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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>184</td>
<td>08/04/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>496</td>
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<td>186</td>
<td>05/20/20</td>
</tr>
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CERVICAL AND LUMBAR SPINAL FUSION WITH OR WITHOUT SPINAL DECOMPRESSION

Policy # 622
Implementation Date: 1/1/18
Review Dates: 2/21/19, 2/17/20, 2/18/21, 1/7/22
Revision Dates: 2/16/18, 1/29/19, 5/1/19, 11/20/19, 2/21/20, 6/8/21, 9/24/21, 10/8/21, 12/13/21, 1/13/22, 3/3/22

Related Medical Policies:
#450 Axial Lumbar Interbody Fusion (AXIALIF)
#320 Interspinous Distraction Devices/Spacers
#558 Interspinous Fixation (Fusion) Devices
#243 Artificial Spinal Disc Replacement
#446 Image Guided Lumbar Decompression (e.g., Minimally Invasive Lumbar Decompression [mild])
#209 Percutaneous Disc Decompression Procedures

Description
Cervical and lumbar fusion is a surgery that joins or fuses the vertebrae in the neck and back. It is performed through an incision on the front (anterior) or back (posterior). Fusion is often performed when the vertebrae become damaged due to injury or chronic degenerative changes, leading to compression of the spinal cord or the nerve root. The expected outcome from cervical fusion is stabilization of the vertebrae and alleviation of pain and/or weakness resulting from vertebral instability.

Bone grafts are often used, taken from elsewhere in the body or received from a bone bank. Metal implants can be used to hold the vertebrae together until new bone grows between them. Metal plates can be screwed into adjacent vertebrae to join them.

Clinical complications of fusion surgery include infection, injury to the nerves, broken or loosened plates, screws or implants, injury to the spinal cord, possible need for additional surgery due to non-union of fused material due to adjacent segment breakdown, and/or increased pain.

The lifetime incidence of low back pain (LBP) in the general population is reported to be 60% to 90%. According to the National Center for Health Statistics, each year, 14.3% of new patient visits to primary care physicians are for LBP, and nearly 13 million physician visits are related to complaints of chronic LBP. The causes of LBP are numerous.

The initial evaluation of patients with LBP involves ruling out potentially serious conditions such as infection, malignancy, spinal fracture, a rapidly progressing neurologic deficit suggestive of the cauda equina syndrome, bowel or bladder dysfunction, or weakness, which suggest the need for early diagnostic testing. Patients without these conditions are initially managed with conservative therapy.

Chronic LBP that persists despite ongoing conservative treatment and nonsurgical back specialist treatment is best managed using a team approach. This includes physical therapy, physiatry (PM&R), anesthesia with pain subspecialty or neurology with pain subspecialty, and mental health support if indicated. Occasionally, surgical intervention is necessary.

Low back pain stages:
Acute LBP: Pain < 6 weeks
Cervical and Lumbar Spinal Fusion and Combined Decompression/Fusion, continued

**Subacute LBP**: Continued pain after 6 weeks, but patient continues to function well, and core treatment provides some relief; patient may also be receiving nonsurgical back specialist treatment at this stage.

**Chronic LBP**: Core LBP treatment has failed, nonsurgical back specialist treatment has not helped, and persistent pain interferes with function and alters the patient’s life.

### Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children’s Health Insurance Program)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual’s benefit coverage at the time of the request.

SelectHealth **covers cervical/lumbar spinal fusion and combined decompression/fusion if any ONE of the following criteria are met (1–7):**

1. Acute traumatic spine injury with evidence of instability and stabilization not achievable by closed means and **ANY** one of the following:
   - Vertebral fracture which includes fracture of vertebral body/posterior elements and subluxation; or
   - Vertebral dislocation; or
   - Ligamentous disruption.

2. Motor deficit or severe radicular pain due to myelopathy with cord compression confirmed by imaging and decompressive surgery expected to result in instability along with **ANY** of the following:
   - Weakness or severe radicular pain; or
   - Bowel or bladder dysfunction; or
   - Spasticity; or
   - Bilateral loss of dexterity; or
   - Gait disturbance.

3. Vertebral body destruction (confirmed by imaging, for which correction will cause instability) this includes:
   - Resolved osteomyelitis; or
   - Resolved discitis/epidural abscess; or
   - Tumor of spine or spinal cord.

4. Non-traumatic instability, adult deformity, severe foraminal stenosis, or disc disease, or non-union from previous fusion with **motor deficit or severe radicular pain and (Either A or B):**
   - Motor strength, at least 3/5 weakness
   - **OR**
   - **B.** **ALL** the following:
     a) Interferes with ADLs
     b) **ANY** one of the following three (i, ii, or iii):
        i. Translation on x-ray or MRI > 3mm, > 15% or 22 degrees for lumbar; or
        ii. > 3mm, > 20% or 11 degrees for cervical; or
iii. Disc disease supported by imaging.

c) Pain continues after 6 weeks of non-operative therapy including ALL the following (unless contraindicated/not tolerated):
   i. Analgesics, and
   ii. Activity modification, and
   iii. Physical therapy or chiropractic therapy (minimum of 4 visits over a 6-week period), and
   iv. Evaluation for spinal injection.

5. Non-traumatic instability, adult deformity, severe foraminal stenosis, disc disease, or non-union from previous fusion with NO motor deficit and ALL the following:
   A. Interferes with ADLs
   B. Instability supported by x-ray with ANY one of the following:
      a) Translation on x-ray or MRI > 3mm, > 15% or 22 degrees for lumbar; or
      b) > 3mm, > 20% or 11 degrees for cervical; or
      c) Disc disease supported by imaging.
   C. Pain continues for 6 months or more despite non-operative therapy, including at least 6 weeks of ALL the following (unless contraindicated/not tolerated):
      a) Analgesics, and
      b) Activity modification, and
      c) Physical therapy or chiropractic therapy (minimum of 4 visits over a 6-week period), and
      d) Evaluation for spinal injection
   D. Willingness to participate in outcomes database
   E. Tobacco smoking, which includes cigarette usage, e-cigarette usage, or vaping; and vaping of any other substances, must be discontinued >/= 3 months
   F. No psychiatric disorder by history or currently managed as confirmed by screening. If screening abnormal, must have formal evaluation with behavioral health professional
   G. Weight BMI < 40 (required for lumbar only)

6. Cauda Equina Syndrome with motor deficit or severe radicular pain and (BOTH A and B):
   A. Confirmed by imaging; AND
   B. ANY of the following:
      a) Bilateral lower extremity weakness or numbness or pain; or
      b) Bowel or bladder dysfunction and other etiologies excluded; or
      c) Diminished rectal sphincter tone by physical examination; or
      d) Perianal or perineal "saddle" anesthesia by physical examination.

7. Pediatric, age ≤ 21, with progressive deformity with cobb angle > 50 degrees or rapidly progressive curve and > 40 degrees
Neurology/Neurosurgery Policies, Continued

Cervical and Lumbar Spinal Fusion and Combined Decompression/Fusion, continued

**Note** - Separate evaluation is needed if any of the following are being used (please see related medical policies above):

1. Axial lumbar interbody fusion
2. Interspinous distraction devices/spacers
3. Interspinous fixation (fusion) devices
4. Percutaneous image-guided lumbar decompression

**SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)**

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website [http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&) or the manual website.

**SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)**

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php) or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

SelectHealth Community Care will follow the Commercial Plan Policy (Effective May 1, 2019)

**Summary of Medical Information**

The AANS (American Association of Neurological Surgeons) published guidelines in 2009 that used a systematic review of the National Library of Medicine and Cochrane database, regarding indications for anterior cervical decompression for the treatment of cervical degenerative radiculopathy. They state: “In the acute phase, nonoperative management is the mainstay, with success rates averaging 90%.” The AANS further states: “When clinical cervical radiculopathy is present with active nerve root compression visible on diagnostic imaging, the clinician often recommends surgical decompression if nonoperative measures have failed.” While they state that anterior nerve root decompression via anterior nerve root discectomy with or without fusion for radiculopathy is associated with rapid relief (3–4 months) compared with physical therapy, they acknowledge that at the 12-month point, comparable clinical improvements with PT or cervical immobilization are also present. They also acknowledge that there is insufficient data to factor in the cost of complications and any undesirable long-term effect related to the specific surgical intervention, such as adjacent segment disease.

In 2011, the ACOEM (American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine) issued guidelines on the diagnostic testing and management of cervical and thoracic spine disorders. MRI received the strongest ACOEM testing recommendation for patients with: acute cervical pain with progressive neurologic deficit, significant trauma with no improvement in significantly painful or debilitating symptoms, a history of neoplasia (cancer), multiple neurological abnormalities that span more than one neurological root level, previous neck surgery with increasing neurologic symptoms, fever with severe cervical pain, symptoms or signs of myelopathy, and subacute or chronic radicular pain syndromes lasting at least 4 to 6 weeks in whom dermatomal and myotomal symptoms are not trending towards improvement if either injection is being considered or both the patient and surgeon are considering early surgical treatment if supportive findings on MRI are found. For acute, subacute, and chronic cervicothoracic pain, ACOEM “A” (strong) or “B” (moderate) recommendations included strengthening, endurance and aerobic exercises, proton pump inhibitors, sucralfate, acetaminophen/aspiron, and manipulation/mobilization.
In 2013, Washington State Health Care Authority commissioned the ICER to evaluate the comparative clinical effectiveness and comparative value of spinal fusion and its alternatives in patients with cervical degenerative disc disease (DDD). The focus of this appraisal was on adults (> 17 years of age) with cervical DDD symptoms, including neck pain, arm pain, and/or radiculopathic symptoms (e.g., numbness, tingling); these symptoms could occur with or without the presence of spondylosis. In all cases, the target population was focused on patients whose symptoms have persisted despite an initial short course (i.e., 4–6 weeks) of self-care and conservative management.

ICER (Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio) conferred a “Comparable” rating for spinal fusion vs. conservative management for radiculopathic symptoms. They stated: “For patients with clinical symptoms of radiculopathy and radiographic evidence of nerve root compression there is not a large evidence base comparing outcomes between spinal fusion and conservative management.” We identified only 1 RCT and 1 comparative cohort study, neither of which stood out for their methodologic rigor, size, or generalizability. Despite variability in study design, entry criteria, and outcomes measured, findings were reasonably consistent. Specifically, spinal fusion appeared to provide faster relief of pain and symptoms than conservative management (i.e., physical therapy or cervical collar immobilization) in the short term.

Over time, however, these differences diminished and no material differences in outcome were observed by 12 months after intervention. ICER cited a Cochrane review by Nikolaidis and colleagues to determine whether surgical treatment of cervical radiculopathy or myelopathy was associated with improved outcome compared with conservative management. Two trials (N = 149) were included. In both trials, allocation concealment was inadequate and arrangements for blinding of outcome assessment were unclear. One trial (81 patients with cervical radiculopathy) found that surgical decompression was superior to physiotherapy or cervical collar immobilization in the short-term for pain, weakness or sensory loss; at one year, there were no significant differences between groups. One trial (68 patients with mild functional deficit associated with cervical myelopathy) found no significant differences between surgery and conservative treatment in three years following treatment. A substantial proportion of cases were lost to follow-up. The authors concluded that it was unclear whether the short-term risks of surgery are offset by long-term benefits. There was low quality evidence that surgery may provide pain relief faster than physiotherapy or hard collar immobilization in patients with cervical radiculopathy; but there is little or no difference in the long-term. There was very low-quality evidence that patients with mild myelopathy felt subjectively better shortly after surgery, but there was little or no difference in the long-term.

Because of this, and because spinal fusion may cause relatively rare but significant complications, we deemed the overall comparative clinical effectiveness of fusion to conservative management “Comparable.” In some patients, however, neck pain and related symptoms may be so severe and disabling that the faster relief potentially afforded by fusion surgery would also allow a quicker return to work and other normal activities. For such patients, fusion might in fact be considered “Incremental” in comparison to ongoing conservative management.

In analyzing data from randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and comparative cohorts, ICER found that the rate of harm and complications from cervical fusion were significantly greater than those from conservative treatment. Some of the highest rates of potential harm from fusion were events of infection (0–13%), adjacent segment disease (7–16%), paresthesia (14%), dysphagia (3–17%), pseudoarthrosis (8%), and neurological decline (3–23%). Conservative treatment harms were relatively minor, except for neurological decline (14.2%) and paresthesia (8%).

In a meta-analysis, Wu et al. stated that the traditional surgical method of ACDF (Anterior Cervical Discectomy Fusion) carries with it the disadvantages of motion loss at the operative level and accelerated adjacent level disc degeneration. They performed a meta-analysis comparing the long-term outcomes of cervical total disc arthroplasty (TDA) versus fusion. This review was prepared following the standard procedures set forth by the Cochrane Collaboration organization, and preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA). The only studies included were randomized controlled trials with a minimum of 4 years of follow-up data. The meta-analysis included the neck disability index (NDI), visual analog scale (VAS) of neck and arm pain, SF-36 physical component scores (SF-36 PCS), over success, neurological success, work status, implant-related complications, and secondary surgery events. Four randomized controlled trials met the inclusion criteria. The long-term improvement of NDI, VAS of neck and arm pain, SF-36 PCS, over success, and neurological success favored the TDA group. The TDA group also had a lower incidence of secondary surgery for both the index level and adjacent level. In this meta-analysis of 4 including RCTs with a minimum 4 years of follow-ups, total disc arthroplasty showed improvements over ACDF as measured by the NDI, VAS of neck and arm pain, and SF-36 PCS.
Adjacent segment disease (ASD) development is known to occur after anterior cervical discectomy and fusion. Bydon and colleagues (2014) retrospectively evaluated 888 individuals treated at a single institution over a 20-year period who underwent ACDF for cervical spondylosis. Of these individuals, 108 had re-do surgery as a result of symptomatic adjacent segment disease (ASD). Individuals were followed for an average of 92.4 ± 52.6 months after the index ACDF. Individuals were more likely to develop ASD, known to occur after ACDF, above the index level of fusion. In agreement with previous ACDF case series, they found the highest rate of cervical spinal degenerative disease requiring surgery was at C5/C6, followed by C6/C7. However, neither the inherent location of the index ACDF nor the length of instrumented arthrodesis appeared to correlate with the propensity to develop ASD.

Literature suggests that spinal fusion appears to provide faster relief of pain and symptoms than conservative management (i.e., physical therapy or cervical collar immobilization) in the first several months after the surgery. Over time, however, these differences diminished, and clinical outcomes of cervical fusion and conservative treatment were comparable at 12 months after the intervention. Additionally, spinal fusion may cause relatively rare but significant complications. Therefore, the first line of treatment for chronic cervical pain should be a comprehensive nonoperative approach. A non-emergent cervical spine fusion may be a consideration only after conservative therapy has failed and a physical examination and diagnostic imaging findings indicate neural compression at the appropriate level.

Guidelines for the approach to the initial evaluation of LBP have been issued by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (1994), and similar conclusions were reached in systematic reviews (Jarvik et al., 2002; Chou et al., 2007; NICE, 2009). For adults less than 50 years of age with no signs or symptoms of systemic disease, symptomatic therapy without imaging is appropriate. For patients 50 years of age and older, or those whose findings suggest systemic disease, plain radiography and simple laboratory tests can almost completely rule out underlying systemic diseases. Advanced imaging should be reserved for patients who are considering surgery or for those in whom systemic disease is strongly suspected. Conservative care without immediate imaging is also considered appropriate for patients with radiculopathy, as long as symptoms are not bilateral or associated with urinary retention. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) should be performed if the latter symptoms are present, or if patients do not improve with conservative therapy for 4 to 6 weeks. Ninety percent of acute attacks of sciatica will resolve with conservative management within 4 to 6 weeks; only 5% remain disabled longer than 3 months (Gibson and Waddell, 2007; Lehrich and Sheon, 2007; AHCPR 1994).

Conservative management for LBP (Low Back Pain) includes:

- Avoidance of activities that aggravate pain
- Chiropractic manipulation in the first 4 weeks if there is no radiculopathy
- Cognitive support and reassurance that recovery is expected
- Education regarding spine biomechanics
- Exercise program
- Heat/cold modalities for home use
- Limited bed rest with gradual return to normal activities
- Low impact exercise as tolerated (e.g., stationary bike, swimming, walking)
- Pharmacotherapy (e.g., non-narcotic analgesics, NSAIDs [as second-line choices], avoid muscle relaxants, or only use during the first week, avoid narcotics)

In the American Pain Society/American College of Physicians Clinical Practice Guideline on "Nonpharmacological Therapies for Acute and Chronic Low Back Pain," Chou and Huffman (2007), reached the following conclusions: "Therapies with good evidence of moderate efficacy for chronic or subacute low back pain are cognitive-behavioral therapy, exercise, spinal manipulation, and interdisciplinary rehabilitation. For acute low back pain, the only therapy with good evidence of efficacy is superficial heat."

According to a draft technology assessment prepared for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) by the Duke Evidence-Based Practice Center on spinal fusion for treatment of degenerative disease affecting the lumbar spine (AHRQ, 2006), conservative treatments are generally performed routinely before any surgery is considered in axial back pain. These include medical management (such as NSAIDS, etc.), pain management, injections, physical therapy, exercise, and various forms of cognitive rehabilitation. Such conservative treatments are seldom applied in a comprehensive, well-organized rehabilitation program, although some such programs do
exist. Conservative treatments are usually tried for at least 6 to 12 months before surgery for any form of lumbar fusion is considered. Several reviews of these therapies noted that there is no evidence about the effectiveness of any of these therapies for low back or radicular pain beyond about 6 weeks. In addition, the assessment stated that almost all lumbar spine surgery, including lumbar fusion, is performed to reduce the subjective individual symptoms of radiculopathy; thus, patient education to inform patients of their treatment options is considered critical. The other indications for lumbar fusion focus on improvement in axial lumbar pain (i.e., near the midline and not involving nerve roots or leg pain). These indications include lumbar instability, such as degenerative lumbar scoliosis, spondylolisthesis for axial pain alone, and for less common problems, such as discitis, lumbar flat back syndrome, neoplastic bone invasion and collapse, and chronic fractures, such as osteoporotic fractures which develop into burst fractures over time. The assessment concluded that: "The evidence for lumbar spinal fusion does not conclusively demonstrate short-term or long-term benefits compared with non-surgical treatment, especially when considering patients over 65 years of age, for degenerative disc disease; for spondylolisthesis, considerable uncertainty exists due to lack of data, particularly for older patients."

The National Institute for Clinical Excellence's (NICE, 2009) guidance on early management of people with non-specific LBP stated that it is important to help people with persistent non-specific LBP self-manage their condition. The guidance stated that one of the following treatment options should be offered to the patient: (i) an exercise program, (ii) a course of manual therapy (i.e., spinal manipulation, spinal mobilization, and massage), (iii) a course of acupuncture, and (iv) pharmacological therapy. Referral to a combined physical and psychological treatment program may be appropriate for individuals who have received at least one less intensive treatment and have high disability and/or significant psychological distress. The guidance stated: "[t]here is evidence that manual therapy, exercise and acupuncture individually are cost-effective management options compared with usual care for persistent non-specific low back pain. The cost implications of treating people who do not respond to initial therapy and so receive multiple back care interventions are substantial. It is unclear whether there is added health gain for this subgroup from either multiple or sequential use of therapies." In addition, the guidance stated that imaging is not necessary for the management of non-specific LBP. An MRI is appropriate only for people who have failed conservative care, including a combined physical and psychological treatment program, and are considering a referral for an opinion on spinal fusion.

The American Pain Society Clinical Practice Guideline Interventional Therapies, Surgery, and Interdisciplinary Rehabilitation for Low Back Pain (Chou et al., 2009) stated "rates of certain interventional and surgical procedures for back pain are rising. However, it is unclear if methods for identifying specific anatomic sources of back pain are accurate, and effectiveness of some interventional therapies and surgery remains uncertain or controversial." Included in the guideline are the following recommendations.

The APS guideline stated that, in patients with chronic non-radicular LBP, provocative discography is not recommended as a procedure for diagnosing LBP (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence) (Chou et al., 2009).

In patients with non-radicular LBP who do not respond to usual, non-interdisciplinary interventions, the APS guideline recommended that clinicians consider intensive interdisciplinary rehabilitation with a cognitive/behavioral emphasis (strong recommendation, high-quality evidence) (Chou et al., 2009).

