

1 **Clinical Practice Guideline: Range of Motion Testing**

2
3 **Date of Implementation: April 19, 2012**

4
5 **Product: Specialty**

6
7
8 **GUIDELINES**

9 American Specialty Health – Specialty (ASH) considers range of motion (ROM) testing
10 medically necessary for medical conditions that impact multiple extremities and trunk
11 musculature when further testing or evaluation beyond what is included in the Evaluation
12 and Management (E/M) service or standard physical therapy, occupational therapy or
13 athletic training evaluation/re-evaluation service is required to develop a plan of care.
14 Examples include but are not limited to:

- 15 • Spinal cord injury
- 16 • Traumatic brain injury
- 17 • Neurologic conditions (e.g., multiple sclerosis, stroke)
- 18 • Movement disorders (e.g., Parkinson’s disease, cerebral palsy)

19
20 Testing must be pertinent to the plan of care and the diagnosis and a written report with
21 interpretation of the results is required.

22
23 **DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND**

24 CPT® Codes: 95851–95852 (range of motion [ROM] testing) are designated as separate
25 procedures and require the practitioner’s interpretation of the results along with a separate,
26 distinct, dated and signed written report (American Medical Association, current year). For
27 the typical patient, the E/M services for those practitioners that can report E/M services,
28 for Physical Therapy Evaluations/Re-evaluations (codes 97161-97163, 97164) and for
29 Occupational Therapy Evaluations/Re-evaluations (codes 97165-97167, 97168) include all
30 the necessary evaluation tools, including range of motion and manual muscle testing.
31 Baseline measurements may be done with an initial evaluation and are considered
32 incidental and included in the initial E/M service/evaluation/reevaluation. In addition,
33 assessments, which are separate from evaluations and re-evaluations, are included in the
34 therapy treatment services and procedures and should be coded consistent with the
35 intervention for which the assessment is necessary (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid
36 Services [CMS], 2020). The assessments should be provided by therapists or
37 physician/non-physician practitioner (NPP; i.e., physician assistants, nurse practitioners,
38 clinical nurse specialists) and include objective testing and measurement (e.g., ROM and
39 manual muscle testing) for clinical decision-making regarding the patient’s condition and
40 to determine the next step in the treatment plan. On rare occasions, it may be appropriate
41 to perform a thorough range of motion test during the course of treatment that is considered
42 separate from the evaluation/re-evaluation (CMS, 2020). Patients with complicated

1 conditions may warrant specialized tests and measures with standardized reports. For
 2 example, a patient with an incomplete C5 quadriplegia at 6 months post-injury may need
 3 specialized testing for ROM measurements to address specific deficits and goals.

4
 5 Testing should be relevant to the plan of care and the diagnosis. Every muscle or joint in
 6 the affected extremity or trunk section, as described in the code descriptor, must be tested
 7 when coding these procedures. For example:

- 8 • Code 95851 is “Range of motion measurements and report; each extremity
 9 (excluding hand) or trunk section (spine).” To use this code for extremity ROM
 10 testing, every joint of an extremity would need to be tested, with documentation of
 11 why such a thorough assessment was warranted. It would not be appropriate to
 12 submit code 95851 if only shoulder ROM needed to be tested.

13
 14 It is not reasonable or necessary for these codes to be performed on a routine basis or to be
 15 routinely used for all patients (e.g., monthly or in the place of submitting a standard re-
 16 evaluation E/M code). Use of digital devices that provide reports does not justify use of
 17 these codes.

18
 19 **CPT® Code and Documentation Requirements to Substantiate Medical Necessity**

20 These codes are typically consultative. It is expected that the administration of these tests
 21 will generate material that will be formulated into a report. That report should clearly
 22 indicate the purpose and rationale for the test, the test performed with results and how the
 23 information affects the treatment plan.

