at a mean of 33 months postoperatively), 95.8% reported resolution of the chief presenting complaint, and 79.2% said they were 100% satisfied with their surgical outcome. The contribution of the Maxwell-Brancheau Arthroereisis implant to these results cannot be determined by this study design.

Section Summary: Flatfoot

The evidence evaluating the use of subtalar arthroereisis for treatment of flatfoot consists of single-arm observational studies, systematic reviews of observational data, and a small nonrandomized controlled trial comparing subtalar arthroereisis with lateral column calcaneal lengthening. The small nonrandomized comparative trial (N=24 feet) is considered preliminary, and interpretation of the observational evidence is limited by the use of adjunctive procedures in addition to subtalar arthroereisis, creating difficulties in determining the extent to which each modality contributed to the outcomes, or lack of a control group. Another limitation of the published data is the lack of long-term outcomes, which is of particular importance because the procedure is often performed in growing children. Also, some studies have reported high rates of complications and implant removal.

Talotarsal Joint Dislocation

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of subtalar arthroereisis in individuals who have talotarsal joint dislocation is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

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

Populations
The relevant population of interest is individuals with talotarsal joint dislocation.

Talotarsal joint dislocation means that the joint surfaces of the talus are abnormally aligned on the heel and/or navicular bones.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is subtalar arthroereisis.

Arthroereisis is a surgical procedure that limits movement across a joint. Subtalar arthroereisis (also called extraosseous talotarsal stabilization) is designed to correct excessive talar displacement and calcaneal eversion by reducing pronation across the subtalar joint. The stabilization procedure is performed by placing an implant in the sinus tarsi, which is a canal located between the talus and the calcaneus.

Comparators
Alternative surgical approaches for talotarsal joint dislocation.

Outcomes
The outcomes of interest are symptoms, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The follow-up was up to one year.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

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

Bresnahan et al. (2013) reported on a prospective study of talotarsal stabilization using HyProCure in 46 feet of 35 patients diagnosed with recurrent and/or partial talotarsal joint dislocation. (14) No procedures besides insertion of the HyProCure device were performed to address the talotarsal joint dislocation. At 1 year postoperatively, scores on the Maryland Foot Score (on a score out of 100) for 30 patients had improved from 69.53 preoperatively to 89.17 postoperatively. Foot pain decreased by 37.0%, foot functional activities improved by 14.4%,

and foot appearance improved by 29.5%. Implants were removed from 2 feet with no unresolved complications.

Section Summary: Talotarsal Joint Dislocation

The evidence evaluating the use of subtalar arthroereisis for treatment of talotarsal joint dislocation consists of 1 prospective single-arm study of talotarsal stabilization using HyProCure. Although improvements in pain and function were observed, the current evidence on the use of subtalar arthroereisis for treatment of talotarsal joint dislocation is insufficient to draw conclusions about treatment efficacy with certitude.

Adverse Events

Complications are frequently reported in the literature. Scher et al. (2007) reported on 2 cases of extensive implant reaction in 2 children 2 years after a subtalar arthroereisis-peg procedure. (15) Due to the commonly seen complication of severe postoperative pain with failure to reconstitute the longitudinal arch on weight-bearing and a residual flatfoot deformity, the authors do not recommend subtalar arthroereisis in the treatment of painful flatfoot in children. In a radiographic study, Saxena and Nguyen (2007) evaluated a bioabsorbable subtalar arthroereisis and found poor outcomes in 3 of 6 patients who met the inclusion criteria and consented to additional imaging. (16) Two patients requested implant removal; a third patient had persistent pain but refused explantation. Radiographic measurement (magnetic resonance imaging or computed tomography) found that these 3 patients had smaller tarsal canal widths than the diameter of the inserted interference screw. The authors noted that the implant length also had to be reduced before implantation.