In patients with non-radicular LBP, common degenerative spinal changes, and persistent and disabling symptoms, the APS guideline recommended that clinicians discuss risks and benefits of surgery as an option (weak recommendation, moderate-quality evidence) (Chou et al., 2009).

The guideline recommended that shared decision-making regarding surgery for non-specific LBP include a specific discussion about intensive interdisciplinary rehabilitation as a similarly effective option, the small to moderate average benefit from surgery versus non-interdisciplinary non-surgical therapy, and the fact that the majority of such patients who undergo surgery do not experience an optimal outcome (defined as minimum or no pain, discontinuation of or occasional pain medication use, and return of high-level function) (Chou et al., 2009).

The APS guideline explained that for persistent non-radicular LBP with common degenerative changes (e.g., degenerative disc disease), fusion surgery is superior to non-surgical therapy without interdisciplinary rehabilitation in 1 trial, but no more effective than intensive interdisciplinary rehabilitation in 3 trials (Chou et al., 2009). Compared with non-interdisciplinary, non-surgical therapy, average benefits are small for function (5–10 points on a 100-point scale) and moderate for improvement in pain (10–20 points on a 100-point scale). Furthermore, more than half of the patients who undergo surgery do not experience an "excellent" or "good" outcome (i.e., no more than sporadic pain, slight restriction of
function, and occasional analgesics). Although operative deaths are uncommon, early complications occur in approximately 18% of patients who undergo fusion surgery in randomized trials. Instrumented fusion is associated with enhanced fusion rates compared with non-instrumented fusion, but insufficient evidence exists to determine whether instrumented fusion improves clinical outcomes, and additional costs are substantial. In addition, there is insufficient evidence to recommend a specific fusion method (anterior, posterolateral, or circumferential), though more technically difficult procedures may be associated with higher rates of complications.

The APS guideline explained that for persistent and disabling radiculopathy due to herniated lumbar disc, standard open discectomy and microdiscectomy are associated with moderate short-term (through 6 to 12 weeks) benefits compared to non-surgical therapy, though differences in outcomes in some trials are diminished or no longer present after 1 to 2 years (Chou et al., 2009). In addition, patients tend to improve substantially, either with or without discectomy, and continued non-surgical therapy in patients who have had symptoms for at least 6 weeks does not appear to increase risk for cauda equina syndrome or paralysis.

If conservative management fails to relieve symptoms of radiculopathy and there is strong evidence of dysfunction of a specific nerve root confirmed at the corresponding level by findings demonstrated by CT or MRI, further evaluation and more invasive treatment, including spine surgery, may be proposed as a treatment option. The primary rationale of any form of surgery for disc prolapse is to provide decompression of the affected nerve root to relieve the individual's symptoms. It involves the removal of all or part of the lamina of a lumbar vertebra. The addition of fusion with or without instrumentation is considered when there are concerns about instability. Open discectomy, performed with or without the use of an operating microscope, is the most common surgical technique applied, but there are now a number of other less invasive surgical approaches. The surgical treatment of sciatica with discectomy is reportedly ineffective in a sizable percentage of patients, and re-herniation occurs after 5% to 15% of such procedures. Thus, it would be ideal to define the optimal type of treatment for the specific types of prolapse (Carragee et al., 2003).

Different fusion procedures, including anterior lumbar interbody fusion, posterolateral fusion, posterior lumbar interbody fusion and transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion, and anterior-posterior combined fusion, do not vary significantly in pain or disability outcomes, although there are qualitative differences in complications related to the surgical approach. Prior to the 1980’s both anterior and posterior non-instrumented lumbar fusions were commonly performed, using primarily bone graft. As pedicle screws became more widely used, it was noted that the rate of fusion increased from 65% with bone graft alone to nearly 95% with the instrumentation to provide internal support for the bone graft. The increased stiffness from the insertion of screws and rods has been hypothesized to lead to increased degeneration at spine segments adjacent to the fusion.

Anterior spine procedures, through either the peritoneum or retroperitoneum, require no posterior muscle and ligamentous dissection and result in less post-operative axial back pain. This approach is generally recommended for the treatment of axial LBP in young individuals. The usual criteria for consideration of an anterior lumbar fusion (or anterior lumbar arthroplasty) include a young person (i.e., age 20 to 40 years), who on MRI scan has either one or two dark discs, a concordant discogram indicating the axial pain is likely arising from the degenerated joints, and failure of previous conservative measures to improve the back pain over a period of time, with a minimum of 6 month conservative treatment. However, according to AHRQ (2006), the discogram remains highly controversial, and recent reports suggest that relying on the MRI findings of a dark disc and limiting the discogram to just those levels may improve the definition of a “positive discogram”. The AHRQ assessment stated, “However, the high rate of false positives with normal disc spaces is problematic, as well as the high rate of prevalence of dark disc syndrome.” As patients age into their 40s and 50s the disc and facet degenerative processes slowly worsen, and it is less likely to find patients with isolated arthritis, thus, anterior fusion is less often recommended for older patients. Posterior fusion may be preferable for older individuals in order to stabilize facet joint disease. However, the posterior approach involves significant muscle dissection, resulting in severe back pain in the post-operative period, and is avoided by some surgeons.

The natural history of sciatica is favorable, with resolution of leg pain within 8 weeks from onset in most patients (Peul et al., 2007). Dutch guidelines on the diagnosis and treatment of the lumbosacral radicular syndrome (Stam, 1996) recommended the option of lumbar-disk surgery in patients who have sciatica if symptoms do not improve after 6 weeks of conservative treatment. To determine the optimal timing of surgery, investigators (Peul et al., 2007) randomly assigned patients (n = 283) who had had severe sciatica for 6 to 12 weeks to early surgery or to prolonged conservative treatment with surgery if needed. The primary outcomes were the score on the Roland Disability Questionnaire, the score on the visual
analog scale for leg pain, and the patient's report of perceived recovery during the first year after randomization. Repeated-measures analysis according to the intention-to-treat principle was used to estimate the outcome curves for both groups. Of 141 patients assigned to undergo early surgery, 125 (89%) underwent microdiscectomy after a mean of 2.2 weeks. Of 142 patients designated for conservative treatment, 55 (39%) were treated surgically after a mean of 18.7 weeks. There was no significant overall difference in disability scores during the first year (p = 0.13). Relief of leg pain was faster for patients assigned to early surgery (p < 0.001). Patients assigned to early surgery also reported a faster rate of perceived recovery (hazard ratio, 1.97; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.72 to 2.22; p < 0.001). In both groups, however, the probability of perceived recovery after 1 year of follow-up was 95%. The investigators concluded that the 1-year outcomes were similar for patients assigned to early surgery and those assigned to conservative treatment with eventual surgery if needed, but the rates of pain relief and of perceived recovery were faster for those assigned to early surgery.

In one study (Weber, 1983) compared the results of surgical versus conservative treatment for lumbar disc herniation confirmed by radiculography (n = 126) with 10 years of follow-up observation. The author reported a significantly better result in the surgically treated group at the 1-year follow-up examination; however, after 4 years the difference was no longer statistically significant. Only minor changes took place during the last 6 years of observation. The trial was not blinded, and 26% of the conservative group crossed over to surgery.

In another study (Greenfield, 2003), available only as an abstract, compared microdiscectomy with a low-tech physical therapy regime and educational approach in patients with LBP and sciatica with a small or moderate disc prolapse. At 12 and 18 months there were statistically significant differences in pain and disability favoring the surgical group; however, by 24 months there was no difference between the 2 groups.

The Cochrane systematic review (2007) concluded: (i) most lumbar disc prolapses resolve naturally with conservative management and the passage of time; (ii) there is considerable evidence that surgical discectomy provides effective clinical relief for carefully selected patients with sciatica due to lumbar disc prolapse that fails to resolve with conservative management. It provides faster relief from the acute attack of sciatica, although any positive or negative effects on the long-term natural history of the underlying disc disease are unclear. There is still a lack of scientific evidence on the optimal timing of surgery. The amount of cross-over in these trials makes it likely that the intent-to-treat analysis underestimates the true effect of surgery; but the resulting confounding also makes it impossible to draw any firm conclusions about the efficacy of surgery.

In a randomized controlled study, Brox et al. (2006) compared the effectiveness of lumbar fusion with posterior transpedicular screws and cognitive intervention and exercises on 60 patients aged 25 to 60 years with LBP lasting longer than 1 year after previous surgery for disc herniation. Cognitive intervention consisted of a lecture intended to give the patient an understanding that ordinary physical activity would not harm the disc and a recommendation to use the back and bend it. This was reinforced by 3 daily physical exercise sessions for 3 weeks. The primary outcome measure was the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI). The success rate was 50% in the fusion group and 48% in the cognitive intervention/exercise group. The authors concluded that for patients with chronic LBP after previous surgery for disc herniation, lumbar fusion failed to show any benefit over cognitive intervention and exercise.

The American Association of Neurological Surgeons/Congress of Neurological Surgeons (AANS/CNS) Guideline’s for the Performance of Fusion Procedures for Degenerative Disease of the Lumbar Spine (Resnick, 2005), is a series of guidelines that deal with the methodology of guideline formation, the assessment of outcomes following lumbar fusion, recommendations that involve the diagnostic modalities helpful for the pre- and post-operative evaluation of patients considered candidates for or treated with lumbar fusion, followed by recommendations dealing with specific patient populations. Finally, several surgical adjuncts, including pedicle screws, intra-operative monitoring, and bone graft substitutes are discussed, and recommendations are made for their use.

The other randomized trial, by Brox et al. (2003), assigned a specific cognitive and exercise regimen to the non-surgical patients. Enrollment criteria for this study were roughly similar to the other clinical trial, and outcomes were assessed at 1 year. In this study, patients receiving fusion reported improvements ranging from 36 to 49% on pain and disability scales, but patients in the control arm also reported similar improvements in these scores, resulting in differences which were not statistically significant for most outcomes. Although this trial was much smaller (n = 64) than the study by Fritzell et al. (2001), the point estimates of effect for each arm are very similar to each other, and confidence intervals sufficiently narrow to rule out a large clinical benefit of surgery. The authors believed that the difference in results between
the 2 studies was caused by the specific intervention used in the non-surgical group, which produced improvements similar to the surgical fusion group.

Brox et al. (2010) compared the long-term effectiveness of surgical and non-surgical treatment in patients with chronic LBP. The study was conducted at 4 university hospitals in Norway. The limitations on study enrollment ensured that patients with more significant symptoms and findings were not included in the protocol. All participants had LBP for at least 1-year, moderate disability, and evidence of disk degeneration at L4-L5 or L5-S1; those with symptomatic spinal stenosis were excluded from study participation. Similarly, patients with disk herniation or lateral recess stenosis plus signs of radiculopathy were excluded, as were those with generalized disk degeneration, ongoing serious somatic or psychiatric disease, or “reluctance” (term not defined) to undergo one of the study treatments. Participants were randomized to receive instrumented transpedicular fusion or non-surgical therapy. The non-surgical therapy was very intensive and included initial education, support, and physical training sessions that lasted an average of 25 hours per week over 3 weeks. There were 4 to 7 participants assigned to this training at a time, and they stayed in a hotel for patients during the 3 weeks. Specialists in physical medicine and rehabilitation guided the program, and participants also met with a peer who had previously completed the non-surgical program. At the end of the 3 weeks, participants were prescribed a home exercise program. The primary study outcome was the Oswestry disability index, which measures both pain and disability. Researchers also followed patients’ ratings of treatment effectiveness, quality of life, and effects of the interventions on medication use and time missed from work. The study focused on these results measured at 4 years after randomization, and results were adjusted to account for sex, age, previous surgery for disk herniation, and baseline pain and disability scores. Of 234 eligible patients, 124 were enrolled in the trials. Baseline data were similar for the 2 groups. The mean age of participants was 42 years, and 72% were women. The average duration of LBP was 9 years, and the mean severity of back pain was 64 on a scale of 0 to 100, with 100 being the most severe pain. Both treatment groups professed stronger beliefs in surgical versus non-surgical treatment of chronic LBP at baseline. In the surgical group, the rates of undergoing surgery were 88% at 1 year and 91% at 4 years. The respective rates of surgery in the non-surgical group were 5% and 24%. Study follow-up was excellent, with rates of 92% and 86% in the surgical and non-surgical groups at 4 years. Beyond comparing surgical and non-surgical treatment for chronic LBP, the study also gave some insight into the use of healthcare and other resources by these patients. Only a slight majority of patients saw a physician for back pain in the year before study follow-up at year 4. Less than 25% received physical therapy. However, the rate of repeat surgery after the initial study surgery was 25% over 4 years. This high repeat surgery rate was recorded, even though no major adverse events related to surgery occurred through year 1 of the study.

Participants who received surgery were more than twice as likely to receive a disability pension, regardless of their randomized group. However, it would be wrong to infer that surgery itself promoted a higher rate of disability. These patients had surgery in response to more severe symptoms and were therefore more likely to receive a disability pension in the first place. Moreover, applications for disability pension from patients who had received surgery could have received more favorable reviews. There were no differences between randomized groups in the outcomes of pain and disability in either intent-to-treat or as-treated analyses at 4 years. The mean Oswestry disability index score declined in both groups from an approximate mean of 44 at baseline to 28 at 4 years. Among secondary outcomes, the only difference between treatment groups was a reduction in fear and avoidance of physical activity, favoring the non-surgical group. Measurements of general function improved by approximately 40% in both groups, and life satisfaction also improved. The number of participants returning to work improved with both treatments to a similar degree, and the proportions of participants rating their treatment as successful at 1 year were 61% and 65% in the surgical and non-surgical cohorts, respectively. Use of pain medication was higher among participants who received surgery, but any difference between treatment groups was not significant on intent-to-treat analysis.

Billing/Coding Information

**CPT CODES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0275T</td>
<td>Percutaneous laminotomy/laminectomy (interlaminar approach) for decompression of neural elements, (with or without ligamentous resection, discectomy, facetectomy and/or foraminotomy), any method, under indirect image guidance (eg, fluoroscopic, CT), single or multiple levels, unilateral or bilateral; lumbar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Neurology/Neurosurgery Policies, Continued

### Cervical and Lumbar Spinal Fusion and Combined Decompression/Fusion, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22533</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, lateral extracavitary technique, including minimal discectomy to prepare interspace (other than for decompression); lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22534</td>
<td>, each additional vertebral segment (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22551</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, anterior interbody, including disc space preparation, discectomy, osteophysectomy and decompression of spinal cord and/or nerve roots; cervical below C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22552</td>
<td>, each additional interspace (List separately in addition to code for separate procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22554</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, anterior interbody technique, including minimal discectomy to prepare interspace (other than for decompression); cervical below C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22558</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, anterior interbody technique, including minimal discectomy to prepare interspace (other than for decompression); lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22585</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, anterior interbody technique, including minimal discectomy to prepare interspace (other than for decompression); each additional interspace (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22600</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, posterior or posterolateral technique, single level; cervical below C2 segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22612</td>
<td>; lumbar (with lateral transverse technique, when performed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22614</td>
<td>; each additional vertebral segment (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22630</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, posterior interbody technique, including laminectomy and/or discectomy to prepare interspace (other than for decompression), single interspace; lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22632</td>
<td>; each additional interspace (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22633</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, combined posterior or posterolateral technique with posterior interbody technique including laminectomy and/or discectomy sufficient to prepare interspace (other than for decompression), single interspace and segment; lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22634</td>
<td>; each additional interspace and segment (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22800</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, posterior, for spinal deformity, with or without cast; up to 6 vertebral segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22802</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, posterior, for spinal deformity, with or without cast; 7 to 12 vertebral segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22804</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, posterior, for spinal deformity, with or without cast; 13 or more vertebral segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62287</td>
<td>Decompression procedure, percutaneous, of nucleus pulposus of intervertebral disc, any method utilizing needle based technique to remove disc material under fluoroscopic imaging or other form of indirect visualization, with discography and/or epidural injection(s) at the treated level(s), when performed, single or multiple levels, lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>Laminectomy with exploration and/or decompression of spinal cord and/or cauda equina, without facetectomy, foraminotomy or discectomy (eg, spinal stenosis), 1 or 2 vertebral segments; lumbar, except for spondylolisthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63012</td>
<td>Laminectomy with removal of abnormal facets and/or pars inter-articularis with decompression of cauda equina and nerve roots for spondylolisthesis, lumbar (Gill type procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63015</td>
<td>Laminectomy with exploration and/or decompression of spinal cord and/or cauda equina, without facetectomy, foraminotomy or discectomy (eg, spinal stenosis), more than 2 vertebral segments; cervical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cervical and Lumbar Spinal Fusion and Combined Decompression/Fusion, continued

63017; lumbar

63020 Laminotomy (hemilaminectomy), with decompression of nerve root(s), including partial facetectomy, foraminotomy and/or excision of herniated intervertebral disc; 1 interspace, cervical

63030; 1 interspace, lumbar

63035; each additional interspace, cervical or lumbar (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

63040 Laminotomy (hemilaminectomy), with decompression of nerve root(s), including partial facetectomy, foraminotomy and/or excision of herniated intervertebral disc, reexploration, single interspace; cervical

63042; lumbar

63043; each additional cervical interspace (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

63044; each additional lumbar interspace (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

63045 Laminectomy, facetectomy and foraminotomy (unilateral or bilateral with decompression of spinal cord, cauda equina and/or nerve root[s], [eg, spinal or lateral recess stenosis]), single vertebral segment; cervical

63047; lumbar

63048; each additional segment, cervical, thoracic, or lumbar (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

63052 Laminectomy, facetectomy, or foraminotomy (unilateral or bilateral with decompression of spinal cord, cauda equina and/or nerve root[s] [eg, spinal or lateral recess stenosis]), during posterior interbody arthrodesis, lumbar; single vertebral segment (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

63053 Laminectomy, facetectomy, or foraminotomy (unilateral or bilateral with decompression of spinal cord, cauda equina and/or nerve root[s] [eg, spinal or lateral recess stenosis]), during posterior interbody arthrodesis, lumbar; each additional segment (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

63056 Transpedicular approach with decompression of spinal cord, equina and/or nerve root(s) (eg, herniated intervertebral disc), single segment; lumbar (including transfacet, or lateral extraforaminal approach) (eg, far lateral herniated intervertebral disc)

63057; each additional segment, thoracic or lumbar (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

HCPCS CODES

C2614 Probe, percutaneous lumbar discectomy

Key References
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COGNITIVE REHABILITATION

Policy # 405
Implementation Date: 7/18/08
Review Dates: 6/11/09, 6/17/10, 8/16/12, 10/24/13, 6/11/15, 6/16/16, 6/15/17, 6/21/18, 6/20/19, 6/2/20
Revision Dates:

Description
Stroke (also called cerebrovascular accident or stroke syndrome) is characterized by the sudden loss of blood circulation to an area of the brain, resulting in a corresponding loss of neurological function.

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) is defined as an injury to the brain by externally inflicted trauma, which may result in significant physical, cognitive, and psychosocial impairment.

The consequences of TBI or stroke can be enormous and may include a dramatic change in the person’s life with profound disruption to the family, substantial loss of income, and extensive lifetime service utilization. TBI and stroke often produce deterioration of cognitive abilities, which can have a negative impact on interpersonal relationships, school, and work. Among those with severe TBI, 40% are left with persistent motor disabilities, 50% suffer from cognitive impairment, and 60% suffer from emotional/affective changes. Recovery from TBI is lengthy and variable, with a course that spans months or years. Cognitive recovery from stroke or TBI proceeds in overlapping stages, with improvement in different domains of cognitive operation occurring at different times.

Cognitive rehabilitation is defined as a set of therapies designed to help improve damaged intellectual, perceptual, and behavioral skills, as opposed to sensorimotor skills or strictly emotional function. This therapy is directed toward “brain-behavior” deficits, such as attention, memory and learning, affect and expression, and executive functions. The goals of cognitive rehabilitation are to improve the patient’s capacity to process and interpret information and to function in family and community life while maximizing their degree of return to their previous level of functioning. Ninety-five percent of rehabilitation facilities serving the needs of persons with brain injury provide some form of cognitive rehabilitation, including combinations of individual, group, and community-based therapies.

Commercial Plan Policy

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

SelectHealth does NOT cover coma stimulation. The lack of evidence to support clinical utility and statistical validity meets the plan’s definition of investigational/experimental.
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Cognitive Rehabilitation, continued

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS) (Preauthorization Required)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website.