24
 25 **CPT® Codes and Descriptions**

CPT® Code	CPT® Code Description
95851	Range of motion measurements and report (separate procedure); each extremity (excluding hand) or each trunk section (spine)
95852	Range of motion measurements and report (separate procedure); hand, with or without comparison with normal side

26
 27 **EVIDENCE REVIEW**

28 Cools et al. (2014) sought to establish absolute and relative reliability for several
 29 procedures measuring the rotational shoulder ROM and strength into internal (IR) and
 30 external (ER) rotation strength. Relative reliability was determined by intraclass
 31 correlation coefficients (ICC). Absolute reliability was quantified by standard error of
 32 measurement (SEM) and minimal detectable change (MDC). Results demonstrated that
 33 reliability was good to excellent for IR and ER ROM and isometric strength measurements,
 34 regardless of patient or shoulder position or equipment used. Authors concluded that all
 35 procedures examined showed acceptable reliability for clinical use. However, patient

1 position and equipment might influence the results. Kolber and Hanney (2012) investigated
2 the intrarater reliability and concurrent validity of active shoulder mobility measurements
3 using a digital inclinometer and goniometer. Authors concluded that the results cautiously
4 support the interchangeable use of goniometry and digital inclinometer for measuring
5 shoulder mobility measurements. Although reliable, clinicians should consider the 95%
6 limits of agreement when using these instruments interchangeably as clinically significant
7 differences are likely to be present. Literature on inclinometer reliability for the lower
8 extremity is lacking. Beshara et al. (2021) systematically reviewed and appraised the
9 literature on the reliability of the Kinect, inertial sensors, smartphone applications and
10 digital inclinometers/goniometers to measure shoulder ROM. Thirty-two studies were
11 included. A total of 24 studies scored "adequate" and 2 scored "very good" for the
12 reliability standards. Only one study scored "very good" and just over half of the studies
13 (18/32) scored "adequate" for the measurement error standards. Good intra-rater reliability
14 (ICC > 0.85) and inter-rater reliability (ICC > 0.80) was demonstrated with the Kinect,
15 smartphone applications and digital inclinometers. Overall, the Kinect and ambulatory
16 sensor-based human motion tracking devices demonstrate moderate-good levels of intra-
17 and inter-rater reliability to measure shoulder ROM. Future reliability studies should focus
18 on improving study design with larger sample sizes and recommended time intervals
19 between repeated measurements. Hahn et al. (2021) aimed to determine whether
20 smartphone applications are reliable and valid to measure range of motion (ROM) in lower
21 extremity joints. Studies that reported reliability or validity of smartphone applications for
22 ROM measurements were included. Twenty-five studies were included in the review.
23 Eighteen studies examined knee ROM, whereof two apps were analyzed as having good to
24 excellent reliability and validity for knee flexion ("DrGoniometer", "Angle") and one app
25 showed good results for knee extension ("DrGoniometer"). Eight studies analyzed ankle
26 ROM. One of these apps showed good intra-rater reliability and excellent validity for
27 dorsiflexion ROM ("iHandy level"), another app showed excellent reliability and moderate
28 validity for plantarflexion ROM ("Coach's Eye"). All other apps concerning lower
29 extremity ROM had either insufficient results, lacked study quality or were no longer
30 available. Authors concluded that some apps are reliable and valid to measure ROM in the
31 knee and ankle joint. No app can be recommended for hip ROM measurement without
32 restrictions.

33
34 Elgueta-Cancino et al. (2022) assessed the validity, reliability, and responsiveness of
35 smartphone applications (apps) to measure neck ROM in people with and without neck
36 pain. Eleven studies, with a total of 376 participants were included. Three types of apps
37 were identified: clinometer apps, compass apps, and other apps of 'adequate' to 'doubtful'
38 risk of bias. A meta-analysis revealed 'good' to 'excellent' intra-rater and inter-rater
39 reliability across the three types of apps. The overall validity was rated from 'moderate' to
40 'very high' across all apps. The level of evidence was rated as 'low' to 'very low'. Authors
41 concluded that Smartphone applications showed sufficient intra-rater reliability, inter-rater
42 reliability, and validity to measure neck ROM in people with and without neck pain.

