



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

Applies to all products administered or underwritten by Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and its subsidiary, HMO Louisiana, Inc. (collectively referred to as the "Company"), unless otherwise provided in the applicable contract. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Medical Policy periodically.

When Services Are Eligible for Coverage

Coverage for eligible medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products may be provided only if:

- *Benefits are available in the member's contract/certificate, and*
- *Medical necessity criteria and guidelines are met.*

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider the Micra^{TM†} VR single-chamber transcatheter pacing system in individuals to be **eligible for coverage**** when both conditions below are met:

1. The individual has high-grade atrioventricular (AV) block (see Policy Guidelines) in the presence of atrial fibrillation or has significant bradycardia and:
 - Normal sinus rhythm with rare episodes of 2° or 3° AV block or sinus arrest (see Policy Guidelines); OR
 - Chronic atrial fibrillation; OR
 - Severe physical disability (see Policy Guidelines).
2. The individual has a significant contraindication precluding placement of conventional single-chamber ventricular pacemaker leads such as any of the following:
 - History of an endovascular or cardiovascular implantable electronic device (CIED) infection or who are at high risk for infection (see Policy Guidelines); or
 - Limited access for transvenous pacing given venous anomaly, occlusion of axillary veins or planned use of such veins for a semi-permanent catheter or current or planned use of an arteriovenous fistula for hemodialysis; or
 - Presence of a bioprosthetic tricuspid valve.

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider The Micra^{TM†} AV single-chamber transcatheter pacing system in individuals to be **eligible for coverage**** when both conditions below are met:

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Louisiana

Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

1. The individual has high-grade AV block (see Policy Guidelines) in the presence of atrial fibrillation or has significant bradycardia and:
 - Normal sinus rhythm with paroxysmal or permanent high-grade ~~rare episodes of~~ (2° or 3°) AV block or sinus arrest (see Policy Guidelines); OR
 - Chronic atrial fibrillation; OR
 - Severe physical disability (see Policy Guidelines); OR
 - There is an indication for VDD pacing and the individual may benefit from maintenance of AV synchronous ventricular pacing (see Policy Guidelines).
2. The individual has a significant contraindication precluding placement of conventional single-chamber ventricular pacemaker leads such as any of the following:
 - History of an endovascular or cardiovascular implantable electronic device (CIED) infection or who are at high risk for infection (see Policy Guidelines); or
 - Limited access for transvenous pacing given venous anomaly, occlusion of axillary veins or planned use of such veins for a semi-permanent catheter or current or planned use of an arteriovenous fistula for hemodialysis; or
 - Presence of a bioprosthetic tricuspid valve.

When Services Are Considered Investigational

Coverage is not available for investigational medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products.

Based on review of available data, the Company considers The Micra^{TM†} single-chamber transcatheter pacing systems in all other situations in which the above criteria are not met to be **investigational**.*

Based on review of available data, the Company considers other leadless pacing systems, including but not limited to the Aveir^{TM†} single-chamber transcatheter pacing system in all situations to be **investigational**.*

Policy Guidelines

Policy criteria are informed by U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) labeled indications for use and clinical input.

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

Physical Disability and Infection Risk

Clinical input suggests that severe physical disability encompasses a variety of comorbidities where conventional pacemaker placement would confer undue short- or long-term risk or further compromise a limited ability to meet activities of daily living, including compliance with postoperative care instructions. Examples include individuals with short expected lifespan, individuals with end-stage heart, lung, neurologic, or skeletal conditions, and individuals with mental health or developmental challenges.

The 2019 European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) international consensus paper on the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cardiac implantable electronic device (CIED) infections has been endorsed by the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS) and lists the following non-modifiable patient-related risk factors for CIED infections:

- End-stage renal disease;
- Corticosteroid use;
- Renal failure;
- History of device infection;
- Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease;
- Heart failure (New York Heart Association [NYHA] Class \geq II);
- Malignancy;
- Diabetes mellitus.

