

# Medical Policy



## Title: Cardiac Rehabilitation in the Outpatient Setting

<b>Professional / Institutional</b>
Original Effective Date: January 1997 / August 17, 2010
Latest Review Date: June 9, 2026
Current Effective Date: May 23, 2024

**State and Federal mandates and health plan member contract language, including specific provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. To verify a member's benefits, contact [Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Customer Service](#).**

**The BCBSKS Medical Policies contained herein are for informational purposes and apply only to members who have health insurance through BCBSKS or who are covered by a self-insured group plan administered by BCBSKS. Medical Policy for FEP members is subject to FEP medical policy which may differ from BCBSKS Medical Policy.**

**The medical policies do not constitute medical advice or medical care. Treating health care providers are independent contractors and are neither employees nor agents of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas and are solely responsible for diagnosis, treatment and medical advice.**

**If your patient is covered under a different Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan, please refer to the Medical Policies of that plan.**

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With diagnosed heart disease</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outpatient cardiac rehabilitation</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard management without cardiac rehabilitation</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall survival</li> <li>• Disease-specific survival</li> <li>• Symptoms</li> <li>• Morbid events</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With diagnosed heart disease without a second event</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repeat outpatient cardiac rehabilitation</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single course of outpatient cardiac rehabilitation</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall survival</li> <li>• Disease-specific survival</li> <li>• Symptoms</li> <li>• Morbid events</li> </ul>

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With diagnosed heart disease	Interventions of interest are: • Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease	Comparators of interest are: • Standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Symptoms • Morbid events
Individuals: • With diagnosed heart disease	Interventions of interest are: • Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Pritikin Program	Comparators of interest are: • Standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Symptoms • Morbid events
Individuals: • With diagnosed heart disease	Interventions of interest are: • Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Benson-Henry Institute Program	Comparators of interest are: • Standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Symptoms • Morbid events
Individuals: • With heart disease due to post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV2 infection	Interventions of interest are: • Outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Comparators of interest are: • Standard management without cardiac rehabilitation	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Symptoms • Morbid events
Individuals: • With diagnosed heart disease	Interventions of interest are: • Virtual cardiac rehabilitation	Comparators of interest are: • Standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Symptoms • Morbid events

## DESCRIPTION

Cardiac rehabilitation refers to comprehensive medically supervised programs in the outpatient setting that aim to improve the function of individuals with heart disease and prevent future cardiac events. National organizations have specified core components to be included in cardiac rehabilitation programs.

## OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether outpatient cardiac rehabilitation programs improve the net health outcome in individuals with heart disease.

**BACKGROUND**

Heart disease is the leading cause of mortality in the United States, accounting for more than half of all deaths. Coronary artery disease is the most common cause of heart disease. In a 2024 update on heart disease and stroke statistics from the American Heart Association, it was estimated that 720,000 Americans have a new coronary attack (first hospitalized myocardial infarction or coronary heart disease death) and 335,000 have a recurrent attack annually.<sup>1</sup> Both coronary artery disease and various other disorders—structural heart disease and other genetic, metabolic, endocrine, toxic, inflammatory, and infectious causes—can lead to the clinical syndrome of heart failure, of which there are about 650,000 new cases in the United States annually.<sup>2</sup> Given the burden of heart disease, preventing secondary cardiac events and treating the symptoms of heart disease and heart failure have received much attention from national organizations.

**Cardiac Rehabilitation**

In 1995, the U.S. Public Health Service defined cardiac rehabilitation services as, in part, “comprehensive, long-term programs involving medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, cardiac risk factor modification, education, and counseling.... [These programs] are designed to limit the physiologic and psychological effects of cardiac illness, reduce the risk for sudden death or reinfarction, control cardiac symptoms, stabilize or reverse the atherosclerotic process, and enhance the psychosocial and vocational status of selected patients.” The U.S. Public Health Service recommended cardiac rehabilitation services for patients with coronary heart disease and heart failure, including those awaiting or following cardiac transplantation. A 2010 definition of cardiac rehabilitation from the European Association of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation stated: “Cardiac rehabilitation can be viewed as the clinical application of preventive care by means of a professional multi-disciplinary integrated approach for comprehensive risk reduction and global long-term care of cardiac patients.”<sup>3</sup> Since the 1995 release of the U.S. Public Health Service guidelines, other societies, including in 2005 the American Heart Association<sup>4</sup> and in 2010 the Heart Failure Society of America<sup>5</sup>, have developed guidelines on the role of cardiac rehabilitation in patient care.

**REGULATORY STATUS**

Not applicable.

**POLICY**

- A. Outpatient cardiac rehabilitation programs are considered **medically necessary** for individuals with a history of the following conditions and procedures:
  - 1. An acute myocardial infarction (MI) (heart attack) within the preceding 12 months; **OR**
  - 2. A coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgery; **OR**
  - 3. Percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty (PTCA) or coronary stenting; **OR**
  - 4. Heart valve surgery; **OR**
  - 5. A heart or heart-lung transplant; **OR**
  - 6. Current stable angina pectoris; **OR**
  - 7. Compensated heart failure.
- B. Repeat participation in an outpatient cardiac rehabilitation program in the absence of another qualifying cardiac event is considered **experimental / investigational**.
- C. Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease, Pritikin Program, or Benson-Henry Institute Program is considered **experimental / investigational**.
- D. Physical and/or occupational therapy are **not medically necessary** in conjunction with cardiac rehabilitation unless performed for an unrelated diagnosis.
- E. Virtual cardiac rehabilitation is considered **experimental / investigational**.
- F. Outpatient cardiac rehabilitation is considered **experimental / investigational** for all other indications (e.g., SARS-CoV-2).

**POLICY GUIDELINES**

- A. Cardiac rehabilitation programs must include the following components:
  - 1. Physician-prescribed exercise each day cardiac rehabilitation items and services are furnished;
  - 2. Cardiac risk factor modification;
  - 3. Psychosocial assessment;
  - 4. Outcomes assessment; and
  - 5. An individualized treatment plan detailing how each of the above components are utilized.
- B. Cardiac rehabilitation items and services must be furnished in a physician's office or a hospital outpatient setting.
- C. All settings must have a physician immediately available and accessible for medical consultations and emergencies at all times when items and services are being furnished under the program.
- D. Duration of the Program:  
A cardiac rehabilitation exercise program is eligible for coverage for 3 sessions per week up to a 12-week period (36 sessions).
- E. A comprehensive evaluation may be performed before initiation of cardiac rehabilitation to evaluate the individuals and determine an appropriate exercise program. In addition to a medical examination, an electrocardiogram stress test may be performed. An additional stress test may be performed at the completion of the program.

**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 it applies to an individual member.**

## **RATIONALE**

This evidence review was created using searches of the PubMed database. The most recent literature update was performed through February 3, 2026.

Evidence reviews 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 the quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent one 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. RCTs 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.

## **OUTPATIENT CARDIAC REHABILITATION FOR HEART DISEASE**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of cardiac rehabilitation in individuals who have heart disease 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 review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with diagnosed heart disease.

### ***Interventions***

The treatment being considered is cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

**Comparators**

The comparator of interest is standard management without cardiac rehabilitation. The following practices are currently being used to manage heart disease: medication, surgery, and medical devices.

**Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are overall survival (OS), disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, an affected individual will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

**Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

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

**REVIEW OF EVIDENCE****Systematic Reviews**

Oldridge (2012) identified 6 independent meta-analyses published since 2000 that reported outcomes from 71 RCTs (N=13,824) following cardiac rehabilitation interventions.<sup>6</sup> The RCTs included in the meta-analyses enrolled patients with myocardial infarction, coronary heart disease, angina, percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI), and/or coronary artery bypass graft (CABG). The RCTs compared cardiac rehabilitation programs (exercise-only and/or comprehensive rehabilitation) with usual care. Cardiac rehabilitation was associated with a statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) reduction in all-cause mortality in 4 of the 5 meta-analyses that reported this outcome. In the pooled analysis, cardiac rehabilitation was associated with an 18.5% mean reduction in all-cause mortality. Also, cardiac rehabilitation was associated with a statistically significant reduction in cardiac mortality in 3 of the 4 meta-analyses that reported disease-specific mortality as an outcome. Tables 1 and 2 describe the characteristics and results from this review.

Two of the meta-analyses on cardiac rehabilitation were Cochrane reviews. One included patients with coronary heart disease<sup>7</sup>, and the other focused on patients with systolic heart failure.<sup>8</sup> Both addressed exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation programs (exercise alone or as part of a comprehensive program). Anderson et al (2016) updated a 2011 Cochrane review addressing exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for individuals with coronary heart disease.<sup>7,9</sup> Reviewers included RCTs of exercise-based interventions with at least 6 months of follow-up compared with no-exercise controls in patients with myocardial infarction, CABG, or PCI, or with angina pectoris or coronary artery disease. The updated review included 63 RCTs (N=14,486), of which 16 trials had been published since the 2011 update. Reviewers reported that the overall risk of bias was unclear, although the quality of reporting improved with more recent trials. Due to the nature of

the intervention, patients were not blinded to the treatment group in any of the studies, but 16 (25%) of 62 studies reported details of blinded assessment of study outcomes. In the pooled analysis, cardiac rehabilitation was not significantly associated with overall mortality. However, among 27 studies, cardiac rehabilitation was significantly associated with reduced cardiovascular mortality (292/3850 for cardiac rehabilitation subjects vs. 375/3,619 for control subjects; relative risk [RR], 0.74; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.64 to 0.86). Rates of myocardial infarction, CABG, and PCI were not significantly associated with receiving cardiac rehabilitation.

Dibben et al (2021) published an updated Cochrane review to replace Anderson et al (2016).<sup>10</sup> This review included 85 trials (N=23,430), 22 of which were new from the previous update. Authors noted that overall trial reporting was poor, although there was evidence of improved quality over the last decade. There was still no significant reduction in overall mortality associated with cardiac rehabilitation. There was also no significant difference between cardiac rehabilitation and control in cardiovascular mortality in the short term (6 to 12 months), however there was a reduction in cardiovascular mortality in the medium term (12 to 36 months; risk ratio, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.63 to 0.93; 5 trials) and the long term (>36 months; risk ratio, 0.58; 95% CI, 0.43 to 0.78). In the short-term follow-up (6 to 12 months), cardiac rehabilitation was associated with a reduction in myocardial infarction (risk ratio, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.55 to 0.93; 22 trials; number needed to treat for an additional beneficial outcome [NNTB], 75; high certainty evidence) and a reduction in all-cause hospitalization (risk ratio, 0.58; 95% CI, 0.43 to 0.77; 14 trials; NNTB, 12; moderate certainty evidence). Rates of CABG and PCI were not significantly associated with receiving cardiac rehabilitation.

Long et al (2019) reported an updated Cochrane review of studies assessing cardiac rehabilitation in patients with heart failure. A total of 44 RCTs were evaluated, 11 of which were new trials, for the effects of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation on adults with heart failure ( 5783 total participants).<sup>11</sup> A single trial, Exercise Based Cardiac Rehabilitation for Adults With Heart Failure (HF-ACTION), contributed almost half of the patients (with results reported in 18 publications); most other studies were small and single-center. All studies had 6 months or longer follow-up and did not include a formal exercise training intervention as a comparator. The primary outcomes reported were mortality, hospital admission, and health-related quality of life (HRQoL). The overall risk of bias was assessed as being low or unclear, and results were downgraded using the GRADE tool for all outcomes except one. Results showed that cardiac rehabilitation had little effect on all-cause mortality over  $\leq 1$  year of follow-up (27 trials, 2596 participants: cardiac rehabilitation 5.1% vs. control 5.8%; low-quality evidence). However, cardiac rehabilitation may make a difference in the long-term (> 1 year of follow-up; 6 trials, 2845 participants: cardiac rehabilitation 17.2% vs. control 19.6%; high-quality evidence). Mortality related to heart failure was not consistently reported in the studies. Chances of avoiding hospital admission for any cause within 12 months of follow-up were better with cardiac rehabilitation (21 trials, 2182 participants: cardiac rehabilitation 16.5% vs. control 23.7%; moderate-quality evidence). Cardiac rehabilitation may also reduce short-term heart failure-related hospital admission (14 trials, 1114 participants: cardiac rehabilitation 7.1% vs. control 11.1%; RR, 0.59, 95% CI, 0.42 to 0.84;  $p=.003$ ), but the evidence was rated low quality. HRQoL was reported by 29 trials, most of which used the Minnesota Living With Heart Failure questionnaire; however, other tools were also used among the 29 trials that reported validated HRQoL measures. For exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation, no trials reported lower HRQoL scores with cardiac rehabilitation than with control, and all but 1 reported on results at  $\geq 6$  months follow-up. The pooled results from all measures used showed a clinically important improvement (a 5-point difference on the Minnesota Living

With Heart Failure) with exercise at up to 12 months follow-up, but the evidence was of very low quality. Compared with the 2014 review, this version included more women, older patients, participants with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction in recent trials, and more trials of cardiac rehabilitation in a home-based setting; this version may be more valid and applicable. A 2023 update by Molloy et al identified 16 new trials. Improvements in all-cause mortality, all-cause hospitalization, and heart failure-related hospitalization were noted with cardiac rehabilitation in any setting compared with usual care; however, the improvements were only significant for all-cause hospitalization in the short term (RR, 0.69, 95% CI, 0.56 to 0.86).<sup>12,13</sup>The characteristics and results from the most up-to-date Cochrane reviews are summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1. Systematic Review Characteristics**

Study	Dates	Trials	Participants	N (Range)	Design of Included Trials
Oldridge (2012) <sup>6</sup> ,	2000-2011	71	Patients with MI, CHD, angina, PCI, and/or CABG	13,824 ( 6111 to 10,794)	RCT
Dibben et al (2021) <sup>10</sup> ,	1975-2021	85	Patients with MI, angina pectoris, CAD, or who underwent CABG or PCI	23,430 (25 to 3959)	RCT
Molloy et al (2023) <sup>12,13</sup> ,	Through December 2021	60	Patients with HF	8728 (NR)	RCT

CABG: coronary artery bypass graft; CAD: coronary artery disease; CHD: coronary heart disease; HF: heart failure; MI: myocardial infarction; NR: not reported; PCI: percutaneous coronary intervention; RCT: randomized controlled trial.

**Table 2. Systematic Review Results**

Study	All-Cause Mortality	Cardiovascular Mortality
Oldridge (2012) <sup>6</sup> ,	6 studies	6 studies
Reduction, mean %	18.50	29.4
p-value	<.05	NR
Range, %	NR	20 to 43
Dibben et al (2021) <sup>10</sup> ,	Short term follow-up (up to 12 months): 25 studies (n=8823) Medium term follow-up (12 to 36 months): 16 trials (n=11,073) Long-term follow-up (>36 months): 11 trials (n=3828)	Short term follow-up: 15 studies (n=5360) Medium term follow-up: 5 trials (n=3614) Long-term follow-up: 8 trials (n=1392)

Study	All-Cause Mortality	Cardiovascular Mortality
Short term follow-up: RR (95% CI)	0.87 (0.73 to 1.04)	0.88 (0.68 to 1.14)
Medium term follow-up: RR (95% CI)	0.90 (0.80 to 1.02)	0.77 (0.63 to 0.93)
Long term follow-up: RR (95% CI)	0.91 (0.75 to 1.10)	0.58 (0.43 to 0.78)
Molloy et al (2023) <sup>12,13,</sup>	3780 participants, 8 studies	(studies did not consistently report deaths due to heart failure)
RR	0.87 (long-term, >12 months)	NR
95% CI	0.72 to 1.04	NR

CI: confidence interval; NR: not reported; RR: relative risk.

### Randomized Controlled Trials

Findings of a large, multicenter RCT from the United Kingdom, which evaluated the effectiveness of cardiac rehabilitation in a “real-life” setting, were published by West et al (2012).<sup>14</sup> Called the Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial (RAMIT), the study included patients from 14 centers with established multifactorial cardiac rehabilitation programs (including exercise, education, and counseling), involved more than one discipline, and provided an intervention lasting a minimum of 10 hours. A total of 1813 patients were randomized: 903 to cardiac rehabilitation and 910 to a control condition. Vital status was obtained at 2 years for 99.9% (all but one patient) and at 7 to 9 years for 99.4% of patients. By 2 years, 166 patients had died: 82 in the cardiac rehabilitation group and 84 in the control group. The between-group difference in mortality at 2 years (the primary study outcome) was not statistically significant (RR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.74 to 1.30). After 7 to 9 years, 488 patients had died, 245 in the cardiac rehabilitation group and 243 in the control group (RR, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.85 to 1.15). In addition, at 1 year, cardiovascular morbidity did not differ significantly between groups. For a combined endpoint including death, nonfatal myocardial infarction, stroke, or revascularization, the RR was 0.96 (95% CI, 0.88 to 1.07). In discussing the study’s negative findings, trialists noted that medical management of heart disease had improved over time, and patients in the control group might have had better outcomes than in earlier RCTs on this topic. Moreover, an editorial accompanying the publication of the trial’s findings emphasized that RAMIT was not an efficacy trial, but rather, a trial evaluating the effectiveness of actual cardiac rehabilitation programs in the United Kingdom.<sup>15</sup> Finally, these results might in part reflect the degree to which clinically-based cardiac rehabilitation programs in the United Kingdom differ from the treatment protocols used in RCTs based in research settings.

A concern raised by the negative findings in the RAMIT trial is that most of the RCTs evaluating cardiac rehabilitation were conducted in an earlier era of heart disease management and might not be relevant to current care. However, RAMIT’s results, along with 15 additional RCTs reported since a 2011 Cochrane review, were included in the updated 2016 Cochrane review, which found improvements in cardiovascular mortality associated with exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation.

Pandey et al (2017) evaluated endurance exercise training as part of a cardiac rehabilitation program in a population of heart failure patients stratified by ejection fraction.<sup>16</sup> Participants had heart failure with preserved ejection fraction or reduced ejection fraction, were 65 years of age or older, and had participated in a 16-week exercise program that intensified from 40% to 50% of

heart rate reserve in the first 2 weeks to 60% to 70% over the ensuing weeks as part of a previously published RCT.<sup>17</sup> The primary outcome for assessing change in exercise capacity was the percentage change in peak oxygen uptake (mL/kg per minute) from baseline to end of exercise training (16-week follow-up). Data on testing from 48 patients (24 reduced ejection fraction, 24 heart failure with preserved ejection fraction) were assessed. Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction patients experienced greater improvement in exercise training patients (18.7%) than reduced ejection fraction patients (-0.3%;  $p < .001$ ) as measured by peak oxygen uptake. There was no information on subsequent hospitalization rates or clinical outcomes such as heart failure progression or mortality. This secondary analysis was used to assert the appropriateness of cardiac rehabilitation in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction patients.

Opotowsky et al (2018) compared cardiac rehabilitation to the standard of care in 28 subjects (mean age, 41.1 years) with moderate to severe congenital heart disease.<sup>18</sup> Cardiac rehabilitation was associated with a significant increase in peak oxygen consumption with no associated adverse events. There was also a nonsignificant improvement in peak work rate with cardiac rehabilitation as compared to standard of care ( $p = .16$ ) and a significant improvement in self-assessment of overall health ( $p < .04$ ). However, the study was limited by its small sample size and short-term follow-up.

Tables 3 and 4 provide a summary of key RCT characteristics and results.

**Table 3. Summary of Key Randomized Controlled Trial Characteristics**

Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	Comparator
West et al (2012); RAMIT <sup>14</sup> ,	United Kingdom	14	1997-2000	Patients diagnosed with acute MI (N=1813)	Cardiac rehabilitation (n=903)	Control (n=910)
Pandey et al (2017) <sup>16</sup> ,	U.S.	1	NR	Patients aged $\geq 65$ years with HFrEF (n=24) or HFpEF (n=24)	16-wk supervised moderate endurance exercise training (n=48)	HRrEF (n=24) vs. HFpEF (n=24)
Opotowsky et al (2018) <sup>18</sup> ,	U.S.	1	NR	Patients aged $\geq 16$ years with moderate to severe congenital heart disease (N=28)	12-wk cardiac rehabilitation (n=13)	Standard of care (n=15)

HF: heart failure; HFpEF: HF with preserved ejection fraction; HFrEF: HF with reduced ejection fraction; MI: myocardial infarction; NR: not reported; RAMIT: Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial.

**Table 4. Summary of Key Randomized Controlled Trial Results**

<b>Study</b>	<b>2-yr Mortality</b>	<b>Readmission to Hospital for Any Cardiac Condition at 1 y</b>	<b>Training-Related Improvement in Vo<sub>2</sub> peak Change</b>
West et al (2012); RAMIT <sup>14</sup> ,	N= 1813 participants	N= 1813 participants	NR
CR	82 patients	222 (25%)	NR
Control	84 patients	239 (26%)	NR
RR	0.98	NR	NR
95% CI	0.74 to 1.30	NR	NR
Pandey et al (2017) <sup>16</sup> ,	NR	NR	N=48 participants
HFrEF	NR	NR	18.7+/-17.6
HFpEF	NR	NR	-0.3+/-15.4
p-value	NR	NR	<.001
Opotowsky et al (2018) <sup>18</sup> ,			N=28 participants
CR	NR	NR	+2.2 mL/kg/min (compared to standard of care)
95% CI; p-value	NR	NR	0.7 to 3.7; p=.002

CI: confidence interval; CR: cardiac rehabilitation; HF: heart failure; HFpEF: HF with preserved ejection fraction; HFrEF: HF with reduced ejection fraction; NR: not reported; RAMIT: Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial ; RR: relative risk; Vo<sub>2</sub>peak: peak oxygen uptake.

The purpose of the limitations tables (see Tables 5 and 6) is to display notable limitations identified in each study. This information is synthesized as a summary of the body of evidence following each table and provides the conclusions on the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the position statement.

**Table 5. Study Relevance Limitations**

<b>Study</b>	<b>Population<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Intervention<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Comparator<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Outcomes<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>Follow-Up<sup>e</sup></b>
West et al (2012); RAMIT <sup>14</sup> ,	4,5. Descriptions of diversity in study populations were not reported				1,2. Trial was closed prematurely
Pandey et al (2017) <sup>16</sup> ,	4. Enrolled populations do not reflect relevant diversity; 81% of participants were White		2. No comparator used		1,2. Only 16 wks follow-up

Study	Population <sup>a</sup>	Intervention <sup>b</sup>	Comparator <sup>c</sup>	Outcomes <sup>d</sup>	Follow-Up <sup>e</sup>
Opotowsky et al (2018) <sup>18,</sup>	4,5. Descriptions of diversity in study populations were not reported			1. Key health outcomes such as mortality or readmission not addressed	1,2. Only 12 wks follow-up

RAMIT: Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial.

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

a Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Study population is unclear; 3. Study population not representative of intended use; 4, Enrolled populations do not reflect relevant diversity; 5. Other.

b Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest. 5: Other.

c Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively. 5: Other.

d Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. No CONSORT reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinical significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinical significant difference not supported. 7. Other.

e Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms. 3. Other.

**Table 6. Study Design and Conduct Limitations**

Study	Allocation <sup>a</sup>	Blinding <sup>b</sup>	Selective Reporting <sup>c</sup>	Follow-Up <sup>d</sup>	Power <sup>e</sup>	Statistical <sup>f</sup>
West et al (2012); RAMIT <sup>14,</sup>	3. Allocation concealment unclear	1,2. Not blinded				
Pandey et al (2017) <sup>16,</sup>	1. Participants not randomly allocated	1,2. Not blinded				
Opotowsky et al (2018) <sup>18,</sup>		1,2. Not blinded			1. Power calculations not reported	

RAMIT: Rehabilitation After Myocardial Infarction Trial.

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

a Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias.

b Blinding key: 1. Not blinded to treatment assignment; 2. Not blinded outcome assessment; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician.

c Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication.

d Follow-Up key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials).

e Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference.

f Statistical key: 1. Intervention is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Intervention is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated.

### Observational Studies

Sumner et al (2017) published a systematic review of controlled observational studies evaluating cardiac rehabilitation in patients diagnosed with acute myocardial infarction.<sup>19</sup> Cardiac rehabilitation interventions consisted of structured multicomponent programs that included exercise and at least 1 of the following: education, information, health behavior change, and psychological or social support. Usual care interventions, generally supervised medical interventions, were the control conditions. Ten studies met reviewers' eligibility criteria. In a meta-analysis of 5 studies reporting all-cause mortality (an unadjusted outcome), there was a significantly lower risk of death in the group that received cardiac rehabilitation (odds ratio [OR], 0.25; 95% CI, 0.16 to 0.40). Three studies that reported an adjusted analysis of all-cause mortality also found a significant benefit from cardiac rehabilitation (OR, 0.47; 95% CI, 0.38 to 0.59). Similarly, a meta-analysis of 3 studies reporting cardiac-related mortality (an unadjusted analysis) found a significant benefit from cardiac rehabilitation (OR, 0.21; 95% CI, 0.12 to 0.37). Only one study reported an adjusted analysis of cardiac-related mortality, so data could not be pooled.

Nilsson et al (2018) investigated the effect of a 12-week cardiac rehabilitation program with a high-intensity interval exercise component using participant peak oxygen uptake as a measure of improved exercise capacity.<sup>20</sup> Increased exercise capacity has been shown to improve survival among persons with coronary heart disease. The objective of the study was to assess whether this addition to a cardiac rehabilitation program yielded improved long-term results. One hundred thirty-three coronary patients participated in this prospective cohort study and were evaluated at baseline, at the end of the 12-week program, and again at a 15-month follow-up. Additional test measurements included a cardiopulmonary exercise test, body mass index, blood pressure tests, and quality of life questionnaire. Of the 133 patients, 86 patients had complete information for the 15-month follow-up. Mean peak oxygen uptake improved from a baseline of 31.9 mL/kg/min to 35.9 mL/kg/min ( $p < .001$ ) at the end of the 12-week program, and to 36.8 mL/kg/min (CI not reported) at 15-month follow-up. Most of the 86 patients reported maintaining an exercise routine. Study limitations included the small sample size, a relatively low-risk male population at baseline, and lack of information on the qualifying event for cardiac rehabilitation. The authors concluded that the cardiac rehabilitation program intervention potentially fostered consistent and beneficial exercise habits as demonstrated by improved peak oxygen uptake.

Jafri et al (2021) conducted a retrospective cohort study to evaluate home-based cardiac rehabilitation (HBCR) in patients with established cardiovascular disease.<sup>21</sup> A total of 269 patients at a Veterans Affairs Medical Center were eligible for inclusion (HBCR group,  $n=157$ ; non-HBCR control group,  $n=100$ ); 12 patients were excluded due to having outcomes less than 90 days after enrollment (study follow-up period was between 3 to 12 months). A majority of patients (98%) were male, and the mean age was 72 years. The primary outcome was composite all-cause mortality and hospitalizations and secondary outcomes were all-cause hospitalization, all-cause mortality, and cardiovascular hospitalizations. The primary composite outcome occurred in both the HBCR ( $n=30$ ) and control ( $n=30$ ) groups (adjusted hazard ratio [HR], 0.56; 95% CI, 0.33 to 0.95;  $p=.03$ ). All-cause mortality occurred in 6.4% of HBCR patients versus 13% of the control group (adjusted HR, 0.43; 95% CI, 0.18 to 1.0;  $p=.05$ ). There was no difference in cardiovascular or all-cause hospitalizations between groups.

**Section Summary: Outpatient Cardiac Rehabilitation for Heart Disease**

Overall, the evidence from RCTs reviewed in well-structured systematic reviews suggests that cardiac rehabilitation is associated with reduced cardiovascular mortality in patients with coronary heart disease. Additional RCTs, systematic reviews, and observational studies have evaluated outpatient cardiac rehabilitation in patients with heart failure or in the postintervention setting. An overview of 6 meta-analyses found a statistically significant association between cardiac rehabilitation and reduction in all-cause mortality and/or cardiac mortality. The available evidence has limitations, including lack of blinded outcome assessment, but, for the survival-related outcomes of interest, this limitation is less critical.

**REPEAT OUTPATIENT CARDIAC REHABILITATION****Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of repeat cardiac rehabilitation in individuals who have heart disease without a second event 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 review.

***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with diagnosed heart disease who have had cardiac rehabilitation before but who have not had a second cardiac event.

***Interventions***

The treatment being considered is repeat cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

***Comparators***

The comparator of interest is standard management with a single course of cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, an affected individual will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

**Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

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

4. Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

### **Review of Evidence**

No studies were identified that evaluated the effectiveness of repeat participation in a cardiac rehabilitation program.

### **Section Summary: Repeat Outpatient Cardiac Rehabilitation**

For individuals who have been diagnosed with heart disease without a second event who receive repeat outpatient cardiac rehabilitation, the evidence includes no trials.

### **Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation for Heart Disease**

There is no standard definition of an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program and, thus, specific programs are reviewed individually. Three programs have been evaluated by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and the published evidence supporting these programs is reviewed. The ideal trial design would be an RCT comparing the impact of intensive cardiac rehabilitation with standard cardiac rehabilitation on health outcomes.

### **ORNISH PROGRAM FOR REVERSING HEART DISEASE**

#### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease in individuals who have been diagnosed with heart disease 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 review.

#### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with diagnosed heart disease.

#### ***Interventions***

The treatment being considered is the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease.

The Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease is an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program that focuses on exercise, diet, stress management, and support from others.

The multiple 4-hour sessions are administered by an Ornish-certified physician, cardiac therapist, or other certified health care provider.

#### ***Comparators***

The comparator of interest is standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

#### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, an affected individual will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

### Study Selection Criteria

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

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

## REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

### Randomized Controlled Trials

Ornish et al (1990) conducted an RCT, called the Lifestyle Heart Trial, comparing a version of the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease with usual care. Initial results were reported in 1990, and 5-year results in 1998.<sup>22,23</sup> Eligibility for the trial included diagnosed coronary artery disease, left ventricular ejection fraction greater than 25%, no myocardial infarction during the previous 6 weeks, not scheduled for CABG, and not taking lipid-lowering medication. Ninety-four eligible patients were randomized to an intervention group (n=53) or a usual care control group (n=43). Final consenting was done after randomization; 28 (53%) patients assigned to the intervention group and 20 (43%) assigned to the control group agreed to participate in the trial.

The lifestyle intervention consisted of recommending a low-fat vegetarian diet and an individualized exercise regimen. Also, patients were taught stress management techniques and were taught to practice them at home for at least an hour a day. Also, twice-weekly group discussions were offered to provide social support. It is not clear how long patients attended these group discussions (ie, the number of weeks or months). As reported by Ornish et al (1990), the mean percentage diameter stenosis decreased from 40% at baseline to 37.8% at 1 year in the intervention group and increased from 42.7% to 46.1% in the control group (p=.001). The frequency and duration of chest pain did not differ between groups. However, during chest pain episodes, at 1 year, the intervention group reported mean chest pain severity of 1.7 (on a 7-point scale) whereas the mean score in the control group was 2.5 (p<.001).

Twenty (71%) of 28 patients in the intervention group and 15 (75%) of 20 in the control group completed the 5-year follow-up. The intervention and control groups did not differ significantly in the number of myocardial infarction events (2 vs. 4), CABGs (2 vs. 5), or deaths (2 vs. 1). However, compared with the control group, the intervention group had significantly fewer percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasties (8 vs. 14; p<.050) and cardiac hospitalizations (23 vs. 44; p<.001).

### Section Summary: Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease

One RCT was identified that evaluated the Ornish Program in patients diagnosed with heart disease and compared it with usual care. This RCT, which included patients with coronary artery disease but no recent cardiac event, had mixed findings at 1 and 5 years. The trial had a small sample size for a cardiac trial (N=48), and only 35 patients were available for the 5-year follow-up. The Ornish Program is considered by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to be an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program, but the program described in this RCT might meet the

criteria for standard cardiac rehabilitation. No studies were identified that compared the Ornish Program with any other cardiac rehabilitation program.

## **PRITIKIN PROGRAM**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of the Pritikin Program in individuals who have been diagnosed with heart disease 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 review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with diagnosed heart disease.

### ***Interventions***

The treatment being considered is the Pritikin Program.

The Pritikin Program is an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program based on effective exercise, a healthy diet, and a healthy mindset.

### ***Comparators***

The comparator of interest is standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, an affected individual will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

## **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

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

## **REVIEW OF EVIDENCE**

### **Nonrandomized Studies**

No RCTs evaluating the Pritikin Program were identified. Key nonrandomized trial characteristics and results are summarized in Table 7 and Table 8. Lakhani et al (2023) conducted a prospective, nonrandomized study that compared intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Pritikin Program and traditional outpatient cardiac rehabilitation.<sup>24</sup> The primary outcomes of interest were change in

diet quality and quality of life from baseline to visit 24. There was a significant improvement in diet quality but not in quality of life between the Pritikin Program and traditional cardiac rehabilitation groups. Body mass index was also improved in patients who received intensive rehabilitation. Limitations of the study include a short follow-up and lack of data for cardiovascular outcomes.

Racette et al (2023) published 7-year outcomes from the first institution to implement the Pritikin Program.<sup>25</sup> Retrospective data for 1507 patients who received the intensive cardiac rehabilitation program and 456 patients who received traditional cardiac rehabilitation were compared. Outcomes of interest (eg, anthropometric measures, dietary patterns, 6-minute walk distance [6MWD], grip strength, and HRQoL) all improved with the Pritikin Program. Significant benefit of the Pritikin Program compared to traditional cardiac rehabilitation were noted for change in body weight (p<.0001), body mass index (p<.0001), waist circumference (p<.0001), and diet quality as measured by the Rate Your Plate score (p<.0001). There was no difference in 6MWD or grip strength between groups. Cardiovascular outcomes, including rehospitalization or mortality, were not assessed.

**Table 7. Summary of Key Nonrandomized Trials**

Study	Study Type	Country	Dates	Participants	Intensive cardiac rehabilitation	Traditional cardiac rehabilitation	Follow-Up
Lakhani et al (2023) <sup>24</sup> ,	Cohort	U.S.	2017-2021	Referred by a cardiologist for cardiac rehabilitation	n=230	n=62	24 visits
Racette et al (2022) <sup>25</sup> ,	Cohort	U.S.	2013-2019	Enrolled in a cardiac rehabilitation program in the course of usual care	n=1507	n=456	72 sessions over 18 weeks; 7 year follow-up

**Table 8. Summary of Key Nonrandomized Trials**

Study	Change in diet quality	Change in QOL	Change in body weight (kg)	Change in BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	Change in 6MWD (m)
Lakhani et al (2023) <sup>24</sup> ,	N=292	N=292	NR	NR	NR
Intensive cardiac rehabilitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% improved</li> <li>• 3% no change</li> <li>• 7% worsened</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% improved</li> <li>• 7% no change</li> <li>• 13% worsened</li> </ul>	NR	NR	NR
Traditional cardiac rehabilitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 71% improved</li> <li>• 5% no change</li> <li>• 24% worsened</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 71% improved</li> </ul>	NR	NR	NR

Study	Change in diet quality	Change in QOL	Change in body weight (kg)	Change in BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	Change in 6MWD (m)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13% no change</li> <li>• 16% worsened</li> </ul>			
p-value	.001	NS	NR	NR	NR
Racette et al (2022) <sup>25</sup> ,	NR	NR	N= 1963	N= 1963	N= 1963
Intensive cardiac rehabilitation	NR	NR	-1.4±2.8	-0.5±1.0	46.4±57.8
Traditional cardiac rehabilitation	NR	NR	0.1±3.2	0.1±1.1	44.4±58.9
p-value	NR	NR	<.001	<.001	.106

6MWD: 6-minute walk distance; BMI: body mass index; NR: not reported; NS: not significant; QOL: quality of life.

### Section Summary: Pritikin Program

No RCTs have evaluated the Pritikin Program; 2 nonrandomized studies in patients with heart disease were identified. Conclusions cannot be drawn from this limited data on the impact on cardiovascular outcomes of intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Pritikin Program compared with standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation.

### BENSON-HENRY INSTITUTE PROGRAM

#### Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of the Benson-Henry Institute Program in individuals who have been diagnosed with heart disease 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 review.

#### Populations

The relevant population of interest is individuals with diagnosed heart disease.

#### Interventions

The treatment being considered is the Benson-Henry Institute Program.

The Benson-Henry Institute Program is an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program based on effective exercise, a healthy diet, and a healthy mindset.

#### Comparators

The comparator of interest is standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

## **Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, an affected individual will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

## **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

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

## **REVIEW OF EVIDENCE**

### **Case-Control Studies**

Zeng et al (2013) reported outcomes of a Medicare-sponsored demonstration of 2 intensive lifestyle modification programs in patients with symptomatic coronary heart disease: the Cardiac Wellness Program of the Benson-Henry Mind Body Institute and the Dr. Dean Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease.<sup>26</sup> This analysis included 461 participants and 1795 matched controls using Medicare claims data from 1998 to 2008. Four matched controls were sought for each participant from Medicare claims data, 2 of whom had received traditional cardiac rehabilitation within 12 months following their cardiac events (cardiac rehabilitation controls) and 2 of whom had not (non-cardiac rehabilitation controls). Outcomes included mortality rates during the 3 post-enrollment years, total hospitalizations, hospitalizations with a cardiac-related principal discharge diagnosis, and Medicare-paid costs of care. Of the 324 participants in the Benson-Henry Mind Body Medical Institute program analysis, the authors concluded that during the active intervention and follow-up years, total, cardiac, and non-cardiac hospitalizations were lower in the Benson-Henry program participants than their controls for each comparison ( $p < .001$ ). The investigators further reported that after year 1, the mortality rate was 1.5% in the Benson-Henry program participants compared with 2.5% and 4.2%, respectively, in cardiac rehabilitation and non-cardiac rehabilitation controls. After year 3, comparable figures were 6.2% in Benson-Henry program participants, 10.5% in cardiac rehabilitation controls, and 11.0% in non-cardiac rehabilitation controls. These mortality differences for the Benson-Henry program participants reached borderline significance ( $p = .08$ ).

### **Case Series**

Casey et al (2009) reported the results of a case series that evaluated the effects of an intensive cardiac rehabilitation program, incorporating components of the Benson-Henry Institute Cardiac Wellness Program at a single center.<sup>27</sup> From 1997 to 2005, 637 patients with coronary artery disease were enrolled and completed the program, which consisted of 13 weekly 3 hour sessions with supervised exercise, relaxation techniques, stress management, and behavioral interventions. The mean age of participants was 63 years (range, 27 to 92 years); men comprised 72% of the study population. Results revealed significant improvements in clinical (blood pressure, lipids, weight, exercise conditioning, frequency of symptoms of chest pain, and

shortness of breath) and psychological outcomes (general severity index, depression, anxiety, and hostility) ( $p < .0001$ ) with the program.

### **Section Summary: Benson-Henry Institute Program**

No RCTs have evaluated the Benson-Henry Institute Program; a case-control study found the program participants to have lower total, cardiac, and non-cardiac hospitalizations during the active intervention and follow-up years compared to controls for each comparison. Additionally, program participants had lower mortality rates compared to controls; however, the mortality differences were borderline significant at year 3. A case series also demonstrated that the implementation of components of the Benson-Henry Institute program resulted in an improvement in clinical and psychological outcomes. Conclusions cannot be drawn from these data on the impact of intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Benson Henry Institute program compared with standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation.

## **POST-ACUTE CARDIAC SEQUELAE OF SARS-COV-2 INFECTION**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of outpatient cardiac rehabilitation in individuals with post-acute cardiac sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on standard management without outpatient cardiac rehabilitation.

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

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with post-acute cardiac sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection or COVID-19. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention define long COVID as symptoms persisting after infection with SARS-CoV-2 and present for at least 3 months as a continuous, relapsing and remitting, or progressive disease state that affects at least one organ system.<sup>28</sup> The World Health Organization developed the following consensus case definition of 'post COVID-19 condition (long COVID)': individuals with "a history of probable or confirmed SARS CoV-2 infection, usually 3 months from the onset of COVID-19 with symptoms and that last for at least 2 months and cannot be explained by an alternative diagnosis. Common symptoms include fatigue, shortness of breath, cognitive dysfunction but also others and generally have an impact on everyday functioning. Symptoms may be new onset following initial recovery from an acute COVID-19 episode or persist from the initial illness. Symptoms may also fluctuate or relapse over time."<sup>29</sup>

### ***Interventions***

The treatment being considered is cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

### ***Comparators***

The comparator of interest is standard management without cardiac rehabilitation. The following practices are currently being used to manage heart disease: medication, surgery, and medical devices.

**Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, an affected individual will require lifelong monitoring by a cardiologist.

**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 longer-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.

**Review of Evidence**

Reports of patient rehabilitation after COVID-19 recovery have largely been observational, without clearly identifiable cardiac rehabilitation components within multidisciplinary or cardiorespiratory rehabilitation programs.

No studies specifically assessing the efficacy of cardiac rehabilitation programs for post-acute cardiac sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection were identified.

**Section Summary: Post-Acute Cardiac Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection**

No direct evidence on the efficacy of cardiac rehabilitation programs in patients with post-acute cardiac sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection was identified. Controlled prospective studies in well-defined patient populations with sufficient follow-up duration are necessary to evaluate net health outcomes.

**VIRTUAL CARDIAC REHABILITATION****Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of virtual cardiac rehabilitation in individuals who have been diagnosed with heart disease 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 review.

**Populations**

The relevant population of interest is individuals with diagnosed heart disease.

**Interventions**

The treatment being considered is virtual cardiac rehabilitation.

Virtual cardiac rehabilitation is HBCR delivered by virtual or remote interactions between affected individuals and providers, including video conferencing, phone, email, text, smartphone applications, or wearable devices.

### **Comparators**

The comparator of interest is standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation. Cardiac rehabilitation includes long-term programs that include medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, modification to reduce cardiac risks, education, and counseling.

### **Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, symptoms, and morbid events.

Once diagnosed with heart disease, an affected individual will require lifelong monitoring.

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

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

## **REVIEW OF EVIDENCE**

### **Systematic Reviews**

Many meta-analyses/systematic reviews are available for virtual cardiac rehabilitation.<sup>30,31,32,33,34,35,36</sup> In general, these reviews have found significant effects on physical activity, cardiovascular risk factors, and quality of life, but evidence for cardiovascular outcomes is limited.

A Cochrane systematic review by McDonagh et al (2023) compared home-based cardiac rehabilitation (including a variety of virtual methods) with center-based rehabilitation.<sup>37</sup> A total of 24 RCTs were included (N=3046). The meta-analysis did not find a significant difference between home and center-based rehabilitation up to 12 months in the outcomes of: total mortality (risk ratio, 1.19; 95% CI, 0.65 to 2.16) or exercise capacity (standardized mean difference, -0.10; 95% CI, -0.24 to 0.04). The authors concluded that home rehabilitation with or without virtual platforms results in similar clinical outcomes; however, the analysis does not provide adequate information on specific virtual rehabilitation programs.

The analysis by Cruz-Cobo et al (2022) included 20 randomized studies (N= 4535) of mobile health interventions in patients who had experienced a coronary event.<sup>33</sup> Beneficial effects of mobile health interventions were found for exercise capacity, physical activity, adherence to treatment, and quality of life. All-cause hospital readmission (p=.04) and hospital readmission for cardiovascular causes (p=.05) were statistically lower in the mobile health intervention group compared to the control group, but these may not be clinically relevant differences (point estimates for actual risk differences were -0.03 and -0.04, respectively). There was no difference

between groups in mortality. A major limitation of this study is lack of clarity of how many individuals received mobile health interventions for the purpose of cardiac rehabilitation.

Zhou et al (2023) conducted a systematic review of smartphone-assisted cardiac rehabilitation compared with usual cardiac rehabilitation.<sup>38</sup> A total of 14 RCTs (N=1962) were included and key outcomes included peak oxygen uptake, 6MWD, compliance, and body mass index (BMI). There were no significant differences in terms of 6MWD (weighted mean difference [WMD], 12.88; 95% CI, -0.82 to 26.57) or BMI (WMD, -0.14; 95% CI, -0.34 to 0.06) between groups; however, peak oxygen uptake (WMD, 1.32; 95% CI, 0.82 to 1.81) and compliance (WMD, 1.62; 95% CI, 1.21 to 2.17) were improved with smartphone-assisted rehabilitation.

Li et al (2025) reported on a meta-analysis comparing HBCR using mHealth technology to center-based cardiac rehabilitation (CBCR).<sup>39</sup> Thirteen RCTs (N=1508) were included in the review. Participants had myocardial infarction, angina pectoris, or heart failure, or had undergone revascularization. Intervention ranged from 6 to 24 weeks. Compared to usual care, mHealth HBCR significantly improved 6MWT (mean difference, 24.74; 95% CI, 9.88 to 39.60; n=532) and peak oxygen uptake (mean difference, 1.77; 95% CI, 1.19 to 2.35). However, there were no significant differences between HBCR and CBCR

### Randomized Controlled Trials

Numerous RCTs with virtual cardiac rehabilitation have been published.<sup>40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51</sup> Of these, a limited few have reported results for cardiovascular outcomes of interest. Indraratna et al (2022) found that unplanned hospital readmissions and cardiac readmissions were significantly lower with a smartphone-based intervention to facilitate the transition to outpatient cardiac care (including rehabilitation) compared to usual care among 164 patients being discharged after hospitalization for acute coronary syndrome or heart failure.<sup>43</sup> However, only 100 patients in the study received cardiac rehabilitation after discharge and rehospitalization rates were not provided for this cohort alone. Other limitations of this study include short duration of follow-up (6 months) and that enrollment was terminated in March 2020 so the study may not reflect how usual care is delivered in the post-COVID-19 pandemic era. Piotrowicz et al (2020) conducted a 9-week RCT of telerehabilitation compared to usual care in 850 patients with heart failure.<sup>45</sup> Both groups had a median follow-up of 793 days. The primary outcome (days alive and out of the hospital through end of follow-up) was similar between groups (median, 775 days [telerehabilitation] vs. 776 days [usual care]). There was also no difference between telerehabilitation and usual care in all-cause hospitalization (HR, 0.913; 95% CI, 0.762 to 1.093), cardiovascular hospitalization (HR, 0.837; 95% CI, 0.667 to 1.050), all-cause mortality (HR, 1.035; 95% CI, 0.706 to 1.517), or cardiovascular mortality (HR, 0.985; 95% CI, 0.619 to 1.569). Since the study only included patients with heart failure, the results may not be applicable to patients with other forms of heart disease. Other limitations include a lack of power for hospitalization and mortality outcomes, and that the cardiac monitoring device used in the study may not reflect the effect of video- or smartphone-based virtual rehabilitation methods used in current practice.

A single-center, parallel group, noninferiority trial was published by Schmidt et al (2025) which investigated the impact of CBCR versus HBCR in patients with heart failure.<sup>52</sup> Patients (N=120) were randomized 1:1, then adjusted to a 1 center/2 home ratio during the COVID-19 pandemic, then adjusted to 12 weeks of standard CBCR (24 supervised sessions) or HBCR (4 supervised sessions plus 20 sessions at home). Ultimately, 45 patients were randomized to CBCR and 75

were randomized to HBCR. At 12 weeks, the authors found no significant between-group differences in peak oxygen uptake change from baseline to week 12, change in 6MWT, or change in quality of life scores, meeting noninferiority.

### **Observational Studies**

Nkonde-Price et al (2022) conducted a retrospective study of virtual cardiac rehabilitation compared to traditional cardiac rehabilitation in a cohort of 2556 patients with cardiovascular disease.<sup>53</sup> Virtual cardiac rehabilitation consisted of HBCR using a mobile phone application linked to a wearable smartwatch, self-directed exercise sessions, weekly nurse phone calls, and health education for 8 weeks. The primary outcome, all-cause hospitalization during 12 months of follow-up, was lower in patients who experienced the virtual cardiac rehabilitation program compared to traditional outpatient cardiac rehabilitation (14.8% vs. 18.1%; OR, 0.79; 95% CI, 0.64 to 0.97;  $p=.03$ ). There was no difference between groups in 30-day or 90-day all-cause or cardiovascular hospitalization. Mortality was not addressed.

Shah et al (2024) conducted a retrospective study (N=3006) that compared outcomes and costs of virtual cardiac rehabilitation and center-based cardiac rehabilitation within a single health system.<sup>54</sup> The outcomes of interest were 1-year mortality, recurrent myocardial infarction, all-cause hospital readmission, and emergency department visits. Over a 2-year period, virtual cardiac rehabilitation was associated with a lower rate of all-cause hospital readmission (incident rate ratio, 0.616; 95% CI, 0.489 to 0.777;  $p<.001$ ) and emergency department visits (incident rate ratio, 0.557; 95% CI, 0.452 to 0.687;  $p<.001$ ) at 1 year compared to center-based cardiac rehabilitation. There was no difference in myocardial infarction or all-cause mortality between rehabilitation settings. Medical costs ( $p=.0144$ ) and total costs ( $p=.0176$ ) were lower with virtual cardiac rehabilitation than center-based cardiac rehabilitation.

Wang et al (2024) conducted a retrospective review of 6868 patients who were referred for HBCR.<sup>55</sup> Of these, 4557 enrolled in HBCR (3835 completed the program) and 2311 did not enroll. The mean duration of follow-up was 2.28 years (range, 0.02 to 3.75 years). All-cause mortality (HR, 0.57; 95% CI, 0.47 to 0.69;  $p<.0001$ ) and hospitalization (HR, 0.70; 95% CI, 0.62 to 0.78;  $p<.0001$ ) were significantly lower among patients who completed HBCR than those who did not enroll. All-cause mortality (HR, 0.57; 95% CI, 0.43 to 0.75;  $p<.0001$ ) and hospitalization (HR, 0.73; 95% CI, 0.62 to 0.85;  $p<.0001$ ) were also lower among patients who completed HBCR compared to those who enrolled but did not complete the HBCR program.

### **Section Summary: Virtual Cardiac Rehabilitation**

Systematic reviews and RCTs suggest that virtual cardiac rehabilitation may have similar effects on cardiovascular outcomes compared to standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation, but evidence about the effect on hospital readmission is inconsistent. One RCT in patients with heart failure found no difference between virtual cardiac rehabilitation and standard outpatient cardiac rehabilitation on the primary outcome of days alive and out of the hospital. No RCTs have been adequately powered to detect or reported a difference in all-cause mortality or cardiovascular mortality.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

The purpose of the following information is to provide reference material. Inclusion does not imply endorsement or alignment with the evidence review conclusions.

### **Practice Guidelines and Position Statements**

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in 'Supplemental Information' if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

### **American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association**

The 2022 American College of Cardiology (ACC) and the American Heart Association (AHA) heart failure (HF) guidelines recommend rehabilitation for Stage C HF stating, "In patients with HF, a cardiac rehabilitation program can be useful to improve functional capacity, exercise tolerance, and health-related QOL [quality of life]."<sup>56</sup> In 2023, the ACC/AHA published a statement on supervised exercise training specific to patients with chronic heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF) and concluded, "data reviewed herein demonstrate a comparable or larger magnitude of improvement in exercise capacity from supervised exercise training in patients with chronic HFpEF compared with those with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction."<sup>57</sup>

### **American Heart Association**

In 2024, the AHA and the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation issued an updated consensus statement on the core components of cardiac rehabilitation programs.<sup>58</sup> The core components included patient assessment before beginning the program, nutritional counseling, weight management and body composition, blood pressure management, lipid management, diabetes management, tobacco cessation, psychosocial management, aerobic exercise training, strength training, physical activity counseling, and program quality. Programs that only offered supervised exercise training were not considered cardiac rehabilitation. The guidelines specified the assessment, interventions, and expected outcomes for each of the core components. For example, symptom-limited exercise testing before exercise training was strongly recommended. The guidelines did not specify the optimal overall length of programs or the number or duration of sessions.

In 2019, the AHA, with the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation and the ACC, released a scientific statement on home-based cardiac rehabilitation (HBCR).<sup>59</sup> They make the following suggestions for healthcare providers:

- Recommend center-based cardiac rehabilitation (CBCR) to all eligible patients.
- As an alternative, recommend HBCR to clinically stable low- and moderate-risk patients who cannot attend CBCR.
- Design and test HBCR "using effective processes of care for CVD [cardiovascular disease] secondary prevention."
- For healthcare organizations, develop and support the following:
  - Maximization of cardiac rehabilitation (CR) referrals
  - High-quality CBCR and HBCR programs "using evidence-based standards and guidelines, strategies to maximize patient adherence both in the shorter and longer-term, and outcome tracking methods to help promote continuous quality improvement."
  - "Testing and implementation of an evidence-based hybrid approach to CR" that are optimized for each patient and that "promote long-term adherence and favorable behavior change."

- For CR professionals, “work with other healthcare professionals and policymakers to implement additional research and...expand the evidence base for HBCR.”

The guideline does not use the terminology "virtual" cardiac rehabilitation, but it states that electronic tools such as text messaging, smartphone applications, and wearable sensors may allow patients to follow personalized recommendations for exercise, dietary, and behavioral interventions, and thus expand the number of patients who can participate in cardiac rehabilitation. Other benefits of technology-assisted HBCR include greater patient engagement and patient-provider communication. The panel stated that studies were needed regarding the effect of technology-assisted HBCR on outcomes.

### **U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations**

Not applicable.

### **Cardiac Rehabilitation**

Since 1989, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) has had a national coverage determination (NCD) for cardiac rehabilitation. The NCD was retired in April 2023. CMS periodically retires NCDs that no longer contain clinically pertinent and/or current information or no longer reflect current medical practice. In the absence of NCDs, coverage determinations are made by the Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs) under section 1862(a)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act.<sup>60</sup>

In October 2020, virtual cardiac rehabilitation and intensive cardiac rehabilitation were added to the list of telehealth services that Medicare would cover during the COVID-19 public health emergency.<sup>61</sup> Virtual cardiac rehabilitation was only covered through the end of 2024.<sup>62,63</sup>

### **Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation**

In January 2010, Medicare added intensive cardiac rehabilitation as a benefit. Intensive cardiac rehabilitation programs must be approved by Medicare on an individual basis.<sup>64</sup>

The national coverage determination described intensive cardiac rehabilitation in the following manner:

“Intensive cardiac rehabilitation (ICR) refers to a physician-supervised program that furnishes cardiac rehabilitation services more frequently and often in a more rigorous manner. As required by §1861(eee)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (the Act), an ICR program must show, in peer-reviewed published research, that it accomplished 1 or more of the following for its patients: (1) positively affected the progression of coronary heart disease; (2) reduced the need for coronary bypass surgery; and, (3) reduced the need for percutaneous coronary interventions. The ICR program must also demonstrate through peer-reviewed published research that it accomplished a statistically significant reduction in 5 or more of the following measures for patients from their levels before cardiac rehabilitation services to after cardiac rehabilitation services: (1) low density lipoprotein; (2) triglycerides; (3) body mass index; (4) systolic blood pressure; (5) diastolic blood pressure; and, (6) the need for cholesterol, blood pressure, and diabetes medications. Individual ICR programs must be approved through the national coverage determination process to ensure that they demonstrate these accomplishments.”

In 2010, CMS also issued 2 decision memos on specific programs. One stated that the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease met the ICR program requirements and was included on the

list of approved intensive cardiac rehabilitation programs.<sup>64</sup> It provided the following description of the Ornish Program: "The Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease (also known as the Multisite Cardiac Lifestyle Intervention Program, Multicenter Cardiac Lifestyle Intervention Program and the Lifestyle Heart Trial program) ... incorporates comprehensive lifestyle modifications including exercise, a low-fat diet, smoking cessation, stress management training, and group support sessions. Over the years, the Ornish program has been refined but continues to focus on these specific risk factors."

The other stated that the Pritikin Program met program requirements and was included on the list of approved ICR programs.<sup>65</sup> As described in the decision memo: "The Pritikin program (also known as the Pritikin Longevity Program) evolved into a comprehensive program that is provided in a physician's office and incorporates a specific diet (10% to 15% of calories from fat, 15% to 20% from protein, 65% to 75% from complex carbohydrates), exercise and counseling lasting 21 to 26 days. An optional residential component is also available for participants."

In 2014, CMS issued another decision memo on the Benson-Henry Institute Cardiac Wellness Program.<sup>66</sup> The memo stated that "the evidence is sufficient to expand the intensive care rehabilitation benefit to include the Benson-Henry Institute Cardiac Wellness Program. The Cardiac Wellness Program is a multicomponent intervention program that includes supervised exercise, behavioral interventions, and counseling, and is designed to reduce cardiovascular risk and improve health outcomes."

### Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

Some currently ongoing and unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 9.

**Table 9. Summary of Key Trials**

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
<i>Ongoing</i>			
NCT06077201	Home-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation Using a Novel Mobile Health Exercise Regimen Following Transcatheter Heart Valve Interventions	375	Oct 2026
NCT05933083	MCNAIR Study: coMparative effeCtiveness of iN-person and teleheAlth cardIac Rehabilitation	516	Oct 2027
NCT05972070 <sup>a</sup>	Integration of Telemedicine and Home-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation: Feasibility, Efficacy, and Adherence	500	Dec 2025
NCT04245813	Effectiveness of a Cardiac Rehabilitation Program in Patients With Heart Failure	144	May 2023 (unknown status)
NCT02984449	Preventive Heart Rehabilitation in Patients Undergoing Elective Open Heart Surgery to Prevent Complications and to Improve Quality of Life (Heart-ROCQ) - A Prospective Randomized Open Controlled Trial, Blinded End-point (PROBE)	350	Aug 2025
NCT05689385	The Effectiveness of eHealth-based Cardiac Rehabilitation in Post-myocardial Infarction Patients: a Randomized Controlled Trial	150	Dec 2028

NCT: national clinical trial.

<sup>a</sup> Indicates industry sponsored or cosponsored trial.

**CODING**

**The following codes for treatment and procedures applicable to this policy are included below for informational purposes. This may not be a comprehensive list of procedure codes applicable to this policy.**

**Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. 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 it applies to an individual member.**

**The code(s) listed below are medically necessary ONLY if the procedure is performed according to the "Policy" section of this document.**

<b>CPT/HCPCS</b>	
93797	Physician services for outpatient cardiac rehabilitation; without continuous ECG monitoring (per session)
93798	Physician services for outpatient cardiac rehabilitation; with continuous ECG monitoring (per session)
G0422	Intensive cardiac rehabilitation; with or without continuous ECG monitoring with exercise, per session
G0423	Intensive cardiac rehabilitation; with or without continuous ECG monitoring; without exercise, per session

<b>REVISIONS</b>	
08-17-2010	Policy added to the bcbsks.com web site.
09-24-2012	Description section updated.
	In the Policy section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In Item E, added "It is preferable that programs start within 90 days of the cardiac event and be completed within 6 months of the cardiac event."</li> </ul>
	Rationale section updated. Reference section updated.
12-11-2013	Added Medical Policy and Coding Disclaimers.
	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In Item A, added #7, "Compensated heart failure".</li> </ul>
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Added ICD-10 Diagnosis codes (<i>Effective October 1, 2014</i>)</li> </ul>
Updated Reference section.	
07-15-2014	Description section updated
	In Policy section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Added to A 7 "(Stable congestive heart failure with left ventricular ejection fraction of 35% or less and New York Heart Association (NYHA) class II to IV symptoms despite being on optimal heart failure therapy for at least 6 weeks)" to define compensated heart failure.</li> </ul>
	Revision section updated
	References updated

<b>REVISIONS</b>	
09-23-2015	Title of policy changed from "Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs"
	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In Item A, removed "items and services" and "who have experienced one or more" and added "outpatient", "programs," "with a history", and "conditions and procedures", to read "Outpatient cardiac rehabilitation programs are considered medically necessary for patients with a history of the following conditions and procedures:"</li> <li>▪ In Item A 1, added "(MI) (heart attack)", to read "An acute myocardial infarction (MI) (heart attack) within the preceding 12 months; OR"</li> <li>▪ In Item A 2, added "graft (CABG)", to read "A coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgery; OR"</li> <li>▪ In Item A 4, added "surgery" and removed "repair or replacement", to read "Heart valve surgery; OR"</li> <li>▪ In Item A 6, added "OR", to read "A heart or heart-lung transplant; OR"</li> <li>▪ In Item A 7, removed "(Stable congestive heart failure with left ventricular ejection fraction of 35% or less and New York Heart Association (NYHA) class II to IV symptoms despite being on optimal heart failure therapy for at least 6 weeks)"</li> <li>▪ In Item B 2, removed ", including education, counseling, and behavioral intervention at least once during the program, tailored to patients' individual needs", to read "Cardiac risk modification"</li> <li>▪ In Item B 5, removed "for each patient", to read "An individualized treatment plan detailing how components are utilized."</li> </ul>
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Removed bullet stating "A single initial visit with the physician for referral to a program may be allowed under CPT code 99215."</li> </ul>
	Updated References section.
11-24-2015	In Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Removed ICD-10 code I20.0.</li> </ul>
	Updated References section.
05-11-2016	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Previous Policy Items B, C, D, E, and F were moved to Policy Guidelines section.</li> <li>▪ In Policy Guidelines, added "each of the above" to Item 1 (previous Policy Item B) to read "An individualized treatment plan detailing how each of the above components are utilized."</li> </ul>
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
08-18-2017	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Added new Item C, "Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease or Pritikin Program is considered experimental / investigational."</li> <li>▪ In Policy Guidelines, removed "Note: This policy does not address programs considered to be "intensive cardiac rehabilitation programs," such as the Dean Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease and the Pritikin Program."</li> </ul>
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Added HCPCS codes: G0422, G0423.</li> </ul>
	Updated References section.

<b>REVISIONS</b>	
10-01-2017	In Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added ICD-10 codes: I21.A1, I50.810, I50.811, I50.812, I50.813, I50.814, I50.82, I50.83, I50.84.</li> </ul>
04-11-2018	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removed ICD-9 codes.</li> </ul>
	Updated References section.
04-24-2019	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
03-23-2021	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
06-03-2022	Updated Description Section
	Updated Policy Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added "or Benson-Henry Institute Program" to the statement "Intensive cardiac rehabilitation with the Ornish Program for Reversing Heart Disease or Pritikin Program is considered experimental / investigational."</li> </ul>
	Updated Policy Guideline Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duration of the Program: changed wording to read "A cardiac rehabilitation exercise program is eligible for coverage for 3 sessions per week up to a 12-week period (36 sessions). Programs should start within 90 days of the cardiac event and be completed within 6 months of the cardiac event."</li> </ul>
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated Coding Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Converted ICD-10 codes to ranges</li> <li>Added ICD-10 codes Z94.1, Z94.3, Z95.1, Z95.2, Z95.4, Z95.5, Z98.61</li> </ul>
	Updated References Section
11-9-2022	Updated Policy Guideline Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duration of the Program: Removed: "Programs should start within 90 days of the cardiac event and be completed within 6 months of the cardiac event." from criteria</li> </ul>
05-25-2023	Updated Description Section
	Updated Policy Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added Section E: "Virtual cardiac rehabilitation is considered experimental / investigational."</li> </ul>
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated Coding Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removed the ICD-10 Codes</li> </ul>
	Updated References Section
Posted 04-23-2024 Effective 05-23-2024	Updated Description Section
	Updated Policy Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added Section F: "Outpatient cardiac rehabilitation is considered experimental / investigational for all other indications (e.g., SARS-CoV-2)."</li> </ul>
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated References Section
05-13-2025	Updated Description Section
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated References Section

<b>REVISIONS</b>	
06-09-2026	Updated Description Section
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated References Section

## REFERENCES

1. Martin SS, Aday AW, Almarzooq ZI, et al. 2024 Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics: A Report of US and Global Data From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. Feb 20 2024; 149(8): e347-e913. PMID 38264914
2. Balady GJ, Williams MA, Ades PA, et al. Core components of cardiac rehabilitation/secondary prevention programs: 2007 update: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Exercise, Cardiac Rehabilitation, and Prevention Committee, the Council on Clinical Cardiology; the Councils on Cardiovascular Nursing, Epidemiology and Prevention, and Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism; and the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation. *Circulation*. May 22 2007; 115(20): 2675-82. PMID 17513578
3. Corrà U, Piepoli MF, Carré F, et al. Secondary prevention through cardiac rehabilitation: physical activity counselling and exercise training: key components of the position paper from the Cardiac Rehabilitation Section of the European Association of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation. *Eur Heart J*. Aug 2010; 31(16): 1967-74. PMID 20643803
4. Leon AS, Franklin BA, Costa F, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation and secondary prevention of coronary heart disease: an American Heart Association scientific statement from the Council on Clinical Cardiology (Subcommittee on Exercise, Cardiac Rehabilitation, and Prevention) and the Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism (Subcommittee on Physical Activity), in collaboration with the American association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation. *Circulation*. Jan 25 2005; 111(3): 369-76. PMID 15668354
5. Lindenfeld J, Albert NM, Boehmer JP, et al. HFSA 2010 Comprehensive Heart Failure Practice Guideline. *J Card Fail*. Jun 2010; 16(6): e1-194. PMID 20610207
6. Oldridge N. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation in patients with coronary heart disease: meta-analysis outcomes revisited. *Future Cardiol*. Sep 2012; 8(5): 729-51. PMID 23013125
7. Anderson L, Thompson DR, Oldridge N, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for coronary heart disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Jan 05 2016; 2016(1): CD001800. PMID 26730878
8. Davies EJ, Moxham T, Rees K, et al. Exercise based rehabilitation for heart failure. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Apr 14 2010; (4): CD003331. PMID 20393935
9. Heran BS, Chen JM, Ebrahim S, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for coronary heart disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Jul 06 2011; (7): CD001800. PMID 21735386
10. Dibben G, Faulkner J, Oldridge N, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for coronary heart disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Nov 06 2021; 11(11): CD001800. PMID 34741536
11. Long L, Mordi IR, Bridges C, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for adults with heart failure. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Jan 29 2019; 1(1): CD003331. PMID 30695817
12. Molloy CD, Long L, Mordi IR, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for adults with heart failure - 2023 Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Heart Fail*. Dec 2023; 25(12): 2263-2273. PMID 37850321

13. Molloy C, Long L, Mordi IR, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for adults with heart failure. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Mar 07 2024; 3(3): CD003331. PMID 38451843
14. West RR, Jones DA, Henderson AH. Rehabilitation after myocardial infarction trial (RAMIT): multi-centre randomised controlled trial of comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation in patients following acute myocardial infarction. *Heart*. Apr 2012; 98(8): 637-44. PMID 22194152
15. Doherty P, Lewin R. The RAMIT trial, a pragmatic RCT of cardiac rehabilitation versus usual care: what does it tell us?. *Heart*. Apr 2012; 98(8): 605-6. PMID 22505460
16. Pandey A, Kitzman DW, Brubaker P, et al. Response to Endurance Exercise Training in Older Adults with Heart Failure with Preserved or Reduced Ejection Fraction. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. Aug 2017; 65(8): 1698-1704. PMID 28338229
17. Kitzman DW, Brubaker PH, Morgan TM, et al. Exercise training in older patients with heart failure and preserved ejection fraction: a randomized, controlled, single-blind trial. *Circ Heart Fail*. Nov 2010; 3(6): 659-67. PMID 20852060
18. Opotowsky AR, Rhodes J, Landzberg MJ, et al. A Randomized Trial Comparing Cardiac Rehabilitation to Standard of Care for Adults With Congenital Heart Disease. *World J Pediatr Congenit Heart Surg*. Mar 2018; 9(2): 185-193. PMID 29544423
19. Sumner J, Harrison A, Doherty P. The effectiveness of modern cardiac rehabilitation: A systematic review of recent observational studies in non-attenders versus attenders. *PLoS One*. 2017; 12(5): e0177658. PMID 28498869
20. Nilsson BB, Lunde P, Grøgaard HK, et al. Long-Term Results of High-Intensity Exercise-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation in Revascularized Patients for Symptomatic Coronary Artery Disease. *Am J Cardiol*. Jan 01 2018; 121(1): 21-26. PMID 29096886
21. Jafri SH, Imran TF, Medbury E, et al. Cardiovascular Outcomes of Patients Referred to Home Based Cardiac Rehabilitation. *Heart Lung*. 2022; 52: 1-7. PMID 34801771
22. Ornish D, Brown SE, Scherwitz LW, et al. Can lifestyle changes reverse coronary heart disease? The Lifestyle Heart Trial. *Lancet*. Jul 21 1990; 336(8708): 129-33. PMID 1973470
23. Ornish D, Scherwitz LW, Billings JH, et al. Intensive lifestyle changes for reversal of coronary heart disease. *JAMA*. Dec 16 1998; 280(23): 2001-7. PMID 9863851
24. Lakhani F, Racette SB, Park LK, et al. Prospective Study of the Impact of Outpatient Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation on Diet Quality, Health-related Quality of Life, and Cardiovascular Health Indices. *Am J Cardiol*. Apr 01 2023; 192: 60-66. PMID 36736014
25. Racette SB, Park LK, Rashdi ST, et al. Benefits of the First Pritikin Outpatient Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation Program. *J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev*. Nov 01 2022; 42(6): 449-455. PMID 35861951
26. Zeng W, Stason WB, Fournier S, et al. Benefits and costs of intensive lifestyle modification programs for symptomatic coronary disease in Medicare beneficiaries. *Am Heart J*. May 2013; 165(5): 785-92. PMID 23622916
27. Casey A, Chang BH, Huddleston J, et al. A model for integrating a mind/body approach to cardiac rehabilitation: outcomes and correlators. *J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev*. 2009; 29(4): 230-8; quiz 239-40. PMID 19451830
28. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Clinical Overview of Long COVID. July 24, 2025; <https://www.cdc.gov/covid/hcp/clinical-overview/index.html>. Accessed February 3, 2026.
29. Soriano JB, Murthy S, Marshall JC, et al. A clinical case definition of post-COVID-19 condition by a Delphi consensus. *Lancet Infect Dis*. Apr 2022; 22(4): e102-e107. PMID 34951953

30. Jin Choo Y, Chang MC. Effects of telecardiac rehabilitation on coronary heart disease: A PRISMA-compliant systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Jul 15 2022; 101(28): e29459. PMID 35839029
31. Nacarato D, Sardeli AV, Mariano LO, et al. Cardiovascular telerehabilitation improves functional capacity, cardiorespiratory fitness and quality of life in older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Telemed Telecare*. Sep 2024; 30(8): 1238-1248. PMID 36469017
32. Cavalheiro AH, Silva Cardoso J, Rocha A, et al. Effectiveness of Tele-rehabilitation Programs in Heart Failure: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Health Serv Insights*. 2021; 14: 11786329211021668. PMID 34188484
33. Cruz-Cobo C, Bernal-Jiménez MÁ, Vázquez-García R, et al. Effectiveness of mHealth Interventions in the Control of Lifestyle and Cardiovascular Risk Factors in Patients After a Coronary Event: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. Dec 02 2022; 10(12): e39593. PMID 36459396
34. Maulana S, Trisyani Y, Mirwanti R, et al. The Potential of Cardiac Telerehabilitation as Delivery Rehabilitation Care Model in Heart Failure during COVID-19 and Transmissible Disease Outbreak: A Systematic Scoping Review of the Latest RCTs. *Medicina (Kaunas)*. Sep 21 2022; 58(10). PMID 36295482
35. Ramachandran HJ, Jiang Y, Tam WWS, et al. Effectiveness of home-based cardiac telerehabilitation as an alternative to Phase 2 cardiac rehabilitation of coronary heart disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. May 25 2022; 29(7): 1017-1043. PMID 34254118
36. Pagliari C, Isernia S, Rapisarda L, et al. Different Models of Cardiac Telerehabilitation for People with Coronary Artery Disease: Features and Effectiveness: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Clin Med*. Jun 10 2024; 13(12). PMID 38929925
37. McDonagh ST, Dalal H, Moore S, et al. Home-based versus centre-based cardiac rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Oct 27 2023; 10(10): CD007130. PMID 37888805
38. Zhou M, Xu Y, Zhang L, et al. Effectiveness of smartphone-assisted cardiac rehabilitation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Disabil Rehabil*. Jul 2024; 46(15): 3256-3265. PMID 37559408
39. Li L, Ringeval M, Wagner G, et al. Effectiveness of home-based cardiac rehabilitation interventions delivered via mHealth technologies: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Digit Health*. Apr 2025; 7(4): e238-e254. PMID 40023729
40. Nagatomi Y, Ide T, Higuchi T, et al. Home-based cardiac rehabilitation using information and communication technology for heart failure patients with frailty. *ESC Heart Fail*. Aug 2022; 9(4): 2407-2418. PMID 35534907
41. Brouwers RWM, Kemps HMC, Herkert C, et al. A 12-week cardiac telerehabilitation programme does not prevent relapse of physical activity levels: long-term results of the FIT@Home trial. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. May 25 2022; 29(7): e255-e257. PMID 35040993
42. Brouwers RWM, Kraal JJ, Regis M, et al. Effectiveness of Cardiac Telerehabilitation With Relapse Prevention: SmartCare-CAD Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jun 01 2021; 77(21): 2754-2756. PMID 34045031
43. Indraratna P, Biswas U, McVeigh J, et al. A Smartphone-Based Model of Care to Support Patients With Cardiac Disease Transitioning From Hospital to the Community (TeleClinical Care): Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. Feb 28 2022; 10(2): e32554. PMID 35225819

44. Snoek JA, Prescott EI, van der Velde AE, et al. Effectiveness of Home-Based Mobile Guided Cardiac Rehabilitation as Alternative Strategy for Nonparticipation in Clinic-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation Among Elderly Patients in Europe: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Cardiol.* Apr 01 2021; 6(4): 463-468. PMID 33112363
45. Piotrowicz E, Pencina MJ, Opolski G, et al. Effects of a 9-Week Hybrid Comprehensive Telerehabilitation Program on Long-term Outcomes in Patients With Heart Failure: The Telerehabilitation in Heart Failure Patients (TELEREH-HF) Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Cardiol.* Mar 01 2020; 5(3): 300-308. PMID 31734701
46. Yudi MB, Clark DJ, Tsang D, et al. SMARTphone-based, early cardiac REHAbilitation in patients with acute coronary syndromes: a randomized controlled trial. *Coron Artery Dis.* Aug 01 2021; 32(5): 432-440. PMID 32868661
47. Hakala S, Kivistö H, Paajanen T, et al. Effectiveness of Distance Technology in Promoting Physical Activity in Cardiovascular Disease Rehabilitation: Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial, A Pilot Study. *JMIR Rehabil Assist Technol.* Jun 18 2021; 8(2): e20299. PMID 34142970
48. Dalli Peydró E, Sanz Sevilla N, Tuzón Segarra MT, et al. A randomized controlled clinical trial of cardiac telerehabilitation with a prolonged mobile care monitoring strategy after an acute coronary syndrome. *Clin Cardiol.* Jan 2022; 45(1): 31-41. PMID 34952989
49. Maddison R, Rawstorn JC, Stewart RAH, et al. Effects and costs of real-time cardiac telerehabilitation: randomised controlled non-inferiority trial. *Heart.* Jan 2019; 105(2): 122-129. PMID 30150328
50. Lear SA, Singer J, Banner-Lukaris D, et al. Randomized trial of a virtual cardiac rehabilitation program delivered at a distance via the Internet. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes.* Nov 2014; 7(6): 952-9. PMID 25271050
51. Dodson JA, Adhikari S, Schoenthaler A, et al. Rehabilitation at Home Using Mobile Health for Older Adults Hospitalized for Ischemic Heart Disease: The RESILIENT Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open.* Jan 02 2025; 8(1): e2453499. PMID 39775808
52. Schmidt C, Magalhães S, Gois Basilio P, et al. Center- vs Home-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation in Patients With Heart Failure: EXIT-HF Randomized Controlled Trial. *JACC Heart Fail.* May 2025; 13(5): 695-706. PMID 39895436
53. Nkonde-Price C, Reynolds K, Najem M, et al. Comparison of Home-Based vs Center-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation in Hospitalization, Medication Adherence, and Risk Factor Control Among Patients With Cardiovascular Disease. *JAMA Netw Open.* Aug 01 2022; 5(8): e2228720. PMID 36006642
54. Shah ND, Banta CW, Berger AL, et al. Retrospective Comparison of Outcomes and Cost of Virtual Versus Center-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs. *J Am Heart Assoc.* Dec 17 2024; 13(24): e036861. PMID 39673292
55. Wang Z, Elkoustaf R, Batiste C, et al. Home based cardiac rehabilitation: A retrospective cohort analysis on all-cause mortality and hospital readmission rates across sexes and races. *Am J Prev Cardiol.* Sep 2024; 19: 100708. PMID 39157645
56. Heidenreich PA, Bozkurt B, Aguilar D, et al. 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* May 03 2022; 79(17): e263-e421. PMID 35379503
57. Sachdev V, Sharma K, Keteyian SJ, et al. Supervised Exercise Training for Chronic Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association and American College of Cardiology. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Apr 18 2023; 81(15): 1524-1542. PMID 36958952

58. Brown TM, Pack QR, Aberegg E, et al. Core Components of Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs: 2024 Update: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association and the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation. *Circulation*. Oct 29 2024; 150(18): e328-e347. PMID 39315436
59. Thomas RJ, Beatty AL, Beckie TM, et al. Home-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation: A Scientific Statement From the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation, the American Heart Association, and the American College of Cardiology. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jul 09 2019; 74(1): 133-153. PMID 31097258
60. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs (20.31). 2010; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/view/ncd.aspx?NCDId=339&ncdver=1&fromdb=true>. Accessed January 31, 2026.
61. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Trump Administration Drives Telehealth Services in Medicaid and Medicare. October 14, 2020. <https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/press-releases/trump-administration-drives-telehealth-services-medicare-and-medicare>. Accessed January 26, 2026.
62. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. List of Telehealth Services. Updated December 4, 2025. <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Medicare-General-Information/Telehealth/Telehealth-Codes>. Accessed January 27, 2026.
63. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Billing and Coding: Outpatient Cardiac Rehabilitation. Retired November 1, 2023. [https://localcoverage.cms.gov/mcd\\_archive/view/article.aspx?articleInfo=54070:43&](https://localcoverage.cms.gov/mcd_archive/view/article.aspx?articleInfo=54070:43&). Accessed January 29, 2026.
64. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Decision Memo for Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation (ICR) Program - Dr. Ornish's Program for Reversing Heart Disease (CAG-00419N). 2010; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/view/ncacal-decision-memo.aspx?proposed=N&NCAId=240&NcaName=Intensive+Cardiac+Rehabilitation+%28ICR%29+Program+-+Dr.+Ornish>. Accessed February 2, 2026.
65. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Decision Memo for Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation (ICR) Program - Pritikin Program (CAG-00418N). 2010; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/view/ncacal-decision-memo.aspx?proposed=N&NCAId=239&bc=AiAAAAAAAgAAAA%28>. Accessed February 1, 2026.
66. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Decision Memo: Intensive Cardiac Rehabilitation (ICR) Program - Benson-Henry Institute Cardiac Wellness Program. May 6, 2014. <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/view/ncacal-decision-memo.aspx?proposed=N&ncaid=271>. Accessed January 28, 2026.

## OTHER REFERENCES

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Cardiology Liaison Committee, April 2010; May 2014; May 2015; July 2016; May 2018, July 2022.