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

Summary of Medical Information

Multiple systematic reviews have evaluated cognitive rehabilitation. A Hayes Medical Technology Directory (2017) observed that cognitive rehabilitation for traumatic brain injury can improve cognitive functioning. The report concluded, however, that data is insufficient to conclude that cognitive rehabilitation enhances neuronal recovery or repair—or improves functional outcomes. The report also suggested that comprehensive, structured rehabilitation programs that include cognitive rehabilitation therapies are more effective than traditional speech, occupational, and behavioral therapies, though data are inconclusive. Cognitive rehabilitation was given a ‘C’ rating for cognitive rehabilitation in adults with traumatic brain injury. This rating reflects potential but unproven benefit.

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

Cicerone et al. (2019) performed a systematic review for cognitive rehabilitation. He evaluated 491 articles (109 class I or IA, 68 class II, and 314 class III) and these articles made 29 recommendations for evidence-based practice of cognitive rehabilitation (9 Practice Standards, 9 Practice Guidelines, 11 Practice Options). Evidence from this review supports Practice Standards for: (1) attention deficits after TBI or stroke; (2) visual scanning for neglect after right-hemisphere stroke; (3) compensatory strategies for mild memory deficits; (4) language deficits after left-hemisphere stroke; (5) social-communication deficits after TBI; (6) metacognitive strategy training for deficits in executive functioning; and (7) comprehensive-holistic neuropsychological rehabilitation to reduce cognitive and functional disability after TBI or stroke.

A large body of literature suggests that cognitive rehabilitation therapies can improve cognitive functioning as measured by neuropsychological tests; mostly in patients with TBI. There is evidence that it may be valuable in post stroke patients. For the remainder of the neurologic disorders (e.g., multiple sclerosis, Parkinson’s disease, dementia) there is not enough evidence to recommend this therapy. There is great heterogeneity in therapy methods, which limits conclusions about which techniques are most effective. There is a lack of literature examining whether these cognitive changes result in any functional or health improvements. Finally, few studies have examined the durability of these cognitive improvements over time.
Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

Covered: For the conditions outlined above

96125  Standardized cognitive performance testing (e.g., Ross Information Processing Assessment) per hour of a qualified health care professional's time, both face-to-face time administering tests to the patient and time interpreting these test results and preparing the report

97532  Development of cognitive skills to improve attention, memory, problem solving (includes compensatory training), direct (one-on-one) patient contact by the provider, each 15 minutes

HCPCS CODES

Not covered: Investigational/Experimental/Unproven for this indication

S9056  Coma stimulation per diem

Key References
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MEDICAL POLICY

DEEP BRAIN STIMULATION (DBS)

Policy # 205

Implementation Date: 5/1/02
Review Dates: 8/12/02, 10/1/03, 6/24/06, 5/24/05, 5/12/06, 6/11/09, 10/21/10, 10/13/11, 11/29/12, 10/24/13, 10/23/14, 10/15/15, 10/20/16, 10/19/17, 10/15/18, 10/17/19
Revision Dates: 11/1/03, 7/7/07, 6/19/08, 11/9/09, 5/7/19, 10/23/19

Related Medical Policies:
#186 Vagal Nerve Stimulation (VNS)
#556 Responsive Cortical Neurostimulation in the Treatment of Epilepsy

Description
The DBS System is an implantable, multiprogrammable system that delivers electrical stimulation to selected areas of the brain. An implanted pulse generator (IPG) is connected with a lead extension, to a lead with 4 electrodes. The electrodes contact the patient at a specific anatomical structure within the brain. The IPG is implanted under the skin of either the abdomen or under the clavicle, and sends programmable electrical stimulation pulses to a selected combination of output electrodes within the brain. Two of these device systems may be implanted to stimulate both sides of the brain in order to relieve symptoms or 1 device with 2 lead outputs. A control magnet or therapy controller is used to turn the therapy on and off.

Dystonia is a neurological movement disorder characterized by involuntary muscle contractions that force certain parts of the body into abnormal, contorted—sometimes painful—movements or postures. Dystonia affects approximately 250,000 people in the US, making it the third most common movement disorder, following essential tremor and Parkinson's disease. Essential tremor, sometimes referred to as ET, is a nerve disorder characterized by uncontrollable shaking—or "tremors"—in different parts and on different sides of the body. Areas affected often include the hands, arms, head, larynx, or voice box (making the voice sound shaky), tongue, chin, and other areas. The lower body is rarely affected. Parkinson's disease is a neurodegenerative disorder caused by the loss of cells that produce a chemical called dopamine. The hallmark of Parkinson's disease is a resting tremor, slowness of movement (bradykinesia), and limb rigidity.

Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD), is an anxiety disorder and is characterized by recurrent, unwanted thoughts (obsessions) and/or repetitive behaviors (compulsions). Repetitive behaviors such as handwashing, counting, checking, or cleaning are often performed with the hope of preventing obsessive thoughts or making them go away.

It is unclear how DBS works for these disorders. An electrical probe is inserted into the brain and it stimulates an area known as the subthalamic nucleus. This can help people overcome the neurological block on movement. Some researchers think the technique stimulates neurons that initiate movement. Others say it blocks inhibitory neurons, allowing brain signals to resume. Another theory holds that it influences the flow of information along axons (fibers that connect neurons to each other).

Approximately 3 million people in the United States have epilepsy and approximately 30% remain resistant to medical treatment. Patients with pharmaco-resistant epilepsy, who are not suitable candidates for resective surgery, should be considered for neurostimulation therapies. Deep brain stimulation (DBS) and cortical responsive stimulation (CRS) are newer neurostimulation therapies with recently published long-term efficacy and safety data.
Several pilot studies, and recent trials including the Stimulation of the Anterior Nucleus of the Thalamus for Epilepsy (SANTE) trial and a trial of CRS have demonstrated reduction in seizures. The SANTE trial in 110 subjects with localization-related epilepsy found that seizures were significantly reduced by stimulation. The SANTE trial utilized a design with a 3-month baseline, 1-month postoperative recovery, followed by 3 months of double-blind treatment randomized to 5 V or 0 V of stimulation, then an open-label conversion of all subjects to 5-V stimulation for 9 additional months.

The long-term follow-up began at 13 months and continued for an additional 4 years. The primary research question was whether seizure frequency continued to improve over time with open-label anterior thalamic stimulation. Subjects were 18 to 65 years old, with at least 6 partial or secondarily generalized seizures per month, who had failed at least 3 antiepileptic drugs (AEDs) because of lack of efficacy. In the 5 years after implant, 16% (17/109) of randomized subjects reported a seizure-free interval of at least 6 months and 6 subjects were seizure-free for more than 2 continuous years during that time. In addition, 6 subjects had 2 or more seizure-free intervals of at least 6 months. At the 5-year assessment, 11 subjects were seizure-free for at least 6 months. The median percent seizure reduction from baseline at 1 year was 41%, and 69% at 5 years. The responder rate (50% reduction in seizure frequency) at 1 year was 43%, and 68% at 5 years. In the 5 years of follow-up, 16% of subjects were seizure-free for at least 6 months.

There are no head-to-head studies comparing efficacy of types of neurostimulation in refractory epilepsy. All neurostimulation technologies show long-term efficacy, with progressively better seizure control over time. Overall, participants with temporal lobe epilepsy (TLE) who are not suitable for resection may derive the most benefit from vagal nerve stimulation (VNS) or DBS of the anterior nucleus of the thalamus (ANT), also referred to as ANT-DBS. There are data to suggest that VNS and ANT-DBS have the potential to improve seizure control in candidates with failed resections. ANT-DBS has similar potential in previous VNS response failure.

Whether some patients might benefit from VNS after the failure of DBS or CRS has yet to be explored. Future studies may demonstrate that failure of one form of neurostimulation does not preclude use of other forms of neurostimulation for seizure control, given distinct mechanisms of seizure control in each. CRS is at a disadvantage when accurate delineation of the seizure focus is not possible. At present, the use of CRS is also limited to patients with one or two discrete seizure foci. ANT-DBS and VNS are not limited by these factors. Intracranial neurostimulation has a greater side effect profile compared with extracranial stimulation, though all forms of stimulation are considered relatively safe. Pre-existing problems with depression or memory might be of particular concern with regards to ANT-DBS.

**Commercial Plan Policy**

SelectHealth **covers deep brain stimulation when any one of the following criteria are met:**

1. **Primary dystonia(s),** including generalized and/or segmental dystonia, hemidystonia, and cervical dystonia (torticollis), with ALL the following:
   a. Age ≥ 7; AND
   b. Chronic intractable (drug refractory) primary dystonia.

2. **Essential tremor,** when the tremor is resistant to all methods of conservative treatment.

3. **Parkinson’s disease,** with ALL the following:
   a. Severe disability caused by the disease; AND
   b. The symptoms are resistant to all methods of conservative treatment, OR the member is developing dystonic reactions to medical therapy.
4. **Epilepsy**, with ALL the following:

   a. Age ≥ 18
   b. Evidence of focal/partial onset epilepsy
   c. Not a resection candidate for focal epilepsy either due to > 1 focus, or patient unwilling to consider brain resection
   d. The patient must have a well-documented seizure disorder with a debilitating effect on the patient’s ability to function
   e. Failure of 3 or more antiepileptic medications
   f. Failure of vagal nerve stimulation (VNS) or responsive neurostimulation (RNS) are not required

SelectHealth does NOT cover deep brain stimulation for the following conditions:

1. **Obsessive-compulsive disorder**. Limited information concerning efficacy meets the plan definition of experimental/investigational.

2. **Secondary dystonia(s) or any other movement disorders except for those associated with Parkinson’s disease and essential tremor**. Use of this technology for secondary dystonia(s) other than Parkinson’s disease or essential tremor is considered investigational due to a lack of medical literature showing its effectiveness and long-term safety for patients with these conditions.

---

**SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)**

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website [http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&) or the manual website.

---

**SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP)**

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php) or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php).

---

**Summary of Medical Information**

**Deep Brain Stimulation for Dystonia**

Nine studies on DBS for dystonia of adequate methodological design have been published since this area of study was last evaluated in 2003. Of these, 1 was a double-blind, randomized controlled trial using sham stimulation as a control group. Kupsch et al. implanted 40 patients with primary dystonia and then randomly assigned them to 3 months neurostimulation or sham stimulation. After 3 months, all patients received neurostimulation. At 3 months, the blinded evaluation revealed improvement on the Burke-Fahn-Marsden Dystonia Rating Scale to be greater in DBS treatment group, compared with the sham control.
Neurology/Neurosurgery Policies, Continued

Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS), continued

At 6 months, after all patients had been on DBS for at least 3 months, all patients continued to experience reduced dystonia symptoms. The sham stimulation patients experienced a similar improvement in dystonia symptoms. Moreover, patients originally assigned to receive neurostimulation experienced a further, non-statistically significant improvement on the Burke-Fahn-Marsden Dystonia Rating Scale.

The remaining studies in this area are small case series with fewer than 30 patients each. The major weaknesses in this literature continue to be small sample size, lack of control or comparative groups, and lack of blinding. Nevertheless, these studies universally conclude that DBS is effective in treating primary dystonia with few adverse side effects. Most studies were restricted to patients with primary dystonia only. Patients with secondary dystonia were not included in numbers sufficient enough to permit any conclusions regarding the effectiveness of this therapy on patients with this form of dystonia. Studies with the largest periods of follow-up (30–36 months) suggest that the initial improvements observed with DBS are also maintained over time.

Deep Brain Stimulation for Parkinson’s Disease

All 3 of the available systematic reviews: Hayes TEC, CMS, and the Australian Medicare suggest that the evidence supporting the effectiveness of deep brain stimulation, while limited, is compelling. Following are summary remarks from the BCBS TEC report; which is not only the most recent but was also commissioned and used by HCFA (CMS) to guide its coverage policy.

“There are no large prospective randomized studies with long-term follow-up of bilateral DBS for treatment of advanced Parkinson’s disease. In no published studies are patients randomized to treatment arms to compare DBS with best medical management. Only one small pilot study compares the STN and globus pallidus interna (GPI) targets for DBS using prospective randomization.”

Nevertheless, the published scientific evidence is compelling because of the numbers of consecutively treated patients described, the consistency of the findings across studies, and the magnitude of clinical improvements observed on standardized rating scales of neurologic function. More recent evidence suggests that bilateral deep brain stimulation (DBS) of the globus pallidus interna (GPI) or the subthalamic nucleus (STN) may alleviate the entire constellation of Parkinsonian symptoms (tremor, rigidity, and bradykinesia).” Specific indications, including age of candidates and major diagnoses, continue to evolve rapidly.”

Studies suggest candidates for DBS with Parkinson’s disease should have the following characteristics:

1. The patient has received ‘maximal medical therapy’ and, in spite of such therapy, has shown a substantial (> 50%) increase in ‘off time’
2. The patient has advanced Parkinsonism, at least Hoehn and/or Yahr (or equivalent scale such as the Unified Parkinson disease rating scale) stage III or IV, but is not so severe that this therapy is unlikely to result in significant clinical improvement (Hoehn and/or Yahr stage V)
3. The patient has no other independent diagnosis that could explain the failure to respond to medical therapy
4. The patient exhibits at least 2 of the 4 major symptoms of Parkinsonism (tremor, rigidity, bradykinesia, or gait disturbance of Parkinsonism)
5. The patient currently shows some response or has previously responded to dopaminergic replacement therapy
6. Age < 70 years
7. The patient has completed a formal psychiatric evaluation, documented in the patient’s chart, which has determined that the patient does not have any
   • Significant underlying cognitive impairment OR,
   • Any major psychiatric illness such that this therapy is likely to result in significant clinical deterioration.
8. Request is for bilateral deep brain stimulation
9. Stimulator device to be implanted is FDA approved for indication requested

Patients with severe, limiting co-morbidities such as, class III or IV angina pectoris, stage III or higher congestive heart failure, or debilitating arthritis are contraindicated to receive DBS.

Comparison to Alternatives: “The improvements in ‘off’ period motor function following DBS of the GPI or STN are generally as great as or greater than those typically seen after unilateral pallidotomy.”
Deep Brain Stimulation for Essential Tremor
Use of DBS in essential tremor mirrors that of Parkinson’s disease. Unilateral and in some cases bilateral pallidal stimulation have been shown to be effective in patients with severe tremor refractory to medical therapy. These patients should have persistent tremor impairing their ability to perform ADLs despite maximally tolerable doses of beta blockers, benzodiazepines, and myoline or other anti-epileptic medications with a prominent dopaminergic effect.

Deep Brain Stimulation for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder
As of October 2009, the literature is primarily composed of small case series of limited duration. The largest study was done by Cosyn et al. in 2003 and another smaller study by Greenberg in 2006 involved 8 patients with only the Greenberg study looking at outcomes out to 3 years. All studies have demonstrated a beneficial effect, though significant disease activity continued to persist. All studies were considered preliminary by their authors, though not all recommended larger corroborating studies to prove effectiveness in a larger population.

The single randomized study completed by Mallet et al. in 2008 was remarkable in that the study design used sham therapy, which helps eliminate significant bias and more effectively exclude placebo effect. Though patients experienced a reduction in OCD symptoms, the study size was small with only 16 total patients enrolled. Additionally, the duration was only 10 months, which does not provide information regarding the durability of this technology. Concerning also, was the increased frequency of adverse events, which included 15 serious adverse events overall, including one intracerebral hemorrhage and two infections; there were also 23 minor adverse events. This rate of adverse events was much more than noted in other studies.

Essentially, limited studies exist related to deep brain stimulation as applied in the management of treatment resistant obsessive compulsive disorder. Most of these studies are nonrandomized and not blinded, which introduces significant potential bias as to the conclusions drawn from the studies. This is supported, but the American Psychiatric Association’s most recent Guideline Watch (March 2013) for OCD treatments, notes three small studies (Denys 2010, Mallet 2008, and Greenberg 2010) conclude that “the overall strength of evidence for these treatments remains low.” Certainly, larger randomized studies of longer duration are warranted to verify the preliminary findings. Until then, the lack of adequate studies fails to prove this therapy’s efficacy and safety.

Billing/Coding Information
Covered: For the conditions outlined above
CPT CODES
61863 Twist drill, burr hole, craniotomy, or craniectomy with stereotactic implantation of neurostimulator electrode array in subcortical site (e.g., thalamus, globus pallidus, subthalamic nucleus, periventricular, periaqueductal gray), without use of intraoperative micro-electrode recording; first array
61864 ; each additional array (List separately in addition to primary procedure)
61867 Twist drill, burr hole, craniotomy, or craniectomy with stereotactic implantation of neurostimulator electrode array in subcortical site (e.g., thalamus, globus pallidus, subthalamic nucleus, periventricular, periaqueductal gray), with use of intraoperative micro-electrode recording; first array
61868 ; each additional array (List separately in addition to primary procedure)
61870 Craniectomy for implantation of neurostimulator electrodes, cerebellar, cortical
61880 Revision or removal of intracranial neurostimulator electrode
61885 Insertion or replacement of cranial neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver, direct or inductive coupling; with connection to a single electrode array
61886 ; with connection to two or more electrode arrays
61888 Revision or removal of cranial neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver
95970 Electronic analysis of implanted neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter (eg, contact group[s], interleaving, amplitude, pulse width, frequency [Hz], on/off cycling, burst, magnet mode, dose lockout, patient selectable parameters, responsive neurostimulation, detection
algorithms, closed loop parameters, and passive parameters) by physician or other qualified health care professional; with brain, cranial nerve, spinal cord, peripheral nerve, or sacral nerve, neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter, without programming

95978  Electronic analysis of implanted neurostimulator pulse generator system (e.g., rate, pulse amplitude and duration, battery status, electrode selectability and polarity impedance and patient compliance measurements), complex deep brain neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter, with initial or subsequent programming; first hour

95979  ; each additional 30 minutes after first hour (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

95983  Electronic analysis of implanted neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter (e.g, contact group[s], interleaving, amplitude, pulse width, frequency [Hz], on/off cycling, burst, magnet mode, dose lockout, patient selectable parameters, responsive neurostimulation, detection algorithms, closed loop parameters, and passive parameters) by physician or other qualified health care professional; with brain neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter programming, first 15 minutes face-to-face time with physician or other qualified health care professional

95984  Electronic analysis of implanted neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter (e.g, contact group[s], interleaving, amplitude, pulse width, frequency [Hz], on/off cycling, burst, magnet mode, dose lockout, patient selectable parameters, responsive neurostimulation, detection algorithms, closed loop parameters, and passive parameters) by physician or other qualified health care professional; with brain neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter programming, each additional 15 minutes face-to-face time with physician or other qualified health care professional (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

HCPCS CODES

C1767  Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), nonrechargeable
C1778  Lead, neurostimulator (implantable)
C1787  Patient programmer, neurostimulator
C1816  Receiver and/or transmitter, neurostimulator (implantable)
C1820  Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), with rechargeable battery and charging system
C1822  Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), high frequency, with rechargeable battery and charging system
C1897  Lead, neurostimulator test kit (implantable)
L8679  Implantable neurostimulator, pulse generator, any type
L8680  Implantable neurostimulator electrode, each
L8681  Patient programmer (external) for use with implantable programmable neurostimulator pulse generator, replacement only
L8682  Implantable neurostimulator radiofrequency receiver
L8683  Radiofrequency transmitter (external) for use with implantable neurostimulator radiofrequency receiver
L8685  Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, single array, rechargeable, includes extension
Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS), continued

**Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, single array, non-rechargeable, includes extension**

**Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, dual array, rechargeable, includes extension**

**Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, dual array, non-rechargeable, includes extension**

**Key References**

**DBS in dystonia**


2. BCBS TEC report: Deep Brain Stimulation of the Subthalamic nucleus or the Globus pallidus interna for Treatment of Advanced Parkinson's Disease. Dec. 001 TEC meeting


**DBS in OCD**


**DBS in Epilepsy**


**Disclaimer**

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member’s individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member’s contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of “SelectHealth” and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.
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Neurology/Neurosurgery Policies, Continued

**MEDICAL POLICY**

**HARDWARE INJECTIONS IN THE ASSESSMENT OF CHRONIC BACK PAIN**

Policy # 517

Implementation Date: 12/17/12

Review Dates: 12/19/13, 2/20/14, 3/19/15, 2/11/16, 2/16/17, 2/15/18, 2/2/19, 2/17/20

Revision Dates:

**Description**

Back pain is the second most common symptom-related reason for clinician visits in the United States. Up to 84% percent of adults have low back pain at some time in their lives. The long-term outcome of acute low back pain is generally favorable. Rapid improvement in pain and disability and return to work are the norm in the first month. Further improvement generally occurs over 3 months.

