

Policy	MM-005
Effective Date	09/01/2024
Reviewed/Revised Date	03/09/2026
Next Review Date	03/09/2027
Origination Date	07/01/2024
Originated Department	Clinical Operations

Cognitive Rehabilitation

Audience

Providers, Members, Brokers, MHC

Purpose

Medical policies provide general support for applying Mountain Health Co-Op member policy document coverage decisions, and the member-specific benefit plan document must be referenced. The terms of the member-specific Policy document may differ from the standard benefit plan based on this medical policy. If there is a conflict between a member-specific policy document and the Mountain Health Co-Op medical policy, the document supersedes this policy. Any person(s) applying this medical policy must identify member eligibility, the member-specific policy document, and related policies or guidelines before applying this medical policy, including the existence of any state or federal guidance. Mountain Health Co-Op medical policies are designed for informational purposes only and are not an authorization, explanation of benefits, or contract. Receipt of benefits is subject to the satisfaction of all terms and conditions of the member-specific policy document coverage. Mountain Health Co-Op reserves the sole discretionary right to modify all policies and guidelines at any time.

Definition

N/A

Policy/Procedure

Cognitive rehabilitation therapy (CRT) is defined as a set of therapies designed to help improve damaged intellectual, perceptual, and behavioral skills, as opposed to sensorimotor skills or strict emotional function. This therapy is directed toward “brain-behavior” deficits, such as attention, memory and learning, affect and expression, and executive functions. The goals of cognitive rehabilitation are to enhance the patient’s

ability to process and interpret information and to facilitate their participation in family and community life while maximizing their return to their previous level of functioning. Ninety-five percent of rehabilitation facilities serving the needs of persons with brain injury provide some form of cognitive rehabilitation, including combinations of individual, group, and community-based therapies.

Mountain Health Co-Op covers cognitive rehabilitation therapy (CRT) as part of a comprehensive physical, occupational, and/or speech rehabilitation/therapy program for patients who have suffered either a cerebrovascular accident (CVA, stroke) or traumatic brain injury (TBI).

Mountain Health Co-Op Plans does NOT cover cognitive rehabilitation therapy (CRT) for any other indication as the lack of evidence to support clinical utility and statistical validity meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

1. Conditions excluded from coverage include but are not limited to:

- 1.1 Behavioral/psychiatric disorders such as addiction, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADD/ADHD), bipolar disorder, depression, schizophrenia, social phobia, substance use disorders, and autism spectrum disorders (ASD)
- 1.2 Brain tumors
- 1.3 Cancer treatment that causes "chemobrain" or "chemofog"
- 1.4 Cerebral palsy
- 1.5 Cognitive decline in multiple sclerosis (MS)
- 1.6 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)
- 1.7 Coma stimulation (aka the responsiveness program)
- 1.8 Dementia (e.g., from Alzheimer's disease, HIV infection or Parkinson's)
- 1.9 Intellectual or learning disabilities
- 1.10 Long-haul Covid "brain fog"
- 1.11 Treatment of epilepsy or seizure disorders

Mountain Health Co-Op does NOT cover eye movement analysis (EyeBOX® device) for the evaluation and management of traumatic brain injury, concussions or any other indication, as it is considered investigational.

Mountain Health Co-Op does NOT cover virtual reality (VR) therapy for rehabilitation of any acquired cognitive disorders (e.g., CVA/stroke, traumatic brain injury, and neurodegenerative diseases) or any other indications as VR therapy is considered experimental and investigational.

Clinical Rationale

2. Behavioral/Psychiatric Disorders

- 2.1 In a 2021 meta-analysis, Therond et al., looked at the use of cognitive rehabilitation therapy (CRT) as an intervention in individuals with major depressive disorder (MDD), as they often experience cognitive deficits, to demonstrate improving cognition in psychiatric disorders. They analyzed results from 8 studies to estimate the effectiveness of CRT on global cognition and on 6 cognitive domains. These

investigators also examined 3 potential moderators, namely session format (individual versus group), treatment duration, and participants' age. Cognitive rehabilitation therapy was found to improve global cognition ($g = 0.44$), verbal memory ($g = 0.60$), attention/ processing speed ($g = 0.41$), working memory ($g = 0.35$), and executive functioning ($g = 0.30$). The authors found no significant improvements for visuo-spatial memory and verbal fluency. In addition, no significant moderating effect of participant's age, session duration or session format were observed. The authors concluded that a moderate effect size and effectiveness varied between cognitive domains with the use of CRT in improving global cognition in adults with MDD. However, these conclusions were limited by a small number of studies, heterogeneity in cognitive measures, and the lack of indicators of everyday functioning. In a 2022 systematic review, Shahmoradi et al., investigated 2 new emerging treatment approaches both in virtual reality (VR) and CRT that can be used to strengthen cognitive functions in patients, both children and adults, with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). The authors identified 688 studies related to this topic and then extracted the effects of interventions on cognitive outcomes. A total of 17 studies met the inclusion criteria, in which 226 persons with ASD had taken place. The sample size in the selected studies ranged from 1 to 56 participants (median of 8, Q1: 3.5, Q3: 15.5); 4 of the studies were case-control studies, 10 were pre-test/post-test studies, and 3 were randomized control trials (RCTs). Results of 16 studies showed significant progress in various cognitive indexes, such as task learning, attention, executive functioning, and daily skills in patients with ASD. In most studies, virtual technologies had beneficial effects on reducing cognitive problems, but existing limitations could reduce their effectiveness. Limitations of this review included the cost of VR devices, inappropriate size of software, the weight of devices, potential addiction, intolerance of wearing glasses or headsets by patients with autism (especially in children), and the possibility of eye injury. Drawbacks and challenges of the review included the difficulty of comparing studies due to the heterogeneity of the results and exclusion of published studies other than English language ones. In conclusion, the authors found that applying appropriate virtual-based approaches could improve cognitive indexes in patients with ASD. However, further, more robust studies are needed to examine the long-term effects of these technologies, along with improving the challenges and drawbacks found in this review.