Cook et al. (2011) conducted a retrospective case-control study to identify factors that might contribute to failure (explantation) of titanium arthroereisis implants. (17) All patients who required removal of a self-locking wedge-type subtalar arthroereisis (n=22) were compared in a 1:2 ratio (n=44) with patients with nonexplanted arthroereisis who were treated during the same period. Subjects were matched for preoperative radiographic measurements, age, sex, presenting diagnosis, and length of follow-up. Multivariate logistic regression showed no significant effect of age, sex, implant size, shape, length of follow-up, implant position, surgeon experience, or concomitant procedures. Patients who required explantation had slightly greater odds of radiographic undercorrection (odds ratio, 1.175) or residual transverse plane-dominant deformities (odds ratio, 1.096). The percentage of explantations in this retrospective analysis was not described.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have flatfoot who receive subtalar arthroereisis, the evidence includes single-arm observational studies, systematic reviews of observational data, and a small nonrandomized controlled trial comparing subtalar arthroereisis with lateral column calcaneal lengthening. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, and quality of life. The small nonrandomized comparative trial (N=24 feet) is considered preliminary, and interpretation of the observational evidence is limited by the use of adjunctive procedures in addition to subtalar arthroereisis, creating difficulties in determining the extent to which each

modality contributed to the outcomes. Another limitation of the published data is the lack of long-term outcomes, which is of particular importance because the procedure is often performed in growing children. Also, some studies have reported high rates of complications and implant removal. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have talotarsal joint dislocation who receive subtalar arthroereisis, the evidence consists of 1 prospective single-arm study of talotarsal stabilization using HyProCure. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, and quality of life. Although improvements in pain and function were observed, the current evidence on the use of subtalar arthroereisis for treatment of talotarsal joint dislocation is insufficient to draw conclusions about treatment efficacy with certitude. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

Guidance from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2009) concluded that current evidence on the safety and efficacy of sinus tarsi implant insertion for mobile flatfoot was inadequate in quality and quantity. (18)

American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons

Piraino et al. (2020) published the following Clinical Consensus Statement on the appropriate clinical management of adult-acquired flatfoot deformity: "Subtalar arthroereisis should not be considered as a single corrective procedure for stage IIB AAFD [adult flatfoot]." (19)

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

A search of ClinicalTrials.gov in February 2025 did not identify any ongoing or unpublished trials that would likely influence this medical policy.

Coding

Procedure codes on Medical Policy documents are included **only** as a general reference tool for each policy. **They may not be all-inclusive.**

The presence or absence of procedure, service, supply, or device codes in a Medical Policy document has no relevance for determination of benefit coverage for members or reimbursement for providers. **Only the written coverage position in a Medical Policy should be used for such determinations.**

Benefit coverage determinations based on written Medical Policy coverage positions must include review of the member's benefit contract or Summary Plan Description (SPD) for defined coverage vs. non-coverage, benefit exclusions, and benefit limitations such as dollar or duration caps.

CPT Codes	28899, 0335T, 0510T, 0511T
HCPCS Codes	S2117

*Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®) ©2024 American Medical Association: Chicago, IL.

References

1. Galán-Olleros M, Del Baño Barragán L, Figueroa MJ, et al. Outcomes of the "Calcaneo-stop" procedure for treating symptomatic flexible flatfoot in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 2394 feet. Foot Ankle Surg. Oct 2024; 30(7):535-545. PMID 38714453
2. Metcalfe SA, Bowling FL, Reeves ND. Subtalar joint arthroereisis in the management of pediatric flexible flatfoot: a critical review of the literature. Foot Ankle Int. Dec 2011; 32(12):1127-1139. PMID 22381197
3. Chong DY, Macwilliams BA, Hennessey TA, et al. Prospective comparison of subtalar arthroereisis with lateral column lengthening for painful flatfeet. J Pediatr Orthop B. Jul 2015; 24(4):345-353. PMID 25856275
4. Silva S, Tavernini T, Bruschi A, et al. Calcaneo-stop for paediatric idiopathic flexible flatfoot: High functional results and return to sport in 644 feet at mid-term follow-up. J Exp Orthop. Jan 2025; 12(1):e70182. PMID 39980608
5. Graham ME, Jawrani NT, Chikka A. Extraosseous talotarsal stabilization using HyProCure® in adults: a 5-year retrospective follow-up. J Foot Ankle Surg. 2012; 51(1):23-29. PMID 22196455
6. Moraca G, Martinelli N, Bianchi A, et al. Subtalar arthroereisis with metallic implant is a safe and effective treatment for pediatric patients with symptomatic flexible flatfeet. A 10-year clinical and radiographic follow-up. Foot Ankle Surg. Jan 2025; 31(1):31-37. PMID 38972783
7. Vedantam R, Capelli AM, Schoenecker PL. Subtalar arthroereisis for the correction of planovalgus foot in children with neuromuscular disorders. J Pediatr Orthop. 1998; 18(3):294-298. PMID 9600551
8. Nelson SC, Haycock DM, Little ER. Flexible flatfoot treatment with arthroereisis: radiographic improvement and child health survey analysis. J Foot Ankle Surg. 2004; 43(3):144-155. PMID 15181430
9. Needleman RL. A surgical approach for flexible flatfeet in adults including a subtalar arthroereisis with the MBA sinus tarsi implant. Foot Ankle Int. Jan 2006; 27(1):9-18. PMID 16442023
10. Cicchinelli LD, Pascual Huerta J, García Carmona FJ, et al. Analysis of gastrocnemius recession and medial column procedures as adjuncts in arthroereisis for the correction of pediatric pes planovalgus: a radiographic retrospective study. J Foot Ankle Surg. 2008; 47(5):385-391. PMID 18725117
11. Lucaccini C, Zambianchi N, Zanotti G. Distal osteotomy of the first metatarsal bone in association with sub-talar arthroerisis, for hallux valgus correction in abnormal pronation syndrome. Chir Organi Mov. Dec 2008; 92(3):145-148. PMID 19082522
12. Scharer BM, Black BE, Sockrider N. Treatment of painful pediatric flatfoot with Maxwell-Brancheau subtalar arthroereisis implant a retrospective radiographic review. Foot Ankle Spec. Apr 2010; 3(2):67-72. PMID 20400415
13. Brancheau SP, Walker KM, Northcutt DR. An analysis of outcomes after use of the Maxwell-Brancheau Arthroereisis implant. J Foot Ankle Surg. 2012; 51(1):3-8. PMID 22196453