Device Contraindications

As per the FDA label, the AveirTM† Leadless Pacemaker Model LSP112V is contraindicated in the following situations:

- Use of any pacemaker is contraindicated in individuals with a co-implanted implantable cardioverter-defibrillator because high-voltage shocks could damage the pacemaker and the pacemaker could reduce shock effectiveness.
- Single-chamber ventricular demand pacing is relatively contraindicated in individuals who have demonstrated pacemaker syndrome, have retrograde ventriculoatrial conduction, or suffer a drop in arterial blood pressure with the onset of ventricular pacing.
- Programming of rate-responsive pacing is contraindicated in individuals with intolerance of high sensor-driven rates.

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

- Use is contraindicated in individuals with an implanted vena cava filter or mechanical tricuspid valve because of interference between these devices and the delivery system during implantation.
- Persons with known history of allergies to any of the components of this device may suffer an allergic reaction to this device. Prior to use on the patient, the patient should be counseled on the materials contained in the device and a thorough history of allergies must be discussed.

The Aveir^{TM†} Leadless Pacemaker is conditionally safe for use in the magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) environment when used according to the instructions in the MRI-Ready Leadless System Manual (which includes equipment settings, scanning procedures, and a listing of conditionally approved components). Scanning under different conditions may result in severe patient injury, death, or device malfunction.

As per the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) label, the Micra Model MC1VR01 (Micra VR) and Model MC1AVR1 (Micra AV) pacemakers are contraindicated for individuals who have the following types of devices implanted:

- An implanted device that would interfere with the implant of the Micra device in the judgment of the implanting physician
- An implanted inferior vena cava filter
- A mechanical tricuspid valve
- An implanted cardiac device providing active cardiac therapy which may interfere with the sensing performance of the Micra device

As per the FDA label, the Micra Model MC1VR01 and Model MC1AVR1 pacemakers are also contraindicated for individuals who have the following conditions:

- Femoral venous anatomy unable to accommodate a 7.8 mm (23 French) introducer sheath or implant on the right side of the heart (for example, due to obstructions or severe tortuosity)
- Morbid obesity that prevents the implanted device to obtain telemetry communication within <12.5 cm (4.9 in)
- Known intolerance to titanium, titanium nitride, parylene C, primer for parylene C, polyether ether ketone, siloxane, nitinol, platinum, iridium, liquid silicone rubber,

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

silicone medical adhesive, and heparin or sensitivity to contrast medical which cannot be adequately premedicated

As per the FDA label, Micra pacemakers should not be used in individuals for whom a single dose of 1.0 mg dexamethasone acetate cannot be tolerated because the device contains a molded and cured mixture of dexamethasone acetate with the target dosage of 272 µg dexamethasone acetate. It is intended to deliver the steroid to reduce inflammation and fibrosis.

For the MRI contraindications for patients with a Micra MRI device, refer to the Medtronic MRI Technical Manual.

As per the FDA label, some individuals will not benefit from the AV synchronous (VDD) mode supported by the Micra Model MC1AVR1 pacemaker. Individuals with the following conditions should instead be considered for a dual-chamber transvenous pacing system:

- Sinus node dysfunction;
- High sinus rates requiring atrial tracking;
- Weak atrial contraction;
- Symptoms during loss of atrioventricular (AV) synchrony;
- Frequent premature atrial or ventricular contractions.

High-Grade Atrioventricular Block

Atrioventricular block occurs when there is interference of the electrical signals from the atrium to the ventricle. AV block is categorized based on severity. First degree AV block occurs when signals are transferred more slowly than normal. Second-degree AV block is divided into Type I and Type II. Type I is also called Mobitz Type I or Wenckebach's AV block. There is gradually slower activity which may produce skipped heartbeats. Second-degree Type II is also called Mobitz Type II where more signals fail to reach the ventricles, resulting in a slower and more abnormal heart rhythm. Second-degree AV block can be paroxysmal (not