3. *Brain Tumors*

3.1 A 2021 study (Weyer-Jamora et al.) assessed the effectiveness of post-acute cognitive rehabilitation across the continuum of care for adult patients with a brain tumor. Most treatment focus has been on acute rehabilitation, but emerging evidence supports outpatient and post-acute settings. The cognitive impairments including processing speed, attention, memory, and executive function resulted in positive outcomes with a multidisciplinary approach to treatment. Ongoing development of cognitive screenings and planning during the medical course of care are suggested to improve cognitive rehabilitation outcomes and supported in the clinical practice of treatment of this population. In conclusion, the authors found that the multidisciplinary approach and cognitive intervention was beneficial for cognitive outcomes in patients diagnosed with a brain tumor across

programs. However, additional research is warranted to differentiate the specific outcomes resulting from cognitive rehabilitation for varying tumor grades and stages.

4. *Dementia*

4.1 A 2015 meta-analysis (Huntley et al) questioned if cognitive interventions in dementia improved general cognition. Thirty-three studies with interventions divided into categories such as cognitive training, cognitive stimulation, and cognitive rehabilitation were included. Studies classified as cognitive stimulation had a significant effect as measured on the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) and the Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive Subscale (ADAS-Cog). The authors concluded that cognitive stimulation improves scores on MMSE and ADAS-Cog in dementia, but benefits on the ADAS-Cog are generally not clinically significant and difficulties with blinding of patients and use of adequate placebo controls make comparison with the results of dementia drug treatments problematic. Therefore, more appropriate comparison studies are needed to demonstrate clinical significance. A 2019 study (Bahar-Fuchs et al.) assessed the use of CRT for people with mild to moderate dementia. Thirty-three RCTs published between 1988 and 2018 were included in this study. Most RCTs were small and single-site, with sample sizes of 20 patients or fewer in each trial arm. Participants in most trials had a mean age between 70 and 80 years, and the presumed etiology of the cognitive dysfunction was Alzheimer's dementia. Limitations of this study included lack of allocation concealment and lack of blinding of participants and personnel. In conclusion, based on low- to very-low-quality evidence, the authors found no apparent effect of CRT on any outcome, including global cognition and function, 3 to 12 months following treatment. Therefore, further studies with a longer duration of follow-up, extending beyond 12 months post-treatment, are needed. In a 2019 multicenter RCT, Clare et al., outlined results on Individual Goal-oriented Cognitive Rehabilitation to Improve Everyday Functioning for People with Early-stage Dementia (GREAT). The study compared individual goal-oriented cognitive rehabilitation to treatment as usual in individuals with early-stage dementia. Most participants were diagnosed with Alzheimer's dementia. Their mean age was 78.56 years, and their mean MMSE score was 23.82 points. The primary outcome was self-reported goal attainment at 3 months. Goals were identified using the semi-structured Bangor Goal Setting Interview (BGSi). Attainment was assessed on a 0-10 scale. Reporting included self-reported self-efficacy (Generalized Self Efficacy Scale), mood (Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale), dementia specific health related quality of life, memory (story recall from the Rivermead Behavioral Memory Test), attention (elevator counting and elevator counting with distraction subtests from the Test of Everyday Attention), or executive function (verbal letter fluency from the Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System). The authors noted that a 2-point improvement in the goal attainment rating was considered clinically significant. In conclusion, the authors found that improvement in goal attainment was significantly more substantial in the therapy group than in the control group at both 3 months and 9 months. However, no measure of functional ability was assessed, and there were no significant between-group differences on any of the secondary outcomes in 3

or 9 months. In a 2022 systematic review and meta-analysis, Kiper et al. stated that mild cognitive impairment (MCI), a neurodegenerative disease leading to Alzheimer's disease (AD) or dementia, is often associated with physical complaints. Combined physical and CRT have been employed to examine their effects on cognitive function; however, its impact on motor functions and activities of daily living (ADL) has not been explored yet. The combination of physical and cognitive training may be a valuable non-pharmacological intervention that could preserve motor function and quality of life (QOL). These authors investigated whether combined CRT is effective in enhancing motor performance in patients with MCI. A systematic electronic literature search and a meta-analysis were performed. The following criteria were compulsory for inclusion in the study: RCT design, combined CRT compared to motor training alone or no intervention, and motor outcomes as the study's endpoint. A total of 9 studies met the inclusion criteria. Results showed that CRT significantly enhanced balance compared to motor training alone (SMD 0.56; 95 % CI: 0.07 to 1.06; I² = 59 %; 160 participants), whereas a significant improvement was found for mobility in the CRT group when compared to no intervention (MD -1.80; 95 % CI: -2.70 to -0.90; I² = 0 %; 81 participants). However, there was no evidence that individuals with MCI experienced an increase in gait speed or quality of life (QOL) at the end of their practice sessions. Limitations of the report included a small number of studies (n = 5), low-quality reporting in some studies, and the fact that three studies were conducted by the same authors, which made it impossible to determine whether the populations analyzed in those studies were distinct or the same. In conclusion, the authors recommend that further investigation with larger samples and a more extended monitoring period after intervention be undertaken.