14. Bresnahan PJ, Chariton JT, Vedpathak A. Extraosseous talotarsal stabilization using HyProCure®: preliminary clinical outcomes of a prospective case series. J Foot Ankle Surg. 2013; 52(2):195-202. PMID 23313499
15. Scher DM, Bansal M, Handler-Matasar S, et al. Extensive implant reaction in failed subtalar joint arthroereisis: report of two cases. HSS J. Sep 2007; 3(2):177-181. PMID 18751791
16. Saxena A, Nguyen A. Preliminary radiographic findings and sizing implications on patients undergoing bioabsorbable subtalar arthroereisis. J Foot Ankle Surg. 2007; 46(3):175-180. PMID 17466243
17. Cook EA, Cook JJ, Basile P. Identifying risk factors in subtalar arthroereisis explantation: a propensity-matched analysis. J Foot Ankle Surg. 2011; 50(4):395-401. PMID 21708340
18. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Sinus Tarsi Implant Insertion for Mobile Flatfoot. [IPG305]. 2009. Available at: <https://www.nice.org.uk> (accessed March 2024).
19. Piraino JA, Theodoulou MH, Ortiz J, et al. American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons Clinical Consensus Statement: Appropriate Clinical Management of Adult-Acquired Flatfoot Deformity. J Foot Ankle Surg. 2020; 59(2):347-355. PMID 32131002

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)

The information contained in this section is for informational purposes only. HCSC makes no representation as to the accuracy of this information. It is not to be used for claims adjudication for HCSC Plans.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) does not have a national Medicare coverage position. Coverage may be subject to local carrier discretion.

A national coverage position for Medicare may have been developed since this medical policy document was written. See Medicare's National Coverage at <https://www.cms.hhs.gov>.

Policy History/Revision

Date	Description of Change
08/15/2025	Document updated with literature review. The following changes were made to Coverage: Minor language modifications without change to intent. Added references 1, 4, and 6.
01/01/2025	Document updated with literature review. Coverage unchanged. No new references added; some removed.
11/15/2023	Reviewed. No changes.
01/01/2023	Document updated with literature review. Coverage unchanged. Reference 18 added.
09/15/2021	Reviewed. No changes.
01/15/2021	Document updated with literature review. Coverage unchanged. No new references added.
08/01/2019	Reviewed. No changes.

07/15/2018	Document updated with literature review. Clarification made to Note by changing the term “pricing” to “coding”. No new references added.
07/15/2017	Reviewed. No changes.
10/01/2016	Document updated with literature review. Coverage unchanged.
03/15/2015	Document updated with literature review. Coverage unchanged.
01/01/2014	CPT/HCPCS code(s) updated
03/01/2013	Document updated with literature review. Coverage unchanged.
09/01/2010	Document updated with literature review. Coverage unchanged.
11/01/2008	CPT/HCPCS code(s) updated
09/15/2007	Revised/updated entire document
08/01/2007	Revised/updated entire document
11/15/2005	New medical document