1 However, the quality of evidence and the confidence in the findings are low. High-quality
 2 research with large sample sizes is needed to further provide evidence to support the
 3 measurement properties of smartphone applications for the assessment of neck ROM.

4
 5 Note: Appropriate range of motion (ROM) testing (CPT® codes 95851- 95852), including
 6 digital wireless inclinometers or other such electronic device that measures ROM using a
 7 handheld device are integral within Evaluation/Re-evaluation codes.

9 **PRACTITIONER SCOPE AND TRAINING**

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

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

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

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

36 **References**

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

39
 40 American Occupational Therapy Association. (n.d.). Retrieved May 21, 2024, from
 41 www.aota.org

- 1 American Physical Therapy Association. (n.d.). Retrieved May 21, 2024, from
2 www.apta.org
3
- 4 Beshara P, Anderson DB, Pelletier M, Walsh WR. The Reliability of the Microsoft Kinect
5 and Ambulatory Sensor-Based Motion Tracking Devices to Measure Shoulder Range-
6 of-Motion: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sensors (Basel)*.
7 2021;21(24):8186. doi:10.3390/s21248186
8
- 9 Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Local Coverage Determination
10 (LCD): Outpatient Physical and Occupational Therapy Services (L33631). Retrieved
11 on April 15, 2024 from [https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-
12 details.aspx?LCDId=33631&ver=51&NCDId=72&ncdver=1&SearchType=Advance
13 d&CoverageSelection=Both&NCSelection=NCD%7cTA&ArticleType=Ed%7cKey
14 %7cSAD%7cFAQ&PolicyType=Final&s=---
15 %7c5%7c6%7c66%7c67%7c9%7c38%7c63%7c41%7c64%7c65%7c44&Keyword=
16 laser+procedures&KeywordLookUp=Doc&KeywordSearchType=And&kq=true&b
17 c=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&)
18
- 19 Cools AM, De Wilde L, Van Tongel A, Ceysens C, Ryckewaert R, Cambier DC.
20 Measuring shoulder external and internal rotation strength and range of motion:
21 comprehensive intra-rater and inter-rater reliability study of several testing protocols. *J
22 Shoulder Elbow Surg*. 2014;23(10):1454-1461. doi:10.1016/j.jse.2014.01.006
23
- 24 Elgueta-Cancino E, Rice K, Abichandani D, Falla D. Measurement properties of
25 smartphone applications for the measurement of neck range of motion: a systematic
26 review and meta-analyses. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2022;23(1):138.
27 doi:10.1186/s12891-022-05066-6
28
- 29 Guide to Physical Therapist Practice 4.0. Alexandria, VA: American Physical Therapy
30 Association; 2023. Retrieved on May 20, 2024 from <http://guidetoptpractice.apta.org/>.
31
- 32 Hahn S, Kröger I, Willwacher S, Augat P. Reliability and validity varies among
33 smartphone apps for range of motion measurements of the lower extremity: a
34 systematic review. *Biomed Tech (Berl)*. 2021;66(6):537-555. doi:10.1515/bmt-2021-
35 0015 Joint Commission International. (2020). Joint Commission International
36 Accreditation Standards for Hospitals (7th ed.): Joint Commission Resources
37
- 38 Kolber MJ, Hanney WJ. The reliability and concurrent validity of shoulder mobility
39 measurements using a digital inclinometer and goniometer: a technical report. *Int J
40 Sports Phys Ther*. 2012;7(3):306-313.

- 1 Schunk, C., Reed, K., & Deppeler, D. (Ed.). (2008). Clinical practice guidelines:
- 2 Examination and intervention for rehabilitation (3rd ed.). Seattle, WA: Therapeutic
- 3 Associates