5. Cancer Treatment

5.1 A 2016 meta-analysis reported on neuropsychologic intervention for cognitive function in non-central nervous system (CNS) cancer survivors (Zeng et al). Three case-control studies and 7 RCTs with 433 patients (range, 22 to 98 patients) published between January 2010 and September 2015 were included. Most trials assessed the effects of the intervention immediately after the intervention or at short-term follow-up (≤6 months). More than half of the trials were conducted in breast cancer survivors.

5.2 Three trials assessed the effects of cognitive rehabilitation programs, and the weighted mean difference for the intervention effect at post-intervention follow-up was -0.19 (95% CI, -2.98 to 2.61). Limitations of the study included trials with small sample sizes. In conclusion, the authors found that neuropsychological interventions can improve cognitive function in non-CNS cancer survivors. However, further research is needed using larger sample sizes to confirm these findings. In a 2019 systematic review, Fernandes et al., examined cognitive rehabilitation programs in adults with non-central nervous system (CNS) cancers. It included 1,124 participants (n range, 11 to 242) from 19 studies published between 2007 and 2018, with the majority being RCTs (N=12). Waitlist was the most common comparator in the RCTs. As with the previous reviews, the authors found that most studies assessed the effects of the intervention

immediately after the intervention or at short-term follow-up (≤ 6 months), and most trials were conducted among breast cancer survivors. The authors did not find any meta-analyses that included limitations, as participants were not blinded to their group assignment. Findings across the studies were mixed. In conclusion, the authors found that among the RCTs and non-randomized controlled studies, 87% reported short-term improvements on at least one objective cognitive measure, which pertained to measurements taken immediately after the intervention. Therefore, among the longest-term trials (26-month follow-up) and largest studies ($n=242$), there were no significant effects on various objective cognitive measures. Only 63% of studies found improvements in short-term quality of life measures, and none found any improvements in functional outcomes.

5.3 In a 2019 single-center small randomized control trial ($N=46$), Akel et al., evaluated CRT in children with cancer from an inpatient treatment clinic of the Department of Pediatric Oncology at University Hospital in Ankara, Turkey. Cognitive skills targeted by the CRT included place and time orientation, internal and external spatial perception, praxis, attention, visio-motor construction, and thinking operations.

5.4 The children were characterized by a mean age of 10 years, with 55% being male. Cancer diagnoses included non-Hodgkin lymphoma (40%), Hodgkin lymphoma (30%), and bone tumors (30%). Outcomes were evaluated only immediately post-intervention. Although compared to the routine therapy groups, numerically larger effect sizes for change in fatigue and functional independence were reported for the cognitive rehabilitation group. However, it is unknown whether the differences were clinically or statistically significant as the comparative treatment effects were not calculated and clinically significant differences were not pre-specified. In conclusion, the authors found significant improvements in cognitive measures reported pre- and post-intervention in the intervention group; however, no data were reported for the routine therapy group on this outcome. In addition to these inadequate outcome assessment methods, the interpretation of these findings is limited by other methodological shortcomings, including the lack of participant blinding and the absence of long-term follow-up. Since this evidence is insufficient to draw conclusions about the effect on health outcomes, more robust studies are needed.

6. Coma Stimulation

6.1 In a 2002 systematic review, Lombardi et al. evaluated the effectiveness of sensory stimulation programs in patients in a coma or vegetative state. The Cochrane review evaluated randomized controlled trials and nonrandomized controlled clinical trials comparing any type of stimulation programs to standard rehabilitation in patients in a coma or vegetative state. Three studies, including one randomized controlled trial and two nonrandomized controlled trials, with 68 traumatic brain injured patients in total, met the inclusion criteria. The overall methodological quality was poor, and the studies differed widely in terms of study design and conduct. Also, due to the diversity in reporting of outcome measures, a quantitative meta-analysis was not possible. None of the three studies in the

Cochrane review provided useful and valid results on outcomes of clinical relevance for patients with coma. The Cochrane researchers concluded that there is no reliable evidence to support or rule out the effectiveness of multisensory programs in patients in a coma or vegetative state. The researchers further stated that the need to improve knowledge in this field, combined with the lack of effective treatments, indicates that treatment interventions based on sensory stimulation should be provided only in the context of well-designed, adequately sized, randomized controlled trials.

- 6.2** A 2006 RCT of 60 patients was performed to determine the efficacy and benefits of early stimulation therapy in pediatric patients who were in a coma due to non-traumatic neurological insult (Karma and Rawat). Patients were randomized into two groups: the study group, which received stimulation to each of the six senses five times a day for two weeks (n = 30), and the control group, which received no stimulation (n = 30). The level of consciousness was measured using the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) and AVPU (A = the child is awake and alert, or V = responds to voice, or P = responds to pain e.g., pinching or pulling frontal hair, or U = unconscious) scale prior to and after stimulation therapy. The authors reported statistically significant improvement in coma in the treatment group compared to the control group, as measured by GCS and AVPU when the stimulation started less than 15 days from the onset of coma. In conclusion, the authors found that stimulation therapy can reduce the duration of non-traumatic comas in children. However, due to the small sample size and short follow-up duration, larger studies are needed to confirm these results.
- 6.3** Li et al. (2021) conducted a literature review on the progress of sensory stimulation (SS) in enhancing coma arousal after traumatic brain injury. They included all original studies published in English with patients presenting severe disorders of consciousness due to traumatic brain injury who had received SS and whose behavioral/neural responses had been measured. The authors compared data on ten selected studies and analyzed the SS effects in comatose patient outcomes after TBI. They concluded that the literature suggests the SS program improves coma arousal after TBI. However, high-quality clinical trials are needed to establish standard SS protocols.
- 6.4** In a 2022 systematic review, Weaver et al. evaluated the effectiveness of interventions aimed at enhancing arousal and awareness in individuals with disorders of consciousness (DoC) following a traumatic brain injury (TBI). Twenty-seven studies were included and grouped thematically. The authors concluded that unimodal auditory stimulation, familiar voices telling structured stories, and transcranial direct current stimulation had a moderate level of evidence. Multimodal sensory stimulation had the strongest evidence in support of its use in clinical practice. However, further studies are needed to confirm these findings.