Only a small minority of patients suffering from low back pain ever require surgery. However, rates of surgical procedures are rising in the U.S., particularly for spinal fusion in patients with non-specific back pain. The most common surgery for chronic non-specific low back pain with lumbar disc degenerative changes is vertebral fusion, a procedure that unites (fuses) 2 or more vertebral bodies together. The goal is to restrict spinal motion and remove the degenerated disc (the presumed pain generator) in order to relieve symptoms. A variety of fusion techniques are practiced. Fusion can be performed with or without supplemental hardware (instrumentation), such as plates, screws, or cages that serve as an internal splint while the bone graft heals. Fusion alters the normal mechanics of the spine and is associated with an increase in long-term degenerative changes in adjacent spine segments.

Surgical complications include vascular or neurologic injury, pseudarthrosis, infection, graft donor site pain, progressive pelvic obliquity, painful degenerative changes in the segment adjacent to the level of fusion, instability, hardware prominence or failure, and thromboembolism. Hardware complications include slippage of anchoring hooks, fracture of a screw, wire pullout, and migration of the hardware. With instrumentation, there is a 10%–29% incidence of reoperation.

Surgical pain at the surgical site may result from loosening of hardware, non-union, infection, and instability, which could include neurologic deterioration and may also be due to inadequate spinal immobilization. To determine a possible etiology for persisting pain, it has been proposed to inject a local anesthetic agent such as lidocaine and/or corticosteroid alongside the hardware to note, whether there is a decrease in pain. If the pain is temporarily relieved by the injection, it may indicate that the hardware is causing the pain, which may result in removal of the hardware. Failure to reduce the pain is argued to indicate the hardware is not the problem, and thus, hardware removal is not performed.

**Commercial Plan Policy**

SelectHealth **does NOT cover hardware injections for diagnostic purposes, symptomatic management, or any other indication.** Current literature does not demonstrate efficacy and durability of this procedure. This meets the plan’s definition of experimental/investigational.
Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website.

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website.

Summary of Medical Information
A literature review performed in November 2012 did not identify any systematic reviews or published peer-reviewed papers concerning hardware injections for diagnostic purposes, symptomatic management, or any other indication.

Billing/Coding Information

62320 Injection(s), of diagnostic or therapeutic substance(s) (eg, anesthetic, antispasmodic, opioid, steroid, other solution), not including neurolytic substances, including needle or catheter placement, interlaminar epidural or subarachnoid, cervical or thoracic; without imaging guidance

62321 ; with imaging guidance (ie, fluoroscopy or CT)

62322 Injection(s), of diagnostic or therapeutic substance(s) (eg, anesthetic, antispasmodic, opioid, steroid, other solution), not including neurolytic substances, including needle or catheter placement, interlaminar epidural or subarachnoid, lumbar or sacral (caudal); without imaging guidance

62323 ; with imaging guidance (ie, fluoroscopy or CT)

64450 Injection, anesthetic agent; other peripheral nerve or branch

77003 Fluoroscopic guidance and localization of needle or catheter tip for spine or paraspinal diagnostic or therapeutic injection procedures (epidural or subarachnoid) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

HCPCS CODES

J2400 Injection, chloroprocaine HCl, per 30 ml

Key References
Disclaimer
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INTERBODY SPINAL FUSION DEVICES

Policy # 513
Implementation Date: 11/9/12
Review Dates: 12/19/13, 12/18/14, 12/10/15, 12/15/16, 12/21/17, 12/13/18, 12/18/19
Revision Dates:

Related Medical Policies:
#320 Interspinous Distraction Devices/Spacers
#450 Axial Lumbar Interbody Fusion (AXIALIF®)
#558 Interspinous Fixation (Fusion) Devices

Description
Back pain is the second most common symptom-related reason for physician visits in the United States. Up to 84% of adults have low back pain at some time in their lives. The spectrum of illness and morbidity associated with low back pain is broad. For many individuals, episodes of back pain are self-limited and resolve without specific therapy. For others, however, back pain is recurrent or chronic, causing significant pain that interferes with employment and quality of life. The current accepted treatment algorithm for lumbar spinal stenosis (LSS) begins with non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and narcotics, physical therapy, and pain management modalities such as epidural steroid injections. Over the long term, 15% of patients will improve with nonsurgical modalities, and 70% will continue to experience pain.

When patients fail to respond to conservative measures or develop significant neurological signs and symptoms surgical interventions are considered. Decompression and spinal fusion are the most common surgical procedures for the lower back. Decompression surgery removes a small portion of the bone over the nerve root and/or disc material from under the nerve root, relieving pressure and pain. Microdiscectomy and laminectomy are 2 common procedures for spinal decompression surgery.

In many instances lumbar spinal fusion is necessary to not only treat the patient’s underlying problem but also stabilize the spine. There are many approaches to lumbar spinal fusion surgery, and all involve adding bone graft to an area of the spine to set up a biological response that causes the bone graft to grow between the 2 vertebral elements and create a fusion, thereby stopping the motion at that segment.

Fusion can be performed with or without supplemental hardware (instrumentation), such as plates, screws, or cages, which serve as an internal splint while the bone graft heals. Interbody devices create a space to relieve pressure and restore intervertebral disc space. They can be implanted using anterior, lateral, posterior, and transforminal.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) defines interbody fusion devices “act as a disc spacer and holds bone graft, also includes some form of integrated fixation to maintain stability by direct purchase into the bony vertebral endplates. They consist of a hollow cylinder or rectangular box made of metal or polymer with integrated fixation.” The InterPlate® (RSB Spine, LLC, Cleveland, OH) system is made from a titanium alloy and consists of plates, bone screws, and screw covers and uses autografts to facilitate fusion. The Avenue® L Interbody Fusion System (LDR Spine USA, Austin, TX) consists of intervertebral cages from PEEK OPTIMA® LT1 with an embedded titanium alloy. The Independence® Spacer (Globus Medical Inc., Audubon, PA) is made from radiolucent polymer with titanium alloys and integrates a stabilization plate and a PEEK interbody spacer. Polyetheretherketone (PEEK) is a radiolucent thermoplastic polymer that can be shaped into cages and spacers. PEEK mimics the elasticity, stability, and resistance to compression loading similar to bone.

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the “Policy” section for more information.
The StaXx® XD Expandable Spacer (Spine Wave Inc., Shelton, CT) is an expandable PEEK spacer that adjusts its size during the implantation process. The concave endplates are designed to conform to the patient's anatomy. The StaXx XD device is not approved by the FDA for an interbody fusion, only vertebral body replacement.

**Commercial Plan Policy (Preauthorization Required)**

SelectHealth covers interbody devices for FDA approved indications ONLY. All other indications or applications are considered experimental/investigational.

SelectHealth does NOT cover the StaXx® XD Expandable Device when used for interbody fusion procedures as the device is not FDA approved for this indication. This meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

**SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS) (Preauthorization Required)**

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website [http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&) or the manual website.

**SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) (Preauthorization Required)**

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php) or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

**Summary of Medical Information**

A SelectHealth Medical Technology Assessment Committee conducted in September 2012 examined the StaXx XD device for interbody spinal fusion procedures. The Committee could not identify any systematic reviews or peer-reviewed papers concerning the device being used for any indication other than what was approved by the FDA. SelectHealth's policy is to only provide coverage of devices that are FDA approved for specific indications.

**Billing/Coding Information**

**CPT CODES**

- **20936**: Autograft for spine surgery only (includes harvesting the graft); local (e.g., ribs, spinous process, or laminar fragments) obtained from same incision (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
- **20937**: Morselized (through separate skin or fascial incision) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
- **22633**: Arthrodesis, combined posterior or posterolateral technique with posterior interbody technique including laminectomy and/or discectomy sufficient to prepare interspace (other than for decompression), single interspace and segment; lumbar
- **22634**: Each additional interspace and segment (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
- **22842**: Posterior segmental instrumentation (e.g., pedicle fixation, dual rods with multiple hooks and sublaminar wires); 3 to 6 vertebral segments (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
Interbody Spinal Fusion Devices, continued

22853  Insertion of interbody biomechanical device(s) (eg, synthetic cage, mesh) with integral anterior instrumentation for device anchoring (eg, screws, flanges), when performed, to intervertebral disc space in conjunction with interbody arthrodesis, each interspace (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

22854  Insertion of intervertebral biomechanical device(s) (eg, synthetic cage, mesh) with integral anterior instrumentation for device anchoring (eg, screws, flanges), when performed, to vertebral corpectomy (ies) (vertebral body resection, partial or complete) defect, in conjunction with interbody arthrodesis, each contiguous defect (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

22859  Insertion of intervertebral biomechanical device(s) (eg, synthetic cage, mesh, methylmethacrylate) to intervertebral disc space or vertebral body defect without interbody arthrodesis, each contiguous defect (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

63047  Laminectomy, facetectomy and foraminotomy (unilateral or bilateral with decompression of spinal cord, cauda equina and/or nerve root[s], [e.g., spinal or lateral recess stenosis]), single vertebral segment; lumbar

63048  ; each additional segment, cervical, thoracic, or lumbar (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

HCPCS CODES
No specific codes identified

Key References

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract.
Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member’s individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.
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Description

There are approximately thirty million adults in the United States with chronic lower back pain (CLBP), which represents approximately 10–13% of the US adult-aged population. Of these patients with CLBP, one in six (approximately 5 million people), have vertebrogenic CLBP with Type 1 and/or 2 Modic changes (MC). Patients with Modic Type 1 or 2 endplate changes are known to have high levels of disability, poor outcomes with standard treatments, and to incur high rates of healthcare utilization and high costs. The resulting economic burden for these patients with MC, who are currently being treated inconsistently, and ineffectively, is excessive.

Patients with vertebrogenic pain present with low back pain, with or without referral into the buttocks or thighs (somatic referred pain). The pain is often disabling, with over 70% being classified as at least moderately disabled on the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI). In fact, patients with Modic type 1 or 2 changes are known to have the highest levels of disability, the poorest outcomes with standard treatments, and incur the highest rates of healthcare utilization and costs. Enrollment in the two Level I randomized controlled trials of BVN ablation for CLBP would suggest that the mean age of patients is 47–50 years old.

Patients with vertebrogenic pain are often treated as having non-specific LBP, and their treatment usually does not follow validated care pathways. This results in over- or under-treatment, suboptimal outcomes, and high costs. Furthermore, clinical guidelines and payer policies governing nonoperative and surgical treatments for CLBP are inconsistent and have a high degree of heterogeneity. Common therapies aimed at chronic non-specific LBP are limited by small effect size, leaving many patients dissatisfied. When compared to a standard care control, treatment of patients with CLBP failed to demonstrate a statistically significant difference or failed to exceed established thresholds of clinical relevance using acupuncture, cognitive behavioral therapy34, multidisciplinary rehabilitation35, and yoga. Some patients ultimately go on to fusion surgery. While fusion surgery for instability, scoliosis, and other well-defined conditions yield very positive outcomes, a recent meta-analysis of 7 studies comparing segmental fusion to different types of structured and unstructured care for CLBP revealed a weighted mean difference in ODI of 5.13 points (95% CI 0.19–10.07) in favor of fusion surgery.

The Intracept Procedure is a minimally invasive outpatient procedure that targets the basivertebral nerve (BVN) for relief of chronic low back pain caused by vertebrogenic pain between L3 and S1. The procedure is performed under at least moderate conscious sedation. Fluoroscopic imaging is utilized to guide transpedicular positioning of the intervertebral instruments. After reaching the location of the BVN trunk a flexible bipolar radiofrequency (RF) probe is inserted and then connected to a RF generator to heat the tip to 85°C for 15 minutes. This energy creates a 1 cm diameter spherical ablation zone. The procedure is repeated at each additional vertebral body identified pre-operatively.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children’s Health Insurance Program)
Intracpect, continued

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

SelectHealth covers intraosseous ablation of the basivertebral nerve (Intracept) for members who meet the following criteria:

1. Has failed an adequate course of conservative treatment as defined by (at least 6 months):
   a) NSAIDs/Analgesics > 3 weeks or contraindicated
   b) Activity modification > 6 weeks
   c) Physical therapy (minimum of 4 visits over a 6-week period), or chiropractic therapy (minimum of 4 visits over a 6-week period)

2. Type 1 and/or Type 2 Modic changes are present, and confirmed on radiologic report

3. Other sources of lower back pain have been ruled out, specifically radiofrequency of the facet joints is either contraindicated or have failed to relieve the lower back pain

4. Not eligible candidates for surgical intervention, per surgical consult

5. Patient does not have significant radicular pain

** The procedure may not be repeated for 5 years after the initial procedure.

SelectHealth considers all other indications for intraosseous ablation of the basivertebral nerve (Intracept) to be investigational/experimental.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website [http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp) or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php) or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information
SMART Trial
The SMART trial was a prospective randomized, sham-controlled, double-blinded, FDA-IDE trial conducted to evaluate the safety and efficacy of RF ablation of the BVN for the treatment of CLBP. A total of 225 CLBP patients with Type I or Type II Modic changes noted in vertebral bodies L3 to S1 were randomized to either a sham-control (76 patients) or BVN ablation treatment (147 patients). All study participants were treated with the same operating protocol and pedicle access. The sham-control arm received simulated RF ablation therapy. Treatment success was adjudicated in a blinded review of the 6-week MRI. Study participants were followed at 2 weeks, 6 weeks, and 3, 6, 9, and 12 months post-randomized intervention. The primary efficacy endpoint was change in ODI from baseline to 3 months post-procedure. The primary safety endpoint was a comparison of musculoskeletal and neurologic adverse events at 12 months.

Participants in this study were of working age (mean of 47 years), reported severe disability impact from their low back pain (mean ODI of 42), and more than 68% had been experiencing CLBP for greater than 5 years. At 3 months, the mean ODI in the treatment arm decreased 20.5 points, as compared to a 15.2-point decrease in the sham arm ($p = 0.019$, per-protocol population). The reduction in ODI experienced by the treatment arm was twice the minimally clinically important difference of ≥ 10 points and responder rates were 75.6% in the treatment arm compared to 55.3% in the sham control arm. There were no serious device or procedure-related adverse events reported in patients randomized to the RF ablation treatment arm through 12 months.

This level 1 trial demonstrated significant functional improvement in patients treated with RF ablation of the BVN for CLBP compared to patients treated with a sham procedure. Safety of the procedure was also demonstrated. The results supported BVN ablation as a minimally invasive treatment for the relief of chronic low back pain.

**SMART 24-Month Outcomes**

This prospective, single-arm study is an extension of follow-up for the RF ablation treatment arm of the SMART trial. Per the original SMART RCT protocol, at completion of the 12-month primary safety endpoint, patients in the sham-control arm could cross to BVN ablation treatment; 73% elected to cross. Due to this high rate of cross-over, the 147 RF ablation treatment arm participants acted as their own control in comparing 24-month outcomes to baseline.

Clinical improvements in the ODI, VAS, and the Medical Outcomes Trust Short-Form Health Survey Physical Component Summary (SF-36 PCS) were statistically significant compared to baseline at all follow-up time points through 2 years (3, 6, 9, 12, 18 and 24 months). The mean percent improvements at 2 years in ODI and VAS compared to baseline were 53.7% and 52.9%, respectively. Responder rates for ODI and VAS were also maintained through 2 years for both a 10-point ODI MCID threshold (76.4% of patients) and an ODI 20-point improvement threshold (57.5% of patients). The MCID threshold for VAS of 1.5 cm improvement was reported in 70.2% of patients at 24 months. In summary, patients treated with RF ablation of the BVN for CLBP exhibited sustained clinical benefits in ODI and VAS and maintained high responder rates through 2 years following treatment.

**Table 1 – SMART Treatment Arm Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visit</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
<th>Month 6</th>
<th>Month 12</th>
<th>Month 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSWENs Disability Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>42.4±10.92</td>
<td>23.3±15.41</td>
<td>23.1±15.19</td>
<td>22.1±15.39</td>
<td>21.6±14.92</td>
<td>22.5±15.71</td>
<td>18.3±15.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean ± SD</strong></td>
<td>-18.9±15.92</td>
<td>-19.3±15.27</td>
<td>-20.3±15.56</td>
<td>-20.8±15.92</td>
<td>-19.8±16.18</td>
<td>-23.4±18.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Improvement</strong></td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Analog Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>6.73±1.383</td>
<td>3.74±2.280</td>
<td>3.75±2.532</td>
<td>3.80±2.625</td>
<td>3.74±2.684</td>
<td>3.96±2.830</td>
<td>3.13±2.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean ± SD</strong></td>
<td>-2.97±2.407</td>
<td>-2.95±2.558</td>
<td>-2.90±2.642</td>
<td>-2.98±2.639</td>
<td>-2.76±2.887</td>
<td>-3.59±2.739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Improvement</strong></td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SF-36 Physical Component Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>33.50±7.366</td>
<td>43.32±43.89</td>
<td>42.83±45.83</td>
<td>43.74±42.83</td>
<td>43.32±43.89</td>
<td>42.83±45.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SMART protocol was an extension of follow-up for the RF ablation treatment arm of the SMART trial, with patients in the sham-control arm able to cross to BVN ablation treatment; 73% elected to cross. Due to this high rate of cross-over, the 147 RF ablation treatment arm participants acted as their own control in comparing 24-month outcomes to baseline.
INTRACEPT Trial
This prospective, parallel, open-label, randomized control trial conducted at 20 US sites compared the effectiveness of intraosseous RF ablation of the basivertebral nerve (BVN) to standard care for the treatment of chronic low back pain (CLBP) in patients suspected to have vertebrogenic-related pain symptomatology. A total of 140 patients with CLBP of at least 6 months duration, with Modic Type 1 or 2 vertebral endplate changes between L3 to S1, were randomized 1:1 to undergo either RF ablation of the BVN or continue standard care. The primary endpoint was a between-arm comparison of the mean change in ODI from baseline to 3 months post-treatment. Secondary outcome measures included LBP pain scores via Visual Analog Scale (VAS), ODI, and VAS responder rates, SF-36, and EQ-5D-5L at 3, 6, 9, and 12-months post-procedure. An interim analysis to assess for superiority was prespecified and overseen by an independent data management committee (DMC) when a minimum of 60% of patients had completed their 3-month primary endpoint visit.

The interim analysis showed clear statistical superiority (p < 0.001) for all primary and secondary patient-reported outcome measures in the RF ablation arm compared to the standard care arm. This resulted in a DMC recommendation to halt enrollment in the study and offer early cross-over to the control arm. As a result, the study reported the outcomes of the 104 patients included in the intent-to-treat (ITT) analysis of the 3-month primary endpoint, which included 51 patients in the RF ablation arm and 53 patients in the standard care arm. At baseline, the mean age was 50 years, mean ODI was 46.1 (severe pain disability) and mean VAS was 6.67 cm (on a 0 to 10 cm scale). More than 67% of patients reported experiencing LBP for greater than 5 years and more than 70% had received prior injections at baseline.

Comparing the RF ablation arm to the standard care arm, the mean changes in ODI at three months were -25.3 points versus -4.4 points, respectively, resulting in an adjusted difference of 20.9 points (p<0.001); and mean changes in VAS were -3.46 versus -1.02, respectively, an adjusted difference of 2.44 cm (p<0.001). In the RF ablation arm, 74.5% of patients achieved the minimal clinically important difference (MCID) of ≥ 10-point improvement in ODI, compared with 32.7% in the standard care arm (p < 0.001). With a MCID of 2.0 cm improvement in VAS, 72.8% of patients in the RF ablation arm reached clinical success compared to 34.0% of patients in the standard care arm. No RF ablation patients received a spinal injection prior to the 3-month endpoint, while in the standard care arm, 6 standard of care patients (11%) received injections across 5 study sites. The study concluded that minimally invasive RF ablation of the BVN leads to significant improvement of pain and function at 3-months in patients with chronic vertebrogenic related LBP.

Billing/Coding Information
CPT CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22899</td>
<td>Unlisted procedure, spine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Updated CPT codes, effective January 1, 2022]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64628</td>
<td>Thermal destruction of intraosseous basivertebral nerve, including all imaging guidance; first 2 vertebral bodies, lumbar or sacral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64629</td>
<td>Thermal destruction of intraosseous basivertebral nerve, including all imaging guidance; each additional vertebral body, lumbar or sacral (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neurology/Neurosurgery Policies, Continued

Intracept, continued

HCPCS CODES

C9752  Destruction of intraosseous basivertebral nerve, first two vertebral bodies, including imaging guidance (e.g., fluoroscopy), lumbar/sacrum or just “Intraosseous destruct add’l” for short, used in Surgery

C9753  Destruction of intraosseous basivertebral nerve, each additional vertebral body, including imaging guidance (e.g., fluoroscopy), lumbar/sacrum (list separately in addition to code for primary procedure) or just “Intraosseous destruct add’l” for short, used in Surgery

Key References

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member’s individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member’s contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of “SelectHealth” and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.

Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association
MIGRAINE HEADACHE SURGERY

Policy # 291

Implementation Date: 1/20/06

Review Dates: 12/21/06, 12/20/07, 12/18/08, 12/17/09, 10/21/10, 10/13/11, 11/29/12, 10/24/13, 3/19/15, 2/11/16, 2/16/17, 2/15/18, 2/18/19, 2/17/20

Revision Dates: 1/17/14

Related medical policies:
#559 Sphenopalatine Ganglion (SPG) Injection in the Management of headaches
#221 Botulinum Toxin (e.g., Botox) Injections
#420 Peripheral Nerve Stimulation for Occipital Neuralgia and Chronic Headaches

Description
Migraine is a common, often disabling, episodic headache disorder that occurs in up to 17% of women and 6% of men each year. The World Health Organization (WHO) ranks migraines 19th among all diseases worldwide that cause disability. Migraines are thought to have a polygenetic and multifactorial etiology. Migraine sufferers may have a genetic threshold making them prone to migraines, which may be triggered by “neuronal dysfunction” (i.e., the balance between excitation and inhibition) occurring at various levels of the nervous system that activates a cascade of neural changes to produce migraine symptoms. A variety of theories postulate several possible pathways of migraine pathogenesis that involve trigeminal nerve stimulation, cortical hypoperfusion and cortical spreading depression (CSD), and the action of serotonin and calcitonin gene-related peptide (CGRP) on cerebral vasculature.

Several surgical procedures have been developed to prevent chronic migraine headaches. A summary of the more common procedures follows.

Cardiac shunt closure (PFO Closure) is often done percutaneously on an outpatient basis. The procedure involves inserting a catheter into the heart through an incision in the femoral vein. The PFO is measured and a closure device (e.g., Amplatzer® Septal Occluder© CardioSEAL® Septal Occlusion System) is moved through the catheter to the location of the PFO. Once in the correct location, the PFO closure device is allowed to expand its shape to straddle each side of the hole. The device remains in the heart permanently to stop the abnormal flow of blood between the two atria.

Cranial Muscle Surgery aims to reduce compression of certain nerves that traverse the surface of the cranial muscles. Patients undergo multiple botulinum toxin A injections (Botox) to identify headache trigger points. Botox responders (at least 50% reduction in intensity or frequency lasting at least 4 consecutive weeks) are surgery candidates. Surgery involves removal of the corrugator supercilii, depressor supercilii, and procerus muscles for frontal headaches, removal of a portion of the zygomaticotemporal branch of the trigeminal nerve for temporal headaches, and removal of a small portion of the semispinalis capitis muscle for occipital migraines.

Intranasal surgery assumes that some migraine headaches arise from pressure on nasal mucosa from anatomical variations in the nasal cavity (e.g., deviated septum). Patients undergo radiographic imaging to identify contact points between the septum (thin wall of cartilage that divides the nasal cavities) and turbinates (bony plates within the nasal cavity). Patients who report migraine improvement when a topical anesthetic is applied to the contact area are candidates for surgery. Patients with such triggers accompanied by intranasal abnormality undergo septoplasty, in which portions of the nasal septum are removed.
removed or repositioned, and/or turbinectomy, in which the inferior and/or middle turbinates are removed or reduced in size.

### Commercial Plan Policy

SelectHealth does NOT cover any currently available surgical techniques when used primarily for the treatment of migraine headaches, including but not limited to: PFO closure, corrugator/frontalis muscle resection, and ‘contact point’ intranasal surgery. Current evidence is inconclusive as to the safety and efficacy of any surgical intervention in the treatment of migraine headaches; therefore, this meets the plan’s definition of investigational/experimental.

### SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS) (No Preauthorization Required but criteria may apply if appropriate)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website [http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&) or the manual website.

### SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) (Preauthorization Required)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php) or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

### Summary of Medical Information

#### Patent Foramen Ovale Closure

Six studies examining the effect of PFO closure on frequency of migraine headaches were found when conducting a literature review. All were retrospective clinical reports of patients who underwent closure of a PFO or atrial septal defect. Most patients were diagnosed with or were suspected of having paradoxical cerebral embolism. None of the patients in these studies was reported to have undergone PFO closure primarily for migraine prophylaxis nor were patients selected for surgery based on the presence of migraine symptoms. None of these studies measured any utilization outcomes-related migraines (e.g., medication use, office visits, ER visits).

The extant literature generally supports some association between PFO closure and migraine pain relief. Azarbal et al., for example, reported that in PFO closure patients in whom migraine was also present (n = 37), 75% of those with aura and 31% without aura experienced complete remission of migraine symptoms at 3 months post-surgery. Of the remaining migraineurs, 40% reported significant improvement in migraine symptoms. Morandi et al. studied 17 migraine patients scheduled for PFO closure. Six months after surgery, 5 patients no longer complained of migraine, 10 were substantially improved, and 2 were unchanged. A 1-year retrospective study of 50 migraineurs by Reisman et al. found complete resolution of migraine symptoms in 56% of patients and 14% experienced significant reduction in migraine frequency. Overall, the mean number of migraine episodes per month decreased from 6.8 + 9.6 to 1.4 + 3.4 after surgery. Schwerzmann et al.’s study of 48 migraine patients found that PFO closure reduced the frequency of attacks by 54% and 62% in those with and without aura, respectively. In contrast, a 2005 survey of 75 PFO closure patients by Mortelmans et al. found that PFO closure was not related to a decrease in the prevalence of migraine (median follow-up time was 29 months). In fact, 10 patients experienced new-onset migraine after surgery.
The rate of migraine among PFO closure patients from these studies ranged from 11%−57%. However, evidence based on randomized, prospective studies is not yet available to allow conclusions as to whether this therapy indeed is cost-effective in treating migraine headaches, let alone effective.

Cranial Surgery
Four studies involved corrugator muscle resection and other surgical procedures for treatment of migraine headaches, 3 of which were conducted by Bahman Guyuron, a primary developer of this technique. All these studies involved relatively small sample sizes and most lacked adequate strategies for assuring homogeneity of the study sample.

The most recent study, a 2005 investigation of 125 migraine patients, randomly assigned 100 patients to surgery while the remaining 25 served as no treatment controls. Depending on individual trigger sites, surgery involved resection of the corrugator supercili, depressor supercili, and procerus muscles, removal of a section of the zygomaticotemporal branch of the trigeminal nerve, or a portion of the semispinalis capitis muscle. Many of these patients also underwent intranasal surgery as well. Of the 89 who completed the study, 31 (35%) reported elimination of migraine symptoms and 51 (57%) demonstrated at least 50% reduction in migraine headache frequency, duration, or intensity over a mean follow-up period of 396 days. Conversely, 3 of 19 controls (15.8%), recorded reduction in migraine headaches during the 1-year follow-up, but in none were migraines eliminated. The mean annualized cost of migraine care for the treatment group ($925.00) was reduced significantly compared with the baseline expense ($7,612.00 dollars) and the control group ($5,530.00). How these costs were calculated was not reported, however. The mean monthly number of days lost from work for the treatment group (1.2) was reduced significantly compared with the baseline data (4.41) and the control group (4.4) (p = 0.003).

Dirnberger et al. examined 60 consecutive patients who underwent corrugator muscle resection for migraines. Of these, 28.3% reported a total relief from migraine, 40% reported some improvement, and 31.7% experienced minimal or no change in symptoms. Patients with more mild migraine headaches had a higher likelihood of experiencing an improvement or total elimination of migraine than those patients with severe migraine. Eleven patients who had a favorable response within the first weeks experienced a gradual return of their headaches to preoperative intensity after about 4 weeks. Investigator bias and the lack of adequately controlled and powered studies limit the conclusion obtained from this body of literature.

Intranasal Surgery.
Seven studies were found in the literature regarding the use of intranasal surgery in treatment of migraine headache. Most of these were retrospective clinical reports in which surgery was conducted as part of clinical care, rather than a research protocol. Consequently, none of the studies was controlled in that they lacked random subject selection, standard study procedures, or consistent measurement strategies. The procedures administered in these studies included septal correction, resection of the turbinates, ethmoidectomy, and sphenoidectomy.

Results from these studies suggest that intranasal surgery relieves headache pain in migraine patients with radiographic evidence of intranasal contact points between the septum, turbinates, and surrounding sinuses. Behin et al. have published the most recent research in this area. Their 2005 chart review involved 21 subjects with refractory migraine and intranasal contact points, which, when treated with topical anesthesia, produced headache relief. Surgery to correct these contact points resulted a decline in mean headache frequency from 17.7 to 7.7 headache days per month and a decrease in mean headache severity from 7.8 to 3.6 (0−10 scale). Headache-related disability declined from 5.6 to 1.8 (0−10 scale). A second chart review by Behin et al. reported that 80% of migraine patients who underwent surgery to correct intranasal contact points experienced improvement in their headaches. The authors concluded that contact point headaches should be evaluated as an alternative diagnosis in the patient with chronic migraines.

Billing/Coding Information
Not Covered: Investigational/Experimental/Unproven for this indication

CPT CODES

Forehead/Brow Lift

15824 Rhytidectomy, forehead
Excision or Submucous Resection of Nasal Turbinates

30130 Excision turbinate, partial or complete, any method

30140 Submucous resection turbinate, partial or complete, any method

Nasal Septum Repair

30520 Septoplasty or submucous resection, with or without cartilage scoring, contouring or replacement with graft

Patent Foramen Ovale

93580 Percutaneous transcatheter closure of congenital interatrial communication (i.e., Fontan fenestration, atrial septal defect) with implant

Additional Procedures

93315 Transesophageal echocardiography for congenital cardiac anomalies; including probe placement, image acquisition, interpretation and report

93320 Doppler echocardiography, pulsed wave and/or continuous wave with spectral display (List separately in addition to code for echocardiographic imaging); complete

93321 Follow-up or limited study (List separately in addition to codes for echocardiographic imaging)

93325 Doppler echocardiography color flow velocity mapping (List separately in addition to codes for echocardiography)

93533 Combined right heart catheterization and transseptal left heart catheterization through existing septal opening, with or without retrograde left heart catheterization, for congenital cardiac anomalies

HCPCS CODES

C1817 Septal defect implant system, intracardiac

Key References

17. Messé SR, Perloff JK. Atrial septal abnormalities (PFO, ASD, and ASA) and cerebral emboli in adults. UpToDate Online. 2005; http://www.utdol.com


29. Novak VJ. Pathogenesis and surgical therapy of migraine attacks caused by weather (Foehn) and menstruation. Rhinology. 1984; 22(3):165-70.


Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and coding/ reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract and Predictors of Surgical Success." Plast Reconstr Surg 139(1): 184-189.

55.
MEDICAL POLICY

NEUTRALIZING ANTIBodies (NAB) TESTING IN MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS (MS)

Policy # 359
Implementation Date: 7/11/07
Review Dates: 6/19/08, 6/11/09, 6/17/10, 8/16/11, 8/16/12, 8/15/13, 8/28/14, 8/20/15, 8/25/16, 8/17/17, 8/13/18, 10/13/19

Description

Multiple sclerosis (MS) is an inflammatory disease of the central nervous system. It affects 250,000–350,000 people in the US. MS usually occurs in women (2:1 ratio vs. men) at ages 20–45 years. In MS, demyelination occurs with inflammatory responses, causing plaques in the brain, spinal cord, and optic nerves. This causes disruption of the transmission of nerve impulses, resulting in the following classic symptoms: gait problems, paresthesia, pain, spasticity, speech difficulty, bowel/bladder dysfunction, tremor, etc.

Multiple sclerosis can be classified into 3 clinical types:

- Relapsing-remitting MS (RRMS)
- Secondary progressive MS (SPMS)
- Primary progressive MS (PPMS)

The neurological dysfunction seen with RRMS is characterized by acute, self-limited attacks that may evolve over days or weeks and can last weeks to months. The patients are neurologically and symptomatically stable between attacks. In SPMS, patients begin a clinical course similar to RRMS but the number of attacks decreases over time. The patient’s neurological function steadily deteriorates, unrelated to the acute attacks. Patients with PPMS do not present with acute attacks at the onset of the disease, their function steadily declines.

There is no cure for MS. Current therapy works to slow the progression of the disease or treat acute flare ups of the disease through the use of various medications. One group of medications are immune modulators. These disease-modifying agents include Glatiramer acetate, copolymer-1 (Copaxone®), Interferon beta-1b (Betaseron®), Interferon beta-1a, intramuscular (Avonex®), Interferon beta-1a, and subcutaneous (Rebif®). Several of these agents are known to trigger an immune response where antibodies are formed specifically targeted to the drug. These are called neutralizing antibodies (NAb). About one-third of individuals develop NAbs against interferon beta and upwards of 20% of patients receiving interferon alpha. Some clinicians measure these levels in an attempt to make clinical decisions yet the clinical literature has not yet documented a proven relationship between NAb levels and clinical outcomes.

Commercial Plan Policy

SelectHealth does NOT cover neutralizing antibody (NAb) testing in patients with multiple sclerosis as the clinical utility of this testing has not been established. Use of this testing meets the plan’s definition of investigational/experimental.
Neutralizing Antibodies (NAB) Testing in Multiple Sclerosis (MS), continued

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS) (No Preauthorization Required but criteria may apply if appropriate)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website [http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp) or the manual website.

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) (No Preauthorization Required but criteria may apply if appropriate)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php) or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

Summary of Medical Information

A number of laboratories have developed assays for these NABS (e.g., MxA Assay [Berlex Laboratories], NabFeron [Athena Diagnostics]). However, according to the peer-reviewed medical literature, the clinical utility of these assays has not been established. Evidence-based guidelines on multiple sclerosis from the American Academy of Neurology (AAN) state: "The rate of neutralizing antibody (NAb) production is probably less with IFN-1a treatment than with IFN-1b treatment, and the presence of NAb may be associated with a reduction in clinical effectiveness of IFN treatment. The existing data are, however, ambiguous in this regard, and the clinical utility of measuring NAb in an individual on IFN therapy is uncertain."

While the European Federation of Neurological Societies Task Force on anti-IFN-beta antibodies in multiple sclerosis recommended that tests for the presence of NABs should be performed in all patients at 12 and 24 months of interferon beta therapy, the consensus statement from an international conference on the significance of NABs to interferon beta during treatment of MS stated that: "An international standardized assay for NAB is needed; and all patients with MS who receive IFN-beta therapy should be evaluated for the presence of NAB. Moreover, guidelines on how to manage NAB-positive patients should be developed to optimize IFN-beta therapy; these treatment guidelines should be based on the results of well-controlled clinical studies. ... An international standardized assay will facilitate direct comparison of NAB titers amongst studies and will provide further information regarding the immunogenecity of the various types of IFN-beta products and how NAb impact clinical efficacy."

Antonelli et al. stated that: "There is a lack of substantial information on the biological/immunological phenomenon of neutralising antibodies in vivo development. Nevertheless, sufficient experimental data are available to provide a rationale for monitoring the presence of anti-IFN antibodies in patients treated with IFN beta. A standardized quantitative assay to detect antibody to IFNs must be agreed. Only when results can be compared, both in terms of the qualitative presence and quantitative measurement of antibodies, will it be possible to monitor fully the ability of antibodies to cause a relapse during treatment. Although there is increasing evidence to indicate that the development of antibodies to IFN beta may be associated with a failure of the beneficial effects of the therapy, the use of the seropositivity for neutralising antibodies to IFN beta as the only surrogate marker for clinical and therapeutic decision-making is questionable. Also, guidelines on multiple sclerosis from the Association of British Neurologists (2001) state that monitoring neutralizing antibodies for beta interferon is not necessary.

Finally, in March 2007, the Therapeutics and Technology Assessment Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology published an evidence report assessing the clinical value and radiological impact of neutralizing antibodies to interferon beta. On the basis of Class II and III evidence, it was concluded that treatment of patients with MS with IFN (Avonex, Betaseron, or Rebif) is associated with the
production of NAbs (Level A). NAbs in the serum are probably associated with a reduction in the radiographic and clinical effectiveness of IFN treatment (Level B). In addition, the rate of NAb production is probably less with IFN-1a treatment than with IFN-1b treatment, although the magnitude and persistence of this difference is difficult to determine (Level B). Finally, it is probable that there is a difference in seroprevalence due to variability in the dose of IFN injected or in the frequency or route of its administration (Level B). Regardless of the explanation, it seems clear that IFN-1a (as it is currently formulated for IM injection) is less immunogenic than the current IFN preparations (either IFN-1a or IFN-1b) given multiple times per week subcutaneously (Level A). However, because NAbs disappear in some patients even with continued IFN treatment (especially in patients with low titers), the persistence of this difference is difficult to determine (Level B). Although the finding of sustained high-titer NAbs (100 to 200 NU/mL) is associated with a reduction in the therapeutic effects of IFN on radiographic and clinical measures of MS disease activity, there is insufficient information on the utilization of NAb testing to provide specific recommendations regarding when to test, which test to use, how many tests are necessary, or which cutoff titer to apply (Level U).

Additionally, the AAN Technology assessment group recommended specific actions it felt necessary in order to incorporate NAb testing into clinical practice. These included standardization of the assay system applied and the stratification of risk for losing IFN-efficacy based on the degree of test abnormality. Noting that newer methods of analysis (e.g., measuring the IFN-induced in vivo production of MxA protein or measuring the amount of IFN-induced MxA-mRNA expression) may offer more reliable test results, but the utility, sensitivity, and specificity for each of these newer techniques for characterizing the in vivo effects of IFN (either in the presence of NAbs or between individuals at baseline) and correlating these changes (or between-subject differences) in the bioactivity of IFN with its subsequent clinical and radiographic actions must be determined. It specifically recommended the methods of NAb measurement be standardized in order to facilitate cross-trial comparisons. Patients with persistent NAb titers of more than 200 NU/mL, those with persistent lower titers, and those who change status during the course of a trial need to have their clinical and MRI statuses analyzed separately, and only from the time of their first NAb-positive test result. These patient-groups should be compared to persistently NAb-negative patients (adjusted to the time at which the comparator group first became NAb-positive). The effects of NAbs in patients using different products or different doses of IFN need to be analyzed separately.

They also recommended that future clinical trials need to include a long-term ascertainment of NAb status and its clinical impact, and include a determination of IFN-responsiveness in individuals at study onset, in order to link the biologic activity in both NAb-positive and NAb-negative groups with clinical and radiographic outcomes. Because of the small number of NAb-positive patients generally available in RCTs, and because patients cannot be randomized with respect to their ultimate NAb status, conclusive data will need to be compiled from large-scale post marketing surveys. Noting the pharmaceutical industry and the physician community need to work together to acquire and share post-marketing surveillance data so as to characterize accurately the prevalence, persistence, and consequence of Nabs.

A literature search revealed a consensus statement on NAbs from the Italian MS Study group (Bertolotto et al.) published in 2014. This consensus statement recommends testing NAbs initially at 12 months in any patient on IFN-beta. However, the statement notes that the impact on NAbs on the therapeutic efficacy has been difficult to assess for reasons, including: “1. Most of the studies have been underpowered and/or short duration. 2. Studies have used different tests for NAbs detection and quantification 3. The timing of sampling was different, thus making results less comparable. 4. A crucial issue has been the differences is the study design.” The consensus statement favored MxA mRNA as a way to assess for antibodies, but noted that there is no consensus regarding the exact definition of biologically relevant MxA gene expression. The report conclusion recommend that the early identifications of non-responders should be a multidisciplinary process (including consideration of clinical course, MRI activity, and markers of NAbs). From a practical standpoint, much of the decision to transition from therapies could be made by evaluating clinical course and imagining independent of neutralizing antibody testing.

There is mention of neutralizing antibodies in interferon-beta in Multiple Sclerosis Consortium convened in Amsterdam, Netherlands, with results published in 2010 (Polman et al). This report recommends a multifaceted approach with regards to treatment decisions, of which neutralizing antibodies could be a component (see table 4 in Polman 2010). The report notes that: “It has been more difficult to show an efficacy on clinically determined outcomes ...” from NAbs and “Clinical decisions about continuing interferon treatment is based on NAb titers, might be complicated by the fact NAbs tend to disappear over
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From a practical standpoint, with the larger amount of medication treatment options available for multiple sclerosis, one could argue that a patient with advancing disease (either clinically, or on imaging) would be switched to an alternative treatment regardless of an antibody titer, and the contribution of a titer result in such circumstances is questionable.