7. Eye Movement Assessment for TBI/Concussion

- 7.1** According to the FDA (2017), the EyeBOX® is an eye movement assessment aid which tracks patient's eye movements to provide an interpretation of the functional condition of the patient's brain. The EyeBOX is a 4-min test that was created to assist physicians in the evaluation of patients with suspected

concussions and is appropriate for individuals aged 5 to 67 years. This device is an assessment aid that is not intended for standalone detection or diagnostic purposes.

- 7.2** In a 2018 systematic review and meta-analysis, Mani et al investigated the effect that TBI has on oculomotor functions (OM) from papers that objectively measured saccades and smooth-pursuit eye movements in mild and severe TBI. The overall impact of TBI on OM functions was moderate and significant with an effect size of 0.42 from 181 OM case-control comparisons. The heterogeneity, determined using the random effect model, was found to be significant ($Q(180) = 367, p < 0.0001, I^2 = 51$) owing to the variety of OM functions (reflexive saccades, anti-saccades, memory-guided saccades, self-paced saccades and pursuits) measured and varying post-injury periods. The overall effect on OM functions were similar in mild and severe TBI despite differences in combined effect size of various OM functions. OM functions involving complex cognitive skills such as anti-saccades (in mild and severe TBI) and memory-guided saccades (in mild TBI) were the most adversely affected, suggesting that OM deficits may be associated with cognitive deficits in TBI. In conclusion, the authors found that TBI often results in long-standing OM deficits and the experimental measures of OM assessment reflect neural integrity and may provide a sensitive and objective biomarker to detect OM deficits following TBI. However, further, more robust studies are needed to demonstrate these findings. In another 2018 systematic review and meta-analysis, Snegireva et al. evaluated the evidence for the use of eye-tracking technology in assessing and monitoring sports-related concussions. A literature search was conducted for publications between January 1980 and May 2018. Included were empirical research studies in English where at least 50% of the research subjects were athletes, the subjects were individuals with a diagnosis of concussion, and eye movements were measured using an eye-tracking device. Twenty-one publications were integrated on sports-related concussion and eye-tracking technology, 9 of which qualified for the meta-analysis. Overall, the literature reported significant findings for variables in each of the 4 classes of eye-tracking measurements (movement, position, count, and latency). Meta-comparison was made for 7 variables for the acute concussions (the difference between the concussed and the control groups was significant for all of them) and 1 variable for the latent concussions (the difference was not important). The authors concluded that most saccadic and pursuit deficits may be overlooked during clinical examination; thus, eye-tracking technology may be a useful and sensitive screening and monitoring tool for sports-related concussions. The inconsistencies between the eye movement metrics and methodology still make inferences challenging; however, using tasks that are closely related to brain areas involved in executive functions (such as memory-based saccade or anti-saccade tasks) in the acute injury phase holds promise in differentiating between athletes who have a concussion compared to those who do not.
- 7.3** Yaramothu et al (2019) noted that the Vergence Endurance Test (VET), a quantitative and objective eye movement assessment, was used to differentiate control from concussed subjects. A total of 9 symptomatic concussed subjects (2 men; 30.8 ± 11 years) and 9 asymptomatic control subjects (6 men; 25.1 ± 1.4

years) participated in the VET. Symmetrical disparity vergence step targets were presented with and without visual distractors. A masked data analyst measured vergence latency, peak velocity, response amplitude, settling time, and the percentage of trials that contained blinks. A Binocular Precision Index (BPI) and a Binocular Accuracy Index (BAI) were calculated to quantify the changes in vergence parameters over the duration of the VET. Convergence and divergence peak velocity, divergence response amplitude, the percentage of trials that contained blinks during the transient A portion of the response, and the BAI, were significantly ($p < 0.05$) different between the concussed and control subjects. For these parameters, the BAI and divergence response amplitude yielded the greatest accuracy, 78%, in their ability to discriminate between the groups. The authors found that the techniques developed in this study have the potential to evaluate the effectiveness of different vision therapy and vergence rehabilitation protocols, leading to additional improvements in oculomotor function and reduced treatments required for recovery post-concussion. However, more robust studies are needed to determine whether the trends observed here generalize to a larger population. By assessing the differences between control and concussed subjects and how vergence eye movements recorded during the VET may improve after therapeutic interventions or natural recovery. In 2019, Vakil et al. evaluated the "Context-Effect" (CE), which refers to the facilitation of memory for target stimuli due to the similarity of context between the learning and testing phases. Previous studies reported that traumatic brain injury (TBI) affects memory for contextual information when tested directly. However, the indirect effect of contextual information on the memory of the target (i.e., CE) is preserved. Several studies have demonstrated that CE is composed of multiple, distinct cognitive processes. The present study included 4 context conditions to enable identification of the exact process affected by TBI. In addition, eye movements were monitored to test three hypotheses: first, that the TBI group's dwell time on target (DTOT) at encoding would be less than that of the control group. Second, that DTOT at encoding would be more highly associated with recognition at test for the control group than for the TBI group. Third, the overall DTOT at encoding for new items, as compared to old items ("repetition effect"), would be less pronounced for the TBI group compared to controls. A total of 24 patients with mild to severe traumatic brain injury (TBI) and 23 matched controls participated in this study. These researchers presented subjects with photographs of male faces wearing distinctive, trial-unique hats, yielding a specific Target-Context pairing. Eye movements were recorded throughout the test task. Memory for faces following TBI is impaired compared to that of controls. The magnitude and pattern of CE were the same for both groups. The TBI group had a lower DTOT compared to the control group. However, the relative length of DTOT in the various conditions was similar in both groups. The authors found that behavioral results indicated that, although the TBI group had impaired memory for faces, the CE pattern was similar to that of the control group. Similarly, in terms of eye movements, although the TBI group focused less on the target, relations between the various conditions were identical in both groups. However, more robust studies are needed to confirm these findings in a larger population.

7.4 In 2020, Murray et al. (2020) determined that smooth-pursuit eye movements (SPEMs) and saccadic eye movements are both commonly impaired following sport-related concussion (SRC). Typical oculomotor assessments measure individual eye movements in a series of restrictive tests designed to isolate features such as response times. These measures lack ecological validity for athletes because athletes are adept at simple tasks designed for the general population. Yet, because eye movement metrics are sensitive and well-characterized neuroanatomically, it would be valuable to examine if athletes exhibit abnormal eye movements with more challenging tasks. To address this gap in knowledge, these researchers collected eye-tracking data during a sport-like task to gain insight on gaze behavior during active self-motion. SPEMs and saccadic eye movements were recorded during a sport-like visual task within 24 to 48 hours following SRC. A total of 36 Division I student-athletes were divided into SRC and control (CON) groups. All subjects completed two blocks of the Wii Fit soccer heading game (WF) while wearing a monocular infrared eye tracker. Eye movement classification systems quantified saccadic amplitude (SA), velocity (SV), and count (SC); as well as SPEM velocity (SPV) and amplitude (SPA).

7.5 Separate Mann-Whitney U tests evaluated SPA and SC and found no significant effects (SPA, $p = 0.11$; SC, $p = 0.10$). A multivariate analysis of variance for remaining variables revealed SPV was significantly greater in CON ($p < 0.05$). However, the SRC group had greater SA and SV ($p < 0.05$). The authors concluded that to maintain foveation during a sport-like task, SRC subjects used larger amplitude and faster saccades but exhibited slower SPEMs. Furthermore, measuring oculomotor function during ecologically valid, sport-like tasks may serve as a concussion biomarker and provide insights into eye movement control following SRC. However, this is one of the first studies to provide evidence of abnormal SPEMs and saccades during a sport-line task. Therefore, further research is necessary to confirm these findings through larger studies. In another 2020 study, Horan et al) reviewed technological advances to provide an opportunity to refine tools that examine CNS performance. These researchers examined the test-retest reliability and convergent and ecological validity of a newly developed, virtual-reality, concussion assessment tool, "CONVIRT", which uses eye-tracking technology to examine visual processing speed and manual reaction time (pushing a button on a riding crop) to evaluate attention and decision-making. Subjects ($n = 165$), were evaluated with CONVIRT, which uses virtual reality to give the user the experience of riding a horse during a horse race. Subjects were also assessed with standard Cogstate computer-based concussion measures in-between 2 completions of the CONVIRT battery. The physiological arousal induced by the test batteries was assessed via measures of heart rate (HR) and HR variability (low-frequency (LF) to high-frequency (HF) ratio). Satisfactory test-retest reliability and convergent validity were observed with Cogstate attention and decision-making subtests, as well as divergent validity in visual processing speed measures. CONVIRT also increased HR and LF/HF ratio, which may better approximate subject arousal levels in their workplace. The authors concluded that CONVIRT may be a reliable and valid tool to examine elements of cognition and CNS disruption. The increased ecological validity may

also mean better-informed "return-to-play" decisions and stronger industry acceptance due to the real-world meaningfulness of the assessment. However, more robust studies are needed to demonstrate the sensitivity of the CONVIRT tool and its battery before efficacy can be determined. Finally, a 2020 UpToDate review on "Sideline evaluation of concussion" states that several tools are being developed to assist with the evaluation of athletes with a possible concussion. The King-Devick test consists of printed cards with numbers that the athlete reads to assess saccadic eye movements. According to a 2017 systematic review of critical elements of sideline screening, this test shows promise in small studies as a possible sideline assessment tool. Head impact sensors (such as helmet sensors, mouthguard sensors, headband sensors, or sensors directly applied to the skin) have not been shown to provide useful information to sideline evaluators regarding concussions. Some institutions are developing applications for smartphones and handheld devices to assess concussions on the field. Further study is needed before recommendations can be made about adopting such tools for sideline evaluation".

8. Long-haul Covid "Brain Fog"

8.1 In a retrospective, single-center, chart review, Olezena et al (2021) examined the functional impairments of a cohort of patients undergoing inpatient rehabilitation after surviving severe COVID-19 illness to better understand the ongoing needs of this patient population. This study consisted of consecutive patients hospitalized for COVID-19 and admitted to a regional inpatient rehabilitation hospital from April 29 to May 22, 2020. Patient demographics, clinical characteristics and complications from acute hospitalization were examined. Measures of fall risk (Berg Balance Scale), endurance (6 Minute Walk Test [6MWT]), gait speed (10 Meter Walk Test [10MWT]), mobility (transfer and ambulation independence), cognition, speech and swallowing (American Speech and Hearing Association National Outcomes Measurement System Functional Communication Measures) were evaluated at rehabilitation admission and discharge. The study population consisted of 29 patients (70% men, 58.6% white, with a mean age of 59.5 years). The mean length of acute hospitalization was 32.2 days with a mean of 18.7 days intubated. Patients spent a mean of 16.7 days in inpatient rehabilitation, and 90 % were discharged home. Patients demonstrated significant improvement from admission to discharge in measures of fall risk, endurance, gait speed, mobility, cognition, speech, and swallowing ($p < 0.05$). At discharge, a significant portion of the population continued to exhibit deficits in cognition (attention 37 Memory (28 %), problem solving (28 %), balance (55 %), and gait speed (97 %)). The authors concluded that patients admitted to inpatient rehabilitation following hospitalization with COVID-19 demonstrated deficits in mobility, cognition, speech, and swallowing at admission and showed significant improvement in all of these domains by discharge. However, a significant number of patients exhibited residual deficits at discharge, highlighting the post-acute care needs of this patient population. These researchers noted that study limitations included a small sample size ($n = 29$), a single-center retrospective design, and the absence of a standardized rehabilitation protocol for COVID-19 patients. Moreover,