Billing/Coding Information

Not covered: Investigational/Experimental/Unproven for this indication

CPT CODES

86382 Neutralization test, viral

87253 Virus isolation, tissue culture, additional studies or definitive identification (e.g. hemabsortion, neutralization, immunofluoresence stain), each isolate

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References
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PERIPHERAL NERVE STIMULATION FOR OCCIPITAL NEURALGIA AND CHRONIC HEADACHES

Policy # 420
Implementation Date: 8/13/09
Review Dates:  8/19/10, 9/15/11, 11/29/12, 12/19/13, 12/18/14, 12/15/16, 12/21/17, 11/28/18, 12/18/19
Revision Dates: 3/17/10

Related medical policies:
#559 Sphenopalatine Ganglion (SPG) Injection in the Management of headaches
#221 Botulinum Toxin Injections
#291 Migraine Headache Surgery

Description
Peripheral nerve stimulation (PNS) is a neuromodulation technique in which an electrical current is applied to the peripheral nerves to reduce or eliminate chronic pain. It is most commonly applied to patients with chronic neuralgia or headache conditions. After a trial period in which temporary electrodes and an external generator are applied for ~1 week, a standard 4–8 contact electrodes are typically used; the electrodes are passed in the epifascial plane under the skin but above the muscles. Patients routinely undergo a psychological screening to rule out psychological amplifiers of pain, such as depression, substance abuse, behavioral problems, etc.

For the permanent procedure, the electrodes used include cylindrical "wire" types (such as Quad, Octad, Quad Plus, or Quad Compact [Medtronic, Inc.]; Qattrode, Octrode, or Axxess [Advanced Neuromodulation Systems]; and Linear [Advanced Bionics]). The electrodes or extension cables are tunneled toward the generator pocket. The tunneling step is quite painful and necessitates the use of general anesthesia. Location of the pocket is chosen based on the patient's and surgeon's preference. The infraclavicular area is most commonly used for occipital nerve stimulation systems, and in this way the procedure is similar to the one used for placement of deep brain stimulation generators.

A new neurostimulator, the Bion® microstimulator, manufactured by Advanced Bionics, is currently in U.S. clinical trials for the treatment of urinary urge incontinence through pudendal nerve stimulation (for which it has already received the CE Mark), and for the treatment of chronic headache through occipital nerve stimulation. Several other indications are being explored for this revolutionary micro-bionic technology. This small leadless rechargeable device weighing 0.75 g with an overall volume of only 0.19 cm³ (3 mm x 28 mm), the microstimulator is a tiny fraction of the size of other neurostimulators. Its small size enables the microstimulator to be implanted with the use of a custom needle-like insertion tool (4 mm in diameter) in the subcutaneous space above the trapezius muscles; this is proposed to offer an advantage over implantable pulse generator (IPG) systems, since it is immune from problems like lead migration and stress fracturing. IPG advocates stress the greater proximity of electrical energy to the target nerve possible with leads.

Commercial Plan Policy
SelectHealth does NOT cover peripheral nerve stimulation for occipital neuralgia or chronic headaches. This procedure meets the plan’s definition of investigational/experimental.
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**SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS) (Preauthorization Required)**

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website [http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&) or the manual website.

**SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) (Preauthorization Required)**

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php) or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

**Summary of Medical Information**

SelectHealth identified 13 studies for this report. Overall, this literature consists of small case series of generally limited follow-up periods. One of these was a comparative trial. These studies conclude that PNS results in pain reduction and functional improvements relative to baseline assessments. Ahmed et al. reported on 30 patients who underwent PNS for tension headache, migraine, or posttraumatic headache. In this unblended study, patients were randomized to receive PENS (needles with electricity) or "needles alone" according to a crossover study design. All treatments were administered for 30 minutes, 3 times a week for 2 consecutive weeks, with 1 week off between the 2 different treatments. Compared with the needles alone, PENS therapy was significantly more effective in decreasing the overall VAS pain scores for tension-type headache, migraine, and posttraumatic headache (58%, 59%, and 52% vs. 20%, 15%, and 20%, respectively). Similarly, PENS therapy produced greater improvement in the patients' physical activity (41%–58% for PENS vs. 11%–21% for needles only) and quality of sleep (41%–48% for PENS vs. 12%–20% for needles only). However, there were no differences in the pattern of the response to PENS therapy among the three headache groups.

Burns et al. administered PNS (Bion) to 6 patients with hemicrania continua in crossover fashion: the device was on for the first three months, off for the fourth month, and on again during long-term follow-up. All phases were unblinded. At the median 13.5-month follow-up, there was a significant effect of the Bion being on or off for the entire cohort (Wald χ² = 13.1, p = 0.001). A study-day term in the model was used to account for the baseline period (χ²1 = 0.01, p = 0.92). The results of this analysis suggest that the Bion intervention reduces pain levels in this group. The overall estimated effect of the Bion was a reduction in pain score of 5.8 points on the Migraine Disability Assessment Scale (95% CI 4.7–6.9 points).

Kapural et al. reported a case series involving 6 patients who underwent PNS implantation for occipital neuralgia who were followed for 3 months after implantation. Patients experienced significant decreases in VAS pain ratings over time (8.66–2.5) and improved functional capacity as measured by the Pain Disability Index. A 2007 study by Melvin et al. prospectively evaluated PNS in 11 patients with C2-mediated occipital headaches. At 12 weeks, scores on the Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire (-64%), Visual Analog Scale (-67%), and the Present Pain Index (-67%) all declined significantly from baseline. Moreover, 91% of patients reported using less medication for headache pain and 64% reported having fewer headaches. Finally, the impact of headaches on ADLs (-34%), recreation (-35%), and work productivity (-40%) also declined over time.

Slavin et al., conducted a retrospective review of 30 patients with craniofacial pain who underwent PNS of the supraorbital (7 patients), infraorbital (6), and occipital (21) nerves. In 19 patients, more than one nerve was stimulated. Outcomes by stimulation site were not reported. Of the 30 implanted, 22 (73%) experienced more than a 50% reduction in pain intensity and went on to have a permanent system implanted. At an average 35-month follow-up, 2 devices had been removed because of improved pain and three were removed because of loss of effectiveness. Altogether, of 22 patients in whom PNS devices were implanted, 16 (73%) experienced significant (> 50%) improvement in pain intensity (14 with
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and 2 without stimulation); 3 patients (13.5%) reported less than 50% pain improvement; and 3 (13.5%) continued to experience pain after their devices were removed due to either loss of effect or infection.

Though some literature suggests peripheral nerve stimulation may be effective in treating chronic intractable headache, these studies were of small sample size and none were blinded, including the 2 crossover ones. Additionally, there are few comparative trials from which to draw firm conclusions about the efficacy of this treatment, especially as it compares to alternative treatments. The pre-post design utilized by most studies is a weak method for testing treatment effects as it is susceptible to regression toward the mean. For greater certainty, blinded comparative studies are particularly important in pain-related treatment studies to rule out the placebo effect. Therefore, until larger, blinded, comparative studies are completed, PNS cannot be considered a valid alternative in the treatment of chronic intractable headache/neuralgia and remains investigational.

The Congress of Neurological Surgeons published guidelines regarding PNS in 2015. The guideline outlined nine small published studies on the use of occipital nerve stimulation (ONS) for occipital neuralgia (ON). The studies are all small (< 15 patients), and the majority of them have no comparison or control population (in one study treatment patients served as their own controls). The level of evidence in all the studies is Level III (case series, case reports, or comparative studies with historical controls). Based on the review, the authors state that: "The use of ONS is a treatment option for patients with medically refractory ON."

The ONSTIM study published in 2011 defined responders as a patient achieving > 50% reduction in headache days/month or a > 3-point reduction in pain severity. The responder rate in this trial was 39% for active stimulation, 6% for sham, and 0% for medical management. The study was not powered for efficacy evaluation. The response rates are comparable to medical preventative chronic migraine treatments and suggests that additional study is warranted.

Lipton et al., reported the results of the PRISM study in abstract only as part of a conference presentation. The abstract reportedly failed to demonstrate statistically significant improvement compared to sham for occipital nerve stimulation. The trial results have not yet been published in a peer-reviewed journal. A St. Jude study also did not meet statistical significance for its' primary endpoint of active treatment responders achieving > 50% reduction in daily headache scale scores. Further statistical analysis showed a statistical difference at > 30% reduction, but this was not the primary trial endpoint. Another trial (Silberstein) did not reach statistical significance for its primary endpoint.

Chen et al., published meta-analysis as part of procedural guidance for the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). The meta-analysis includes analysis of the three multicenter RCTs previously mentioned. The meta-analysis concluded that mean headache day reduction in those three multicenter trials was 2.56 days per month with active ONS compared to sham control. The analysis goes on to conclude: "The average effect size is modest and may be exaggerated by bias as achieving effective blinding remains a methodological challenge." This review also noted safety concerns with common lead migration and infections potentially requiring revision surgery. For example, in the ONSTIM trial, lead migration occurred in 24% of patients at 3 months follow-up and it occurred in 18% of the St Jude trial at 1-year follow-up. The meta-analysis concluded: "Current evidence on the effectiveness and safety of ONS is still limited in quantity and remains inconclusive given the challenges in trial methodology and patient selection."

A 2017 literature search found a review (Robbins et al., 2017) in the Journal of Head and Face Pain (Headache) summarizing the 3 main trials for stimulation in chronic headache which found this conclusion: "The 3 clinical trials for minimally invasive occipital nerve stimulation for migraine did not clearly demonstrate efficacy but show promising trends. High rates of adverse effects … are serious concerns." There is a prospective ONS trial for chronic migraine (Rodrigo et al., 2017) that shows benefit, however, because it is open-label and uncontrolled, the level of evidence is not strong.

Another small case series suggested medical benefit (Keifer et al., 2017) but like most of the other studies suggesting clinical benefit, it is limited by design and small sample size.

Billing/Coding Information

*Not covered: Investigational/Experimental/Unproven for this indication*

**CPT CODES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64555</td>
<td>Percutaneous implantation of neurostimulator electrodes; peripheral nerve (excludes sacral nerve)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
64575  Incision for implantation of neurostimulator electrodes; peripheral nerve (excludes sacral nerve)
64585  Revision or removal of peripheral neurostimulator electrode array
64590  Insertion or replacement of peripheral or gastric neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver, direct or inductive coupling
64595  Revision or removal of peripheral or gastric neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver
95970  Electronic analysis of implanted neurostimulator pulse generator system (eg, rate, pulse amplitude, pulse duration, configuration of wave form, battery status, electrode selectability, output modulation, cycling, impedance and patient compliance measurements); simple or complex brain, spinal cord, or peripheral (ie, cranial nerve, peripheral nerve, sacral nerve, neuromuscular) neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter, without reprogramming
95975  Electronic analysis of implanted neurostimulator pulse generator system (eg, rate, pulse amplitude, pulse duration, configuration of wave form, battery status, electrode selectability, output modulation, cycling, impedance and patient compliance measurements); complex cranial nerve neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter, with intraoperative or subsequent programming, each additional 30 minutes after first hour (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

**HCPCS CODES**

- C1767  Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), non-rechargeable
- C1778  Lead, neurostimulator (implantable)
- C1787  Patient programmer, neurostimulator
- C1816  Receiver and/or transmitter, neurostimulator (implantable)
- C1883  Adaptor/extension, pacing lead or neurostimulator lead (implantable)
- C1897  Lead, neurostimulator test kit (implantable)

**Key References**
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Neurology/Neurosurgery Policies, Continued

**QUANTITATIVE ELECTROENCEPHALOGRAPHY (QEEG) (BRAIN MAPPING)**

Policy # 319
Implementation Date: 10/25/06
Review Dates: 10/18/07, 10/23/08, 12/17/09, 6/21/12, 6/20/13, 4/17/14, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 6/21/18, 4/12/19, 4/15/20

**Description**
Electroencephalogram (EEG) refers to the continuous recording of brain electrical activity. This can be recorded onto a paper chart, or more commonly, digitized into a computer for frequency analysis. The continuous EEG is made up of waves of different frequencies that each relate to different aspects of mental activity. Quantitative EEG (QEEG) is the digitization of the EEG signal and mathematical analysis of the data and patterns of the signal through various manipulations of the data to help in the diagnosis and prognosis of illness, whether neurological or cognitive (e.g., head trauma or learning disorders). The heart of QEEG lies with the underlying computerized analytic and statistical techniques.

**Commercial Plan Policy**

SelectHealth does NOT cover quantitative electroencephalography (QEEG) (brain mapping) testing. There is a lack of literature supporting its use as an assessment tool; this meets the plan’s definition of investigational/experimental.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS) (No Preauthorization Required but criteria may apply if appropriate)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website [http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp) or the manual website.

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) (No Preauthorization Required but criteria may apply if appropriate)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php) or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.
Summary of Medical Information

Much of the research on quantitative EEG continues to be in its formative stages and its relevance to clinical practice cannot be evaluated. Most of this cross-sectional research involved small sample sizes with the aim of describing EEG abnormalities in different diagnosis groups. For many conditions, very few additional articles were published in the four years since our last review. Consequently, for most potential applications of QEEG, the literature does not support its incorporation into clinical practice.

For several conditions such as attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder/attention deficit disorder (ADHD/ADD) and dementia, QEEG has received more study. The test has also been examined as a means to track response to psychotropic medications. Chabot et al. reviewed the use of QEEG for these and other psychiatric indications.

**ADHD:** QEEG abnormalities may help to differentiate between childhood and adolescent ADHD/ADD and other learning disorders. Chabot et al. concluded that an increased theta-beta power ratio (i.e., high theta power relative to low beta power) in the frontal and temporal regions distinguishes children with ADHD from normal controls. More recent research is consistent with this observation. Barry et al., for example, found decreased levels of alpha and beta activity in 40 children with ADHD, compared with 40 matched controls. Hermens et al. found that children with ADHD had increased (primarily left) frontal theta relative to normal controls. Furthermore, this abnormality predicted performance on cognitive performance tasks. While initial data on adults with ADHD suggest a similar EEG profile, the data are insufficient to conclude whether these findings are reliable, particularly as other research evidence cited by Chabot et al. demonstrated age-related changes in EEG results.

In November 2016, the American Academy of Neurology released a guideline advising against using QEEG for the diagnosis of ADHD (Gloss et al.). Specifically, it states: "Clinicians should inform patients with suspected ADHD and their families that the combination of EEG theta/beta power ratio and frontal beta power should not replace a standard clinical evaluation. There is a risk for significant harm to patients from ADHD misdiagnosis because of the unacceptably high false-positive diagnostic rate of EEG theta/beta power ratio and frontal beta power."

Some of the technical issues raised in the AAN practice guideline for ADHD are likely to be concerns with using qEEG for other conditions. "Theta activity is increased by drowsiness and medication effects and is increased in many neurologic disorders. Theta power is known to be a highly nonspecific feature of EEGs. Likewise, there are many reasons (other than ADHD) why frontal beta power values may be higher or lower than average in certain individuals. These values also change with the patient's state of awareness, so values may differ when a patient is retested just minutes after the previous testing."

**Dementia:** Chabot et al. reported that increased delta or theta power, decreased mean frequency, decreased beta power, and decreased occipital dominant frequency may be indicative of dementia and may help differentiate dementia from other cognitive disorders (e.g., depression). In a more recent research, Kai et al. compared QEEG results from patients with either Alzheimer’s disease (AD) or dementia with Lewy Bodies (DLB). Relative to AD patients, DLB patients had higher delta and theta band intrahemispheric coherence values in the fronto-temporo-central regions and lower beta band in almost all temporo-centro-parieto-occipital regions. In 44 elderly patients with memory complaints, Onishi et al. found that QEEG power did not correlate with scores on the Mini-Mental Status Exam (MMSE), though a combination of QEEG and gender predicted 48% of the variance in MMSE scores. Sneddon et al. used QEEG to discriminate patients with AD and Related Disorders (ADRD) from patients with mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and normal aging. QEEG measured while performing a delayed recognition task correctly identified 30/32 normal aging subjects (94% specificity) and 14/16 MCI-to-mild ADRD (88% sensitivity).

Further literature searches showed a few additional small studies, such as Bonanni et al. from 2016, support the validity of QEEG analysis as a tool for diagnosis in DLB patients. These are small studies, not at a level that would justify using QEEG. The Bonanni study had low correct classification at 90% and 64%.

**Psychotropic Medication Response:** Use of QEEG to evaluate treatment response has been evaluated for a variety of conditions including dementia, depression, ADHD, obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), and schizophrenia. Generally, these studies have been done to examine the neurological basis underlying the cognitive, affective, and behavioral effects of psychotropic medications. These studies suggest that psychotropic medications do produce effects on the brain that can be detected with QEEG. For example, Song et al. obtained QEEG measurements from 20 boys with ADHD before and after administration of methylphenidate. This medication produced a significant increase in alpha band activity.
in both the right and left frontal and occipital areas, an increase of beta band activity in almost all areas except for the temporal region, a decrease of theta band activity in both the occipital and right tempoparietal areas, a mild decrease of delta band activity in the occipito-parietal areas, and an increase of the theta/beta ratio in the right frontal and parieto-occipital, and left temporal areas during the CPT state. Adler et al. administered neuropsychological testing and QEEG prior to 20 AD patients’ initiating treatment with rivastigmine. After 2 weeks of therapy, patients with greater decrease in theta power responded more favorably than those with a smaller theta power decrease. Responders also had better short term memory at baseline. In 50 adults with ADHD and 50 controls, Bresnahan et al. used QEEG to evaluate response to treatment with dexamphetamine. Following medication, ADHD patients experienced a decline in slow wave activity to levels that were similar to that seen in controls. A study by Crumbley et al. examined the validity of QEEG results for predicting response to treatment with psychotropic medication in 70 adolescent inpatients. Their retrospective analysis revealed that treatment concordant with QEEG results was no more effective than treatment discordant with QEEG results.

Overall, the strength of the research supporting most psychiatric indications for QEEG continues to be sparse. For most indications, additional studies are needed with larger and more diverse sample sizes to prospectively investigate the relationship between QEEG and symptom presentation, comorbid conditions, and treatment response. Even for studies with a larger body of literature supporting the association between QEEG findings and clinical diagnosis, the role of QEEG in the diagnostic workup for ADHD remains unclear.

Several issues need to be addressed for QEEG to be incorporated into standard clinical practice: 1) How might QEEG supplement or replace standard diagnostic tests?; 2) How would treatment be altered based on QEEG results?; 3) How should results be interpreted in light of other EEG abnormalities?; 4) How might QEEG results be affected in additional medical or psychiatric comorbidities?; and 5) Which patients are likely candidates for QEEG? Until these issues are more completely addressed in the research literature, QEEG will remain primarily an investigational modality.

Billing/Coding Information

Not Covered: Investigational/Experimental/Unproven for this indication

CPT CODES

95955 Electroencephalogram (EEG) during nonintracranial surgery (e.g., carotid surgery)
95957 Digital analysis of electroencephalogram (EEG) (e.g., for epileptic spike analysis)
95961 Functional cortical and subcortical mapping by stimulation and/or recording of electrodes on brain surface, or of depth electrodes, to provoke seizures or identify vital brain structures; initial hour of attendance by a physician or other qualified health care professional
95962 Functional cortical and subcortical mapping by stimulation and/or recording of electrodes on brain surface, or of depth electrodes, to provoke seizures or identify vital brain structures; each additional hour of attendance by a physician or other qualified health care professional (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

HCPCS CODES

S8040 Topographic brain mapping

Key References
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© CPT Only – American Medical Association
RESPONSIVE CORTICAL NEUROSTIMULATION IN THE TREATMENT OF EPILEPSY

Policy # 556
Implementation Date: 9/16/14
Review Dates: 10/15/15, 10/20/16, 10/19/17, 4/9/18, 10/15/18, 10/13/19

Related Medical Policies:
#186 Vagal Nerve Stimulation (VNS)
#205 Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS)

Description
A seizure is defined by transient focal or generalized signs or symptoms due to abnormal excessive or synchronous neuronal activity in the brain. Focal seizures, which originate within neuronal networks limited to one cerebral hemisphere, produce signs and symptoms corresponding to the specific region of the brain that is affected by the seizure.

There are two broad categories of seizures: partial (or focal) and generalized. Partial seizures involve only a portion of the brain, typically part of one lobe of one hemisphere. A complex partial seizure (CPS) implies that consciousness is impaired, while simple partial seizures (SPS) are not associated with altered consciousness. A partial seizure can evolve over seconds into a tonic-clonic convulsion, referred to as a secondarily generalized seizure.

Seizure disorders are typically treated with antiepileptic medications alone or combination. The management of patients with epilepsy is focused on three main goals: controlling seizures, avoiding treatment side effects, and maintaining or restoring quality of life. The optimal treatment plan is derived following an accurate diagnosis of the patient's seizure type(s), an objective measure of the intensity and frequency of the seizures, awareness of medication side effects, and an evaluation of disease-related psychosocial problems. Despite advances in anti-epileptic drug therapy, epilepsy surgery, and vagus nerve stimulation, approximately 30% of patients continue to have seizures.

The NeuroPace® stimulator is a small, battery-powered device neurostimulator is surgically implanted in the skull. Leads that are connected to the neurostimulator are placed on and/or inside the brain. The neurostimulator monitors the electrical activity of the brain and detects abnormal activity that could lead to a seizure. If abnormal activity is detected, the neurostimulator delivers electrical stimulation to the brain through the leads to help prevent the seizure before it occurs. The neurostimulator is programmed for initial use by the doctor after it is surgically implanted, then the neurostimulator settings will be adjusted on an ongoing basis as needed. A computer (called the NeuroPace Programmer) lets the doctor do the initial programming and follow-up adjustments to the neurostimulator. Adjustments are based on brain activity and response to stimulation, which are both stored in the neurostimulator.

Commercial Plan Policy (Preauthorization Required)

SelectHealth covers responsive cortical neurostimulation in the treatment of epilepsy, when the following criteria are met:

1. 18 years of age or older; and
2. Partial onset seizures; and
3. Undergone diagnostic testing that localized no more than two (2) epileptogenic foci; and
4. Refractory to two or more antiepileptic medications; and
5. Currently having an average of three (3) or more disabling seizures (for example, motor partial seizures, complex partial seizures, or secondary generalized seizures) per month over the most recent three months; and
6. Documentation specifies that the individual has considered vagus nerve stimulation (VNS) or surgical ablation of epileptogenic focus, and outlines the reasons they are not candidates based upon surgical risk or other clinical factors.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS) (Preauthorization Required)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) (Preauthorization Required)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

To date, no systematic reviews and three primary literature articles met inclusion criteria for this report. A total of 390 patients with partial epilepsy were studied, however, it is important to note that the papers by Heck et al. and Morrell et al. reported on the same cohort of 191 patients in a randomized, multicenter, double blind, and sham-controlled trial. Follow-up times were between 9.2 and 24 months.

There is a long-term open labeled follow-up study by Bergey, et al. in 2015 of patients initially reported in a double-blinded pivotal study. Patients were followed up to 7 years. This study showed ongoing benefits of the RNS device with seizure reduction of 48–66% over post-implant years 3–6; the device appears to be safe over an extended period. The most common adverse event was noted to be infections at the surgical sites of stimulator replacements, indicating relative long-term safety. Limits of the study are its lack of blinding, and also significant dropouts, but the authors attempted to compensate for this through statistical analysis.

The evidence has demonstrated the following regarding safety, efficacy, and durability of effect of the NeuroPace device:

Safety and Efficacy – Heck et al. compared the safety of the device to sham and noted that there was no difference between the groups. All three papers illustrated statistically significant reductions in seizures compared with baseline measurements. Heck et al. and Morrell et al. showed that this decrease was present against sham. Morrell et al. reported the top five device-related adverse events in ≥ 2.5% of subjects at 1 year were as follows:

1. Headache (10%)
2. Complex partial seizures (8%)
3. Complex partial seizures increased (8%)
4. Dysesthesia (7%)
5. Implant site pain (7%)
Durability of Effect – Approximately 50% of the seizures were eliminated in patients who received the NeuroPace device at either a 2-month follow-up or at a 24-month follow-up. No evidence of durability of effect exists past 24 months.

In conclusion, the few papers that have been published on the NeuroPace device have demonstrated statistically significant improvements in seizure diminution out to two years. Safety of NeuroPace is commensurate with DBS and its efficacy is on par with vagus nerve stimulation.

Billing/Coding Information

**CPT CODES**

- **61850**  Twist drill or burr hole(s) for implantation of neurostimulator electrodes, cortical
- **61860**  Craniectomy or craniotomy for implantation of neurostimulator electrodes, cerebral, cortical
- **61863**  Twist drill, burr hole, craniotomy, or craniectomy with stereotactic implantation of neurostimulator electrode array in subcortical site (eg, thalamus globus pallidus, subthalamic nucleus, periventricular, periaqueductal gray), without use of intraoperative microelectrode recording; first array
- **61864**  Twist drill, burr hole, craniotomy, or craniectomy with stereotactic implantation of neurostimulator electrode array in subcortical site (eg, thalamus, globus pallidus, subthalamic nucleus, periventricular, periaqueductal gray), without use of intraoperative microelectrode recording; each additional array (List separately in addition to primary procedure)
- **61880**  Revision or removal of intracranial neurostimulator electrodes
- **61885**  Insertion or replacement of cranial neurostimulator pulse generator or received, direct or inductive coupling; with connection to a single electrode arrays
- **61886**  Insertion or replacement of cranial neurostimulator electrodes
- **61888**  Revision or removal of cranial neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver

**HCPCS CODES**

- **C1767**  Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), nonrechargeable
- **C1778**  Lead, neurostimulator (implantable)
- **L8679**  Implantable neurostimulator, pulse generator, any type
- **L8680**  Implantable neurostimulator, electrode, each
- **L8681**  Patient programmer (external) for use with implantable programmable neurostimulator radiofrequency receiver
- **L8682**  Implantable neurostimulator radiofrequency receiver
- **L8683**  Radiofrequency transmitter (external) for use with implantable neurostimulator radiofrequency receiver
- **L8685**  Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, single array, rechargeable, includes extension
- **L8686**  Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, single array, nonrechargeable, includes extension
- **L8687**  Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, dual array, rechargeable, includes extension
- **L8688**  Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, dual array, nonrechargeable, includes extension

**Key References**

Responsive Cortical Neurostimulation in the Treatment of Epilepsy, continued
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© CPT Only – American Medical Association
SPHENOPALATINE GANGLION (SPG) INJECTION
IN THE MANAGEMENT OF HEADACHES

Policy #559
Implementation Date: 11/5/14
Review Dates: 8/25/16, 8/17/17, 8/13/18, 8/7/19
Revision Dates: 5/15/15

Related medical policies:
#221 Botulinum Toxin (E.G., Botox) Injections
#291 Migraine Headache Surgery

Description
The sphenopalatine ganglion (SPG) is located with some degree of variability near the tail or posterior aspect of the middle nasal turbinate. The SPG has been implicated as a strategic target in the treatment of various headache and facial pain conditions. It is part of the autonomic nervous system. A sphenopalatine ganglion (SPG) block has been introduced as a quick, minimally invasive procedure. A local anesthetic, currently Marcaine but historically Lidocaine, is introduced intranasally for topical administration. Access to this structure can be gained via a small area of mucosa just posterior and superior to the tail of the middle turbinate on the lateral nasal wall. At this aspect, there is no bony boundary to the SPG.

More recently, the introduction of a new medical device specific for medication delivery to the nasal passageway has renewed interest in performing SPG blocks to treat migraine and other headache conditions. The Tx360 nasal applicator, developed by Tian Medical in 2011, and the Sphenocath® are promoted as making injections of the SPG easier and more effective. SphenoCath® is an FDA Class I therapeutic “ear, nose, and throat drug administration device” and is not marketed as a migraine treatment. It is marketed as a general use drug administration device, which can be used to facilitate sphenopalatine ganglion (SPG) circuit neuromodulation.

Commercial Plan Policy
SelectHealth does NOT cover sphenopalatine ganglion (SPG) block for the treatment of acute and chronic headaches as current evidence is insufficient to determine efficacy and safety of this procedure.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS) (Preauthorization Required)
Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website.
Neurology/Neurosurgery Policies, Continued

Sphenoplatine Ganglion (SPG) Injection in the Management of Headaches, continued

**SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) (Preauthorization Required)**

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

**Summary of Medical Information**

Current evidence related to the use of sphenopalatine ganglion block in headache management is very limited with few published studies. Narouze (2010) explored the use of SPG ablation for chronic cluster headache. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of the SPG was shown to have encouraging results in those patients with intractable cluster headaches.

Ansarinia et al. (2010) examined the effects of electrical stimulation of SPG for acute treatment of cluster headaches. A total of 6 patients with refractory CCH were treated with short-term (up to 1 hour) electrical stimulation of the SPG during acute cluster headaches. Headaches were spontaneously present at the time of stimulation or were triggered with agents known to trigger cluster headaches in each patient. A standard percutaneous infra-zygomatic approach was used to place a needle at the ipsilateral SPG in the pterygopalatine fossa under fluoroscopic guidance. Electrical stimulation was performed using a temporary stimulating electrode. Stimulation was performed at various settings during maximal headache intensity. Five patients had cluster headaches during the initial evaluation. Three returned 3 months later for a second evaluation. There were 18 acute and distinct cluster headache attacks with clinically maximal VAS intensity of 8 (out of 10) and above. Electrical stimulation of SPG resulted in complete resolution of the headache in 11 attacks, partial resolution (greater than 50 % VAS reduction) in 3, and minimal-to-no relief in 4 attacks. Associated autonomic features of cluster headache were resolved in each responder. Pain relief was noted within several minutes of stimulation. The authors concluded that SPG stimulation can be effective in relieving acute severe cluster headache pain and associated autonomic features. They stated that chronic long-term outcome studies are needed to determine the utility of SPG stimulation for management and prevention of cluster headaches.

Magis and Schoenen (2011) reviewed the latest clinical trial results in anti-migraine treatment. Sphenoplatine ganglion stimulation, and other neuromodulation techniques were reviewed and were noted to be promising treatments for medically refractory patients; but large controlled trials are needed.

One of the most recent studies by Cady et al. (2014) in their double-blind, parallel-arm, placebo-controlled, randomized pilot study using a novel intervention for acute treatment in CM performed a series of 12 SPG blocks with 0.3 cc of 0.5% bupivacaine or saline provided 2 times per week for 6 weeks. Subjects were re-evaluated at 1 and 6 months post final procedure. SPG blockade with bupivacaine delivered repetitively for 6 weeks with the Tx360® device demonstrates promise as an acute treatment of headache in some subjects with CM. Statistically significant headache relief is noted at 15 and 30 minutes and sustained at 24 hours for SPG blockade with bupivacaine vs. saline. But duration of the effect beyond this level was not measured. The Tx360® device was simple to use and not associated with any significant or lasting adverse events. They concluded further research on sphenoplatine ganglion blockade is warranted.

A follow-up publication to the Cady study from 2014 (Cady 2015) shows secondary end points: headache days, quality of life (HIT score), acute pain, and acute medication usage in the study population. None of these endpoints met statistical significance, but there were favorable trends in all categories. The authors noted in their conclusion that: “data from this exploratory pilot study does not establish efficacy, but suggests the possibility that there may be long-term clinical benefits in the use of repetitive SPG blockade.” A more complete study was recommended.

The American Headache Society also released guidelines for treatment of cluster headaches in 2016. In these guidelines (Robbins 2016), SPG electric stimulation for cluster headaches is given a level B (probably effective) rating. This is based on a single class controlled trial done in 28 patients with sphenoplatine ganglion stimulation. The study showed efficacy in acute treatment of cluster headache. However, the guidelines note that this treatment is not routinely available in the United States.

A further review (Robbins 2016) from the Headache Journal outlines SPG pathophysiology and treatment approaches. Studies of SPG blockade for cluster headache are reviewed, the paper notes that: “the
majority of those studies were open and uncontrolled." SPG blockade studies for migraine are also reviewed. The controlled studies are noted to have had mixed results (one in 1196 by Maizels with intranasal lidocaine had brief headache relief but unsustained treatment benefit; another 1999 trial showed lidocaine superior to placebo; another 2001 trial of intranasal lidocaine in the ER found it not superior to placebo; a 2012 randomized trial found intranasal ketorolac with lidocaine was superior to lidocaine alone). The review also outlines Sphenopalatine Blocking Catheters (like Cady et al. discussed above) and neurostimulation.

A new review by Tepper et al. was published in 2017, focused on SPG Stimulation primarily as it impacts cluster headaches. This was a prospective cohort study of patients followed in a registry. Initial one-year data was presented at a meeting in 2016, and a responder rate of 68% was reported. However, this study had multiple methodological flaws as it lacks randomization and blinding, which introduces bias into the conclusions. There is an ongoing randomized controlled study in the US right now, the CH-2 study with an estimated completion date of January 2019.

Overall, the current evidence has not established efficacy, durability, or reliability of this treatment in migraine management.

Billing/Coding Information

**CPT CODES**

64505  
Injection, anesthetic agent, sphenopalatine ganglion

**HCPCS CODES**

No specific codes identified

Key References
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MEDICAL POLICY

TREATMENTS FOR TRIGEMINAL NEURALGIA

Policy # 184

Implementation Date: 1/22/02
Review Dates: 5/22/02, 10/23/03, 4/24/04, 5/12/05, 8/23/07, 8/21/08, 8/13/09, 8/19/10, 9/15/11, 11/29/12, 10/24/13, 10/23/14, 10/15/15, 10/20/16, 10/19/17, 10/15/18, 10/13/19
Revision Dates: 5/27/02, 8/4/06

Related medical policies:
#221 Botulinum Toxin (E.G., Botox®) Injections

Description
Trigeminal neuralgia (TN, tic douloureux) is a disorder of the fifth cranial (trigeminal) nerve that causes episodes of intense, stabbing, electric shock-like pain in the areas of the face where the branches of the nerve are distributed: lips, eyes, nose, scalp, forehead, upper jaw, and lower jaw. A less common form of the disorder, called, "atypical trigeminal neuralgia" may cause less intense, constant, dull burning or aching pain, sometimes with occasional electric shock-like stabs. Both forms of the disorder most often affect one side of the face, but some patients experience pain at different times on both sides. Onset of symptoms occurs most often after age 50, but cases are known in children and even infants.

Something as simple and routine as brushing the teeth, putting on makeup or even a slight breeze can trigger an attack, resulting in sheer agony for the individual. Trigeminal neuralgia is not fatal, but it is universally considered to be the most painful affliction known to medical practice (e.g., 10/10 on pain scale).

Conservative treatment of TN is usually by means of anti-convulsant drugs, such as Tegretol or Neurontin. Baclofen, clonazepam, gabapentin, and valproic acid may also be effective and may be used in combination to achieve pain relief. Some anti-depressant drugs also have significant pain-relieving effects. If medication is ineffective or if it produces undesirable side effects, more invasive procedures such as radiofrequency or surgical ablation of cervical nerves are available to relieve pressure on the nerve or to reduce nerve sensitivity. Some patients report having reduced or relieved pain by means of alternative medical therapies such as acupuncture, chiropractic adjustment, TENS, self-hypnosis, or meditation.

Invasive treatments include several options:

1. “Open” Procedures:
   - Microvascular decompression surgery alleviates neurovascular compression by placing inert shredded Teflon® felt implants between offending vessels and the trigeminal nerve root.
   - Microsurgical rhizotomy involves surgical exposure and cutting of the trigeminal nerve root near its entry into the brain stem.

2. Percutaneous rhizotomies involve inserting a needle through the cheek and into an opening at the skull base (foramen ovale). There, a controlled injury to the trigeminal nerve and Gasserian ganglion may be produced in 1 of 3 ways:
   - Radiofrequency rhizotomy - An electrode is advanced into the Gasserian ganglion and heated to thermally damage the nervous tissue. This is the most commonly performed of the percutaneous neurolysis procedures, produces the most extensive nerve damage, and thus, has the most durable effect and the longest history.
• Percutaneous glycerol injection - Glycerol is injected into the space around the Gasserian ganglion and chemically damages the nervous tissue.
• Percutaneous balloon compression rhizotomy - A balloon is inflated next to the Gasserian ganglion, compressing and mechanically damaging the nervous tissue.

3. Radiotherapy:
• Gamma knife radiosurgery focuses cobalt radiation upon the trigeminal nerve root, producing a delayed injury to nervous tissue that is similar to that produced by other percutaneous rhizotomy techniques.

Commercial Plan Policy

SelectHealth covers conservative treatment for trigeminal neuralgia using any of the modalities listed below.

1. Anti-convulsants: including carbamazepine (Tegretol®), phenytoin (Dilantin®), clonazepam (Klonopin), Lamotrigine (Lamictal®) and oxcarbazepine (Trileptal®). Gabapentin (Neurontin®) is also often used, despite a lack of evidence of its effectiveness for this patient population.

SelectHealth covers invasive treatment for trigeminal neuralgia in patients with an established diagnosis who have failed a reasonable trial of conservative treatment, defined as at least 2 of the medicines (listed above) over 6 months. Covered invasive treatments include:

1. Microvascular decompression surgery
2. Percutaneous rhizotomies:
   a. Radiofrequency rhizotomy
   b. Chemonucleolysis (e.g., glycerol injection)
   c. Balloon (micro-catheter) compression rhizotomy

SelectHealth covers gamma knife radiosurgery for trigeminal neuralgia refractory to medical management.

SelectHealth does NOT cover the following treatments for trigeminal neuralgia:
1. Botulinum toxin
2. Chiropractic therapies
3. Microsurgical rhizotomy
4. TENS/Interferential Stimulation
5. All other therapies not listed as covered, above

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website
Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

Summary of Medical Information

For this report, a search of the literature was not performed. Primary sources were a letter and research studies from a local clinician about treatment options for TN and Hayes reports. Additionally, a search of the International Network of Agencies of Health Technology Assessment site was performed in order to identify any systematic reviews that have been performed and posted on this site; no such reviews of treatment options for TN were identified.

The clinician letter presents discussion on the effectiveness of drug therapies commonly used, as well as invasive therapies provided within the local medical community. This clinician argues that microvascular decompression, with its approximately 25 years of application, may be the treatment of choice in patients who fail or who cannot tolerate drug therapy. There are several percutaneous rhizotomy therapies that are viable treatment options in capable hands; these include radiofrequency and chemical ablation of the trigeminal nerve as well as balloon (micro-catheter) compression rhizotomy. There are many other treatment options that were not mentioned in the clinician’s letter but available through various neurosurgical departments with websites promoting their services.

Notably, Hayes rated stereotactic radiosurgery as a ‘D.’ The local clinician described it as “controversial” and suggested it be considered only as a last resort. These views are supported by a 2001 study published in Neurosurgery.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the indications outlined above

CPT CODES

61450 Cranectomy, subtemporal, for section, compression, or decompression of sensory root of gasserian ganglion
61790 Creation of lesion by stereotactic method, percutaneous, by neurolytic agent (e.g., alcohol, thermal, electrical, radiofrequency); gasserian ganglion
61791 Creation of lesion by stereotactic method, percutaneous, by neurolytic agent (e.g., alcohol, thermal, electrical, radiofrequency); trigeminal medullary tract
64600 Destruction by neurolytic agent, trigeminal nerve; supraorbital, infraorbital, mental, or inferior alveolar branch
64605 Destruction by neurolytic agent, trigeminal nerve; second and third division branches at foramen ovale
64610 Destruction by neurolytic agent, trigeminal nerve; second and third division branches at foramen ovale under radiologic monitoring

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

4. https://www.hayesinc.com/subscribers/displaySubscriberArticle.do?articleId=2344&targetList=searchArticles.do&query=trigeminal+neuralgia&icdQuery=&sd1=asearchRelevance&sd2=transformdatesort&sd3=atransformdoctype&sd4=atransformsort&sectionSelector=ExecutiveSummary#ExecutiveSummary
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Neurology/Neurosurgery Policies, Continued

**MEDICAL POLICY**

**TUMOR-TREATMENT FIELDS FOR THE TREATMENT OF GLIOBLASTOMA MULTIFORME**

Policy # 496  
Implementation Date: 12/5/11  
Review Dates: 7/18/13, 8/28/14, 8/20/15, 8/25/16, 8/17/17, 7/25/18, 6/18/19, 6/14/20  
Revision Dates: 10/20/16

**Description**

Gliomas are the most common primary tumors of the brain, with an incidence of about 25,000 new cases per year in the United States, and are malignant gliomas occur in all age groups but predominate in the fifth and sixth decades. They are the dominant primary intracranial tumors accounting for 35% to 45% of all adult brain tumors. At least half of all gliomas exhibit aggressive, malignant behavior. Glioblastoma multiforme (GBM), in particular, is clinically and pathologically malignant. Patients with GBM have a poor prognosis, with a median survival of one year with aggressive therapy; fewer than 5% will survive 5 years. In spite of its seemingly low incidence, mortality from GBM accounts for 3% to 4% of all cancer deaths each year in the US. These tumors occur in the cerebral hemispheres as sizable, rapidly growing lesions with a characteristic ring-like, enhancing appearance on CT or MRI, with central necrosis, infiltrating margins and surrounding low-density changes.

The NovoTTF-100A® System® (NovoCure, Ltd., Haifa, Israel), which received an FDA PMA on April 8, 2011, for the treatment of recurrent GBM, is a portable battery- or power supply- operated device which produces alternating electrical fields, called tumor treatment fields (“TTFields”) within the human body. TTFields are applied to the patient by electrically-insulated surface electrodes. Research studies demonstrate that TTFields can disrupt the rapid cell division exhibited by cancer cells. The NovoTTF-100A produces alternating electrical fields within the human body that are believed to disrupt the rapid cell division exhibited by cancer cells, with the alternating electrical fields applied to the brain through electrodes placed on the scalp.

The Optune® System (NovoCure, Portsmouth, NH), which is a second-generation system developed for the treatment of recurrent GBM, is a portable battery- or power supply-operated device which produces alternating electrical fields, called tumor treatment fields (“TTFields”) within the human body. TTFields are applied to the patient by electrically-insulated surface electrodes. Research studies demonstrate that TTFields can disrupt the rapid cell division exhibited by cancer cells.

Treatment parameters are preset by NovoCure such that there are no electrical output adjustments available to the patient. Based on detailed training provided by the physician, the patient will learn to change and recharge depleted device batteries and to connect to an external power supply overnight. In addition, the electrodes need to be replaced once to twice a week and the scalp re-shaved in order to maintain optimal contact. Patients carry the device in an over-the-shoulder bag or backpack and receive continuous treatment without changing their daily routine.

**Commercial Plan Policy (No Preauthorization Required but criteria must be met)**

SelectHealth covers tumor field therapy for the treatment of glioblastoma multiforme **limited** circumstances when criteria are met as medically necessary.
SelectHealth does NOT cover tumor treatment field therapy outside its FDA approved indications or for any other tumor type or location.

Coverage Criteria (ALL must be present)

1. Tumor Treatment field therapy is being used in one of the following FDA approved indications:
   a. Histologically-confirmed glioblastoma multiforme (GBM), following histologically- or radiologically-confirmed recurrence in the supra-tentorial region of the brain after receiving chemotherapy. The device is intended to be used as a monotherapy and is being used as an alternative to standard medical therapy for GBM after surgical and radiation options have been exhausted.
   b. Use with temozolomide (TMZ) is indicated for the treatment of adult patients with newly diagnosed, supratentorial glioblastoma following maximal debulking surgery and completion of radiation therapy together with concomitant standard of care chemotherapy.

2. The individual receiving therapy is > 22 years of age

3. The member does not have an active implanted medical device (e.g., deep brain stimulators, spinal cord stimulators, pacemakers, defibrillators)

4. No bullet fragments in the area

5. No intraventricular shunts are present

6. No skull defects (e.g., missing bone with no replacement) are present

Authorization of rental equipment used in tumor treatment field is limited to 6 months and that reauthorization of the device is contingent on use of the device a minimum of 18 hours/day and evidence for disease stabilization or improvement confirmed by MRI.

SelectHealth does NOT cover electrical field therapy for any other tumor type or circumstance as current evidence in other malignancies is insufficient to reach conclusions regarding efficacy and safety in these circumstances.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website.

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and
Neurology/Neurosurgery Policies, Continued

Tumor-Treatment Fields for the Treatment of Glioblastoma Multiforme, continued

Coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool.

Summary of Medical Information

Current evidence related to tumor treatment fields has evolved since initial FDA approval in 2011. In a 2016 review, two systematic reviews and 8 primary studies were identified on the topic. These encompassed results from approximately 1,418 patients (intervention and controls) studied between 2012 and 2016.

The 2 systematic reviews were published in 2016 and were generally favorable in their assertions for efficacy of the therapy. The Hayes review was the most thorough assessment of the literature. In all, the systematic reviews found the technology to be both safe and effective in treating GBM with side-effects not exceeding what would be observed in standard treatments.

Six of the 8 (75%) primary studies were comparative to physician’s best choice or standard treatment regimens. The studies examined the following:

- Intra- and inter-rater reliability of MRI for transducer placement
- Management treatment of sequelae
- Overall and progression-free survival
- Post-chemo patients treated with either TTF + temozolomide (TMZ) or TMZ alone
- TTF + bevacizumab (Bev) or TTF + combination therapy
- TTF alone or chemo alone
- TTF vs. best physician’s choice

Three studies in particular illustrated best the outcomes associated with TTF treatment, namely those by Stupp et al. (2012) (2015) and Wong et al. All 3 of these studies addressed progression free survival (PFS) and/or overall survival (OS). The studies all illustrated an improvement in PFS and OS where reported, though not all reports met statistical significance.

It is important to know from the 3 comparative effectiveness studies that none of them were used as first-line treatments for GBM. That said, 2 of the 3 showed better- or non-inferior PFS and OS in patients who added TTF to their treatment regimen than did patients who underwent standard therapy. The third study (Wong et al.) spoke more to the virtues of an augmented treatment regimen with the inclusion of TTF and showed substantial but not statistically significant improvements in OS.

In conclusion, evidence obtained for this review has demonstrated the safety of TTF for the treatment of GBM. The evidence of improved patient outcomes, especially as a first-line therapy, is more limited but has shown an improvement in OS and PFS.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

No specific codes identified

HCPCS CODES

A4555 Electrode/transducer for use with electrical stimulation device used for cancer treatment, replacement only

E0766 Electrical stimulation device used for cancer treatment, includes all accessories, any type

Key References
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10. Hayes, Novocure (Tumor Treating Fields); 2016 March 3 [cited 2016 August 26].
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VAGAL NERVE STIMULATION (VNS)

Policy # 186

Implementation Date: 7/5/00
Review Dates: 7/17/00, 2/27/01, 8/15/01, 10/4/01, 8/27/02, 12/11/03, 1/9/07, 6/19/08, 6/11/09, 5/19/11, 6/21/12, 6/20/13, 4/17/14, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 6/21/18, 4/12/19, 4/15/20
Revision Dates: 10/28/02, 1/24/06, 7/9/07, 10/14/08, 9/16/09, 5/20/20

Related Medical Policies:
#205 Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS)
#556 Responsive Cortical Neurostimulation in the Treatment of Epilepsy

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the “Policy” section for more information.

Description
The vagus nerve is the tenth and longest cranial nerve. Its name is derived from the Latin meaning "wandering," due to its complex path through the body from the brain stem through organs in the neck, thorax, and abdomen. The vagus nerve innervates vital structures in the body such as the heart, intestines, esophagus, stomach, liver, and muscles of vocalization. In the brain, the vagus nerve forms connections with the medulla but most connections are to the nucleus tractus solitarius (NTS). The NTS is connected to a wide range of nerve projections from and to other areas of the brain. The vagus nerve is the primary sensory organ of the NTS. It is also capable of processing extensive information and has been likened to a small brain within the larger brain.

Cyberonics Inc. markets the VNS Therapy™ System, the only device currently approved for VNS. The device was initially approved in 1997 for epilepsy, but during these clinical trials investigators observed that VNS improved mood and cognition in epilepsy patients. The exact mechanism of action by which VNS is thought to reduce the symptoms of depression is yet unknown, but it has been shown that VNS has an effect on brain metabolism and brain function.

The VNS Therapy System consists of a programmable pulse generator, similar to a pacemaker, which is implanted subcutaneously in the chest and delivers pulses of current via electrodes attached to the vagus nerve in the left side of the neck. Left VNS is preferred to right VNS because the heart rate is mostly influenced by the right vagus nerve, and stimulation could induce cardiovascular complications. The VNS Therapy System includes a handheld computer, programming software, and a programming wand; these components are used to interrogate the pulse generator and modify stored simulation parameters.

Commercial Plan Policy

SelectHealth covers vagal nerve stimulation (VNS) for patients with intractable epilepsy who meet criteria as outlined below:

Criteria for use of VNS in patients with intractable epilepsy require the patient to meet ALL the following:

1. The patient must be one year of age or older;
2. The patient must have a well-documented, seizure disorder with a debilitating effect on the patient’s ability to function;
3. The patient must be unresponsive to an appropriate trial of anti-convulsant medications or be unable to tolerate therapeutic levels of AEDs (meaning a minimum of a 3-month course of at least 3 different classes of anti-epileptic drugs [AEDs] at therapeutic doses);

4. The VNS implantation is recommended by member’s epileptologist/neurologist;

5. Either:
   - Not be a good candidate for other, more effective anti-seizure surgical therapy;
   - Have refused anti-seizure surgical (resective) therapy;

6. Have a surgeon experienced with implantation of the vagal nerve stimulator device (has performed at least 2 previous VNS implants) perform the implantation procedure, using an FDA-approved vagal nerve stimulator device;

7. Be managed by a neurologist/epileptologist familiar with the protocols for use of the device.

SelectHealth does NOT cover vagal nerve stimulation for any other indication; this meets the plan’s definition of investigational/experimental.

---

**SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)**

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website [http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&) or the [manual website](http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&).

**SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP)**

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website [http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php) or the [Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool](http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php).

**Summary of Medical Information**

**Vagal Nerve Stimulation in Depression**

Current literature demonstrates variable efficacy for short-term effect in the treatment of therapy-resistant major depression. Marnagell, Rush et al., in 2002, first published 12-month outcomes for VNS in patients with major depressive disorder. These studies suggested a statistically significant ($p = 0.045$) benefit in remission rates compared with placebo. George et al., in an open trial in 2005 confirmed these results, demonstrating a response rate of 27%, twice the placebo control group. Both these trials were limited by their open nature and relatively small sample sizes ($n = 2.05$). Additionally, the remission rates were low at 29% and 27% respectively. These results do not reach the same level of effectiveness as ECT therapy. Two-year outcome studies published by Nahas, Marangell et al., in 2005, however, suggested a falloff in efficacy to 22%. This study was small and definitive conclusions could not be reached. Further questions related to long-term efficacy and safety were raised in a study published by Rush, Marnagell et al., in 2005. This 10-week randomized trial found response rates much lower than previous uncontrolled studies at 15.2%, compared with a placebo rate at 10% ($p = 0.251$). Additionally, there is insufficient information about the long-term effect of this treatment on depression. Though short-term safety does not seem to be an issue, long-term safety has not yet been fully addressed, and thus, questions in this area also remain. These questions remained unanswered in Sackeim, Rush et al., in their studied published in 2001.
Subsequent reviews, such as a 2006 BCBS TEC review concluded that clinical trial data offered only weak evidence for the efficacy of the procedure and that the effectiveness outside investigational settings has not been established. A review published by the University Health System Consortium offered a similar conclusion—that the literature on VNS for depression offered “inadequate proof of efficacy.” A 2006 review from the California Technology Assessment Forum noted that it is premature to conclude that VNS is equally as or more effective than established therapies for treating depression. Finally, an evaluation by CMS conducted to inform its recent national coverage decision noted that treatment-resistant depression is a poorly defined construct and stated that: “CMS does not believe there is a treatment effect directly attributable to VNS therapy based on the current evidence.”

Since the last M-Tech review in 2005, 2 empirical studies have been published. The first study was an observational study of 205 patients who had previously undergone VNS implantation for treatment-resistant depression; Burke et al. evaluated the use of ECT in non-responsive patients. Of 205 patients followed, 55 (27%) were responders, (> 50% reduction in self-rated depression), and 14 (7%) experienced depression severe enough to warrant ECT during the 12 months following implantation. By 12 months, 11 of these 14 patients (79%) were still considered “non-responders” to VNS.

The other study published in 2006 by Corocoan et al., involved 11 patients with treatment-resistant depression, 55% of whom had received ECT previously. Patients underwent a 12-week acute phase of treatment, which commenced 2 weeks after implantation, and 40 weeks of long-term stimulation. Stimulation levels were set during the first 2 weeks of the acute phase and were not adjusted thereafter. At 1 year, all measures of depression had declined, and 6 patients were considered to be “responders” (Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression score < 10). During the follow-up period, one non-responder died by suicide.

Of note, Dunner et al. reported on the natural outcomes of treatment-resistant depression, which they tracked in 124 patients over a 2-year period. Treatment was uncontrolled (i.e., depression was treated on an individual basis as determined by patients’ individual physicians. During that 2-year period, 18.4% (19/103) experienced a response (≥ 50% decrease in depression) and 7.8% experienced remission. The authors noted that response and remission were typically intermittent and transient.

Based upon the inconclusive nature of the currently available studies, vagal nerve stimulation remains unproven for the treatment of depression.

Vagal Nerve Stimulation in Epilepsy

There is substantial evidence that VNS can reduce seizure frequency, with approximately 30% of patients experiencing at least a 50% mean reduction. In some patients, the effect can be much greater, and patients who respond often experience sustained benefits. However, most studies to date have included patients with a broad range of epilepsy syndromes associated with intractable partial seizures classified as simple, complex, or secondarily generalized. Since specific details regarding each patient were not included in the reports, it is difficult to determine which patients derived the most benefit from the therapy.

The placebo effect may have contributed to the observed improvement in patient status during VNS, since some patients derived benefit from the low-level VNS used as a presumed placebo control. However, it is unclear whether the response seen in these patients was due to a strong placebo effect or whether it represented a true treatment effect of low-level stimulation.

The use of VNS in children has not been well-studied and, at present, the NCP system is approved only for patients over the age of 12. However, results of initial pilot pediatric studies have been promising. In a study by Murphy et al., VNS was particularly beneficial for patients with Lennox-Gastout syndrome, a rare but particularly severe form of childhood epilepsy, and for children who had previous corpuscallosotomy. Hornig et al. note that there are significant advantages to the use of VNS treatment in children compared with medical management alone—no adverse cognitive effects, no drug interactions, and no issues of patient compliance—as therapy is involuntary and automatic. Nine studies and 1 technology assessment met criteria for inclusion in this report. Hayes’ Medical Technology Directory from 2007 gave a ‘B’ rating to VNS in patients > 12 years with medically intractable partial-onset seizures who are not suitable candidates for surgery or in whom surgical treatment has failed. However, it assigned a ‘C’ rating for VNS in patients with generalized epilepsy who are not suitable candidates for surgery or in whom surgical treatment has failed due to the paucity of clinical evidence regarding the efficacy of VNS for generalized seizures. The available evidence consists of a small number of uncontrolled studies involving few patients and retrospective analyses of patient medical history data.
Nine studies published, and all conclude that VNS is a safe and effective therapy for seizures that are refractory to medication. These studies included patients with partial and generalized seizures. For example, Abubakr et al. implanted VNS in 31 patients with refractory generalized and partial seizures who were not candidates for resective surgery. At 6 months, 22 patients (73%) showed considerable improvement in terms of feeling better, being more alert and having fewer seizures; they were considered to be responders to VNS therapy. Among those who initially responded to VNS, 20 patients (66%) demonstrated > 50% reduction in seizure frequency at 6 months (good responders) and 16 of them (53.3%) continued to have sustained improvement (> 50% reduction in seizure frequency) 4 years later. However, none of the patients attained seizure freedom during the follow-up period. In four patients (13.3%) seizures increased in frequency and severity and they were considered poor responders to VNS therapy. Separate results were not reported for generalized versus partial seizures.

Kostov et al. implanted 12 patients with drug-resistant idiopathic generalized epilepsy. At a mean follow-up of 23 months, overall seizure reduction was 61% with a 62% reduction in generalized tonic-clonic seizures, 58% of absences, and 40% of myoclonic seizures. Eight patients were considered responders (> 50% seizure reduction); 2 of these patients became seizure-free. Five out of 7 patients with juvenile myoclonic epilepsy were responders. At the last follow-up visit, the patients had reduced the anti-epileptic drug (AED) usage from an average of 2.3 to 1.7 AED per patient (p = 0.0625). Two patients are currently being treated with VNS therapy only. Nine patients reported side effects, which were mostly mild and tended to diminish over time.

You et al. involved 28 children with refractory epilepsy. Of these, 15 (53.6%) showed a > 50% reduction in seizure frequency and 9 (32.1%) had a > 75% reduction. The reduction in frequency did not differ across seizure type and etiology. There was no correlation between the length of the stimulation period and treatment effect. The seizure reduction rate, however, tended to be inversely related to the seizure duration before VNS implantation and age at the time of VNS therapy. VNS also improved quality of life in this group of patients, including improved memory in 9 (32.1%), improved mood in 12 (42.9%), improved behavior in 11 (39.3%), improved alertness in 12 (42.9%), improved achievement in 6 (21.4%), and improved verbal skills in 8 (28.6%). Adverse events included hoarseness in 7 patients, dyspnea at sleep in 2 patients, and wound infection in 1 patient, but all were transient and successfully managed by careful follow-up and adjustment of parameters.

Orosz et al reported long term followup in 347 children with VNS for intractable seizures. She found that seizure frequency was reduces over a 2 year follow up period with no new safety issues. Finally, Klinkenberg et al evaluated VNS in a randomized trial of 41 children with intractable seizures. VNS reduced seizures by 50% or more in 16% of children in the high-output stimulation group and 21% of the low-output stimulation group with overall severity of seizures statistically improved.

The existing literature supports the use of VNS for treatment of seizures that are refractory to medications. The literature also indicates that adverse effects from implantation are minimal and that use of VNS results in significant reduction in seizure frequency and severity and more rapid recovery. While a majority of patients continue to have seizures even after treatment, they report better control over seizure-activity and improved quality of life. Though, current evidence in support of the procedure for therapy-resistant generalized seizures remains limited, available evidence suggests benefit in this population.

Billing/Coding Information
Covered: For the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES
Implantation

61885 Insertion or replacement of cranial neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver, direct or inductive coupling; with connection to a single electrode array

61886 Insertion or replacement of cranial neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver, direct or inductive coupling; with connection to two or more electrode arrays

64553 Percutaneous implantation of neurostimulator electrodes; cranial nerve

64568 Incision for implantation of cranial nerve (eg, vagus nerve) neurostimulator electrode array and pulse generator
Revision or Removal

64585  Revision or removal of peripheral neurostimulator electrodes array

64569  Revision or replacement of cranial nerve (eg, vagus nerve) neurostimulator electrode array, including connection to existing pulse generator

64570  Removal of cranial nerve (eg, vagus nerve) neurostimulator electrode array and pulse generator

61880  Revision or removal of intracranial neurostimulator electrodes

61888  Revision or removal of cranial neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver

Analysis/Programming

95970  Electronic analysis of implanted neurostimulator pulse generator system (eg, rate, pulse amplitude, pulse duration, configuration of wave form, battery status, electrode selectability, output modulation, cycling, impedance and patient compliance measurements); simple or complex brain, spinal cord, or peripheral (ie, cranial nerve, peripheral nerve, sacral nerve, neuromuscular) neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter, without reprogramming

95974  Complex cranial nerve neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter, with intraoperative or subsequent programming, with or without nerve interface testing, first hour

95975  Complex cranial nerve neurostimulator pulse generator/transmitter, with intraoperative or subsequent programming, each additional 30 minutes after first hour (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

HCPCS CODES

C1767  Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), nonrechargeable

C1778  Lead, neurostimulator (implantable)

C1823  Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), non-rechargeable, with transvenous sensing and stimulation leads

L8680  Implantable neurostimulator electrode, each

L8681  Patient programmer (external for use with implantable programmable neurostimulator pulse generator

L8683  Radiofrequency transmitter (external) for use with implantable neurostimulator radiofrequency receiver

L8685  Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, single array, non-rechargeable, includes extension

L8686  Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator single array, on rechargeable, includes extension

L8687  Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, dual array, rechargeable, includes extension

L8688  Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, dual array, non-rechargeable, includes extension

L8689  External recharging system for implanted neurostimulator replacement only

Key References


Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.
SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

“Intermountain Healthcare” and its accompanying logo, the marks of “SelectHealth” and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association