baseline functional status and psychiatric complications were not examined in this study.

- 8.2** Houben and Bonnechere (2022) stated that there is accumulating evidence suggesting that patients with severe COVID-19 may experience symptoms that persist beyond the acute phase, extending into the early chronic phase. This prolonged COVID-19 pathology is often referred to as “Long COVID”.
- 8.3** Simultaneously, case investigations have shown that COVID-19 individuals might have a variety of neurological problems. The accurate and accessible assessment of cognitive function in patients post-COVID-19 infection is thus of increasing importance for both public and individual health. Little is known about the influence of COVID-19 on general cognitive levels, but more importantly, at the sub-function level. These researchers examined the current level of evidence supporting the negative impact of COVID-19 infection on cognitive functions. A total of 27 studies were included in the systematic review, representing a total of 94,103 participants (90,317 COVID-19 patients and 3,786 healthy controls). These investigators then conducted a meta-analysis, summarizing the results of five studies (959 participants, 513 patients), to quantify the impact of COVID-19 on cognitive functions. The overall effect, expressed in SMDs, was -0.41 (95 % CI: -0.55 to -0.27). The authors concluded that the COVID-19 crisis has profoundly altered society’s organization and challenged various healthcare systems. While re-validation services have been significantly impacted during the various waves (acute management of patients), rehabilitation specialists are now faced with the challenge of managing long-term complications. Among these complications, this review highlights important concerns regarding cognitive functions. Even if most of these disorders diminish with time, on average 6 months after the 1st infection, it is important to develop strategies to improve the situation. There is currently little research focusing on the rehabilitation of cognitive functions; however, the existing evidence suggests that the best approach would be a combination of physical rehabilitation exercises and cognitive training. The latter can be performed using computerized solutions. In the future, it is important to think about the best way to integrate cognitive stimulations within physical rehabilitation since cognitive disorders are frequently associated with many pathologies requiring rehabilitation, not only COVID-19, as has been discussed in this paper, but also, for example, stroke, multiple sclerosis, and Parkinson’s disease.
- 8.4** Bertuccelli et al (2022) stated that severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is a worldwide public health issue. Almost 2 years into the pandemic, the persistence of symptoms following the acute phase is a well-recognized phenomenon. These investigators carried out a scoping review to map cognitive domain impairments, their frequency, and associated psycho-affective disorders in individuals with a previous COVID-19 infection. They searched PubMed/Medline, Scopus, and PsycInfo to identify relevant reports published between December 1, 2019, and February 21, 2022. These researchers followed the PRISMA extension for scoping review guidelines. A total of 3 independent reviewers selected and charted 25 records out of 922. Memory, attention, and executive functions appeared to be the most affected domains. Delayed recall

and learning were the most impaired domains of memory. Among the executive functions, abstraction, inhibition, set shifting, and sustained and selective attention were most commonly impaired. Language and visuo-spatial abilities were rarely affected, although the scarcity of reports might bias this finding.

- 8.5** Neurological and respiratory conditions were often reported in association with cognitive deficits. Results on psycho-affective conditions were inconclusive due to the low frequency of reported data. Admission to an intensive care unit (ICU) is not related to cognitive deficits. This review highlighted the potential impact of a previous post-COVID-19 infection on patterns of memory, attention, and executive function impairments. These investigators stated that these findings need to be confirmed on larger cohorts with comprehensive neuropsychological batteries and correlated to neurophysiological and neurobiological substrates. The authors noted that, despite growing evidence, a clear picture of the cognitive alterations following COVID-19 infection remains missing. Characterizing the post-COVID-19 pattern of cognitive impairments and their frequency will contribute to a better understanding of their pathophysiology. The ultimate goal is to establish effective care and rehabilitation pathways.
- 8.6** The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) guideline on long COVID (Venkatesan, 2022) does not mention the use of cognitive rehabilitation. In 2021, NICE issued a rapid guideline on managing the long-term effects of COVID-19. The guideline recommends using a multidisciplinary approach to guide rehabilitation, encompassing physical, psychological, and psychiatric aspects of management. Cognitive rehabilitation was not explicitly addressed. Assessing the clinical effectiveness of different service models for multimodality/multidisciplinary post-COVID-19 syndrome rehabilitation in improving patient-reported outcomes, such as quality of life, was listed as a key research recommendation.
- 8.7** Furthermore, an UpToDate’s “Patient education: Recovery after COVID-19 (The Basics)” written by the doctors and editors at UpToDate” (January 4, 2023) as well as UpToDate reviews on “COVID-19: Evaluation and management of adults following acute viral illness (long COVID)” (Mikkelsen and Abramoff, 2022) and “Geriatric rehabilitation interventions” (Hoenig and Cary, 2022) do not mention cognitive rehabilitation as a management / therapeutic option.

9. Other Neurological Disorders

- 9.1** A 2018 systematic review of literature from 2007 through 2016 (Goverover et al) determined clinical recommendations for cognitive rehabilitation of people with multiple sclerosis (MS), based on Searches of Medline, PsycINFO, and CINAHL with a combination of the following terms: attention, awareness, cognition, cognitive, communication, executive, executive function, language, learning, memory, perception, problem solving, reasoning, rehabilitation, remediation, training, processing speed, and working memory. A total of 129 articles were identified and underwent initial screening. After this initial screening, 59 articles were selected for inclusion. Following a further detailed review, 19 studies were excluded, leaving 40 studies that were fully reviewed and evaluated. Articles were assigned to 1 of 6 categories, including:

- a) Attention
- b) Learning and memory
- c) Processing speed and working memory
- d) Executive Functioning
- e) Metacognition
- f) Non-specified/combined cognitive domains

9.2 The authors yielded 6 class I studies, 10 class II studies, and 24 class III studies.

One intervention in the area of verbal learning and memory received support for a practice standard. Two computer programs received support as practice guidelines in the areas of attention and multi-cognitive domains. Several studies provided support for five practice options in the domains of attention, learning, and memory. In conclusion, the authors found that substantial progress has been made since the previous review regarding the identification of effective treatments for cognitive impairments in persons with MS. However, they stated that much work remains to be done to optimize rehabilitation potential by applying the most methodologically rigorous research designs to provide more class I evidence in support of a given treatment strategy.

9.3 In 2020 Svaerke et al., assessed the deterioration of working memory (WM) as a common cognitive deficit in Parkinson's disease (PD), which severely influences the ability to lead an independent life. Interventions that could delay the impact of WM deficits could positively impact the independence and QOL of patients. Authors of included studies were contacted to detect unpublished data or articles not found by database-search. Broad selection criteria were applied because literature was expected to be limited. Studies were eligible for inclusion if they examined the effects of CBCRT on WM in a sample consisting of at least 50% PD patients, or in which the results of PD patients could be isolated. Studies were further eligible for inclusion in a planned meta-analysis if the effects of the CBCRT intervention could be isolated, the CBCRT intervention was compared to active or passive control groups consisting solely of PD patients, and the WM outcome measure could be isolated. Only 6 studies were included despite broad inclusion criteria. Study results were heterogeneous, and the risk of bias in study methodology was either unclear or high; 2 studies were eligible for meta-analysis. A meta-analysis was not performed because these studies used different measures of WM that were not rated as equally valid and reliable. In conclusion, the authors found that the existing literature is sparse and provides insufficient evidence to determine whether CBCRT benefits WM in PD patients. The authors found several drawbacks in this study. First, the small number of studies that met the inclusion criteria for this meta-analysis limited the precision of the analysis due to potential publication bias. Furthermore, the lack of data or the use of different methods in the analyses limited the possibility of making a comparison between all the studies included in the systematic review. On the one hand, the variability of trained cognitive functions allowed studies divided by different cognitive domains to be compared, although not all cognitive domains were trained in all studies, so in some cases, the comparison was limited. On the other hand, some of the studies measured the cognitive domains differently. Thus, when

the specific cognitive domains were grouped according to the tests used, only studies that reported those tests independently could be included.

9.4 In a 2021 systematic review and meta-analysis, Sanchez-Luengos et al. evaluated the effectiveness of CRT in addressing cognitive deficits in non-demented PD patients. In order to reduce the impact of cognitive impairment in PD, CRT programs have been developed. A total of 12 articles were selected according to PRISMA guidelines, demonstrating that attention, working memory, verbal memory, executive functions, and processing speed were the most frequently improved domains. Results showed moderate effects on global cognitive status ($g = 0.55$) and working memory ($g = 0.50$); small significant effects on verbal memory ($g = 0.41$), overall cognitive functions ($g = 0.39$) and executive functions ($g = 0.30$); small non-significant effects on attention ($g = 0.36$), visual memory ($g = 0.29$), verbal fluency ($g = 0.27$) and processing speed ($g = 0.24$); and no effect on visuo-spatial and visuo-constructive abilities ($g = 0.17$).

9.5 Depressive symptoms showed a small effect ($g = 0.24$), and QOL showed no effect ($g = -0.07$). A meta-regression was conducted to examine the moderating variables of overall cognitive function effects; however, these moderators did not explain the heterogeneity in improvement following CRT. The authors concluded that these findings suggested that CRT may be beneficial in improving cognition in non-demented PD patients, although further studies are needed to analyze the effectiveness of CRT in patients with PD at the cognitive level and on the instrumental ADL, functionality, and QOL. Furthermore, it would be interesting to analyze individual factors such as age, lifestyle, personality, and genetic factors, which may apply to personalized medicine, in order to design more specific and individualized interventions.

10. Stroke-CVA/Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI)

10.1 A Hayes health technology assessment (2017-reviewed 2021) observed that cognitive rehabilitation therapy (CRT) for traumatic brain injury (TBI) can improve cognitive functioning. Overall, the report concluded that “the efficacy of cognitive rehabilitation, and which forms are most effective, are not possible at this time due to heterogeneity in the patient populations (comorbid conditions, Variable time since TBI, nature, and severity of injury, variability in targeted domains and outcome measures, and heterogeneity in treatment characteristics (including components of therapy, as well as the setting, intensity, and duration of treatment)).

10.2 A Cochrane analysis in 2017 (Kumar et al.) reported that there is insufficient good-quality evidence to support the role of cognitive rehabilitation when compared to no intervention or conventional rehabilitation in improving return to work, independence in ADL, community integration or quality of life in adults with TBI. There is moderate-quality evidence that cognitive rehabilitation, as an in-home program, is like hospital-based cognitive rehabilitation in improving return to work status among active duty military personnel with moderate-to-severe TBI. Moderate-quality evidence suggests that the two strategies do not differ in achieving a return to work in veterans or military personnel with TBI.

10.3 In a 2019 systematic review, Cicerone et al. evaluated cognitive rehabilitation in a total of 491 articles (109 class I or IA, 68 class II, and 314 class III). These articles

made 29 recommendations for evidence-based practice of cognitive rehabilitation (9 Practice Standards, 9 Practice Guidelines, and 11 Practice Options). Evidence from this review supports Practice Standards for attention deficits after TBI or stroke; visual scanning for neglect after right-hemisphere stroke; compensatory strategies for mild memory deficits; language deficits after left-hemisphere stroke; social-communication deficits after TBI; metacognitive strategy training for deficits in executive functioning; and comprehensive-holistic neuropsychological rehabilitation to reduce cognitive and functional disability after TBI or stroke.

10.4 A 2019 multicenter, assessor-blinded randomized controlled trial (RCT) (das Nair et al.) was conducted to evaluate a group memory rehabilitation program for individuals with traumatic brain injury (TBI) at 9 sites in England. The program included 328 patients and consisted of 10 weekly sessions, each lasting approximately 1.5 hours, which a trained Assistant Psychologist delivered to groups of between 4 and 6 participants. The intervention focused on retraining memory functions and strategies to improve encoding and retrieval. The control group received usual care, which typically included employment rehabilitation services, self-help groups, or specialist charity support. Between 2013 and 2015, 328 individuals were randomly assigned to therapy (N = 171) or usual care (N = 157). The participants were characterized by a mean age of 45.1 years, a median GCS closest to admission of 11.5 (25th, 75th centile=6, 14), a length of initial hospital stay for TBI of 84.2 days, and time since TBI of 100.9 months. Limitations of the study included lack of an active control arm, incomplete assessment of intervention fidelity, and exclusion of over 20% of the sample from the primary analysis. On the primary outcome of frequency of memory failures in daily life assessed using the Everyday Memory Questionnaire-patient version at 6 months' follow-up, the between-group difference was not clinically significant (adjusted difference in mean scores -2.1 ; 95% confidence interval [CI] -6.7 to 2.5; p=.37). For secondary outcomes, there was a significant improvement in goal attainment both at 6 and 12 months, but no differences on others such as mood or quality of life. In conclusion, the authors found that the group memory rehabilitation delivered in this trial is unlikely to yield clinical benefits or be a cost-effective treatment for people with TBI in the community. Therefore, future studies should investigate the selection of participants who are most likely to benefit from memory rehabilitation.

10.5 In a 2019 systematic review, Svaerke et al., assessed studies concerning the effects of computer-based cognitive rehab therapy (CBCRT) on visuospatial neglect (VN) after stroke, to summarize the current state of knowledge in this research field and make recommendations for future research. A total of 4 electronic databases were systematically searched. Authors of relevant studies were contacted to identify any unpublished data or articles that were not found through database searches. Data was extracted from included studies using predefined coding schemes and characteristics, and the results of individual studies were summarized qualitatively. Studies were included if at least 50% of the patients included had a stroke, if the studies explored the effects of CBCRT as a primary intervention for rehabilitation of VN and if they included neuropsychological outcome measures for the presence of VN. A total of 7 studies

were included; 6 of the 7 studies suggested that CBCRT has positive effects on VN after stroke. Limitations include that the studies consisted of small samples, varied greatly in design and had various methodological qualities. In conclusion, the authors found that it is currently not possible to either support or reject the effects of CBCRT on VN after stroke, as the existing literature is sparse, and studies have various methodological limitations. Therefore, further, more robust studies are needed to compare CBCRT with active and passive control conditions in randomized and blinded designs to determine health outcomes.

Applicable Coding

CPT Codes

Possibly Covered:

- 96125** Standardized cognitive performance testing (eg, Ross Information Processing Assessment) per hour of a qualified health care professional's time, both face-to-face time administering tests to the patient and time interpreting these test results and preparing the report
- 97129** Therapeutic interventions that focus on cognitive function (eg, attention, memory, reasoning, executive function, problem solving, and/or pragmatic functioning) and compensatory strategies to manage the performance of an activity (eg, managing time or schedules, initiating, organizing, and sequencing tasks), direct (one-on-one) patient contact; initial 15 minutes
- 97130** ; each additional 15 minutes (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
- 92507** Treatment of speech, language, voice, communication, and/or auditory processing disorder; individual

Not Covered:

- 0770T** Virtual reality technology to assist therapy (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

HCPCS Codes

Not covered:

- E1905** Virtual reality cognitive behavioral therapy device (CBT), including preprogrammed therapy software
- S9056** Coma stimulation per diem

Vendors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personify • HPS

References
No References

Review/Revision/Approval History	
Date	Description
07/2024	New Policy
3/9/2026	Revised by Mountain Health CO-OP Policy Committee

Disclaimer
<p>This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult appropriate healthcare providers for medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member’s benefit plan, effective when services are rendered.</p> <p>The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Including or excluding a procedure, diagnosis, or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as they apply to an individual member.</p> <p>Mountain Health Co-Op makes no representations and accepts no liability regarding the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Mountain Health Co-Op updates its Coverage Policies regularly and reserves the right to amend these policies and give notice per State and Federal requirements. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Mountain Health Co-Op.</p> <p>”Mountain Health Co-Op” and its accompanying logo and marks are protected and registered trademarks of Mountain Health Co-Op. The content of this Service is proprietary and protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes outlined in these Conditions of Use.</p> <p>© CPT Only – American Medical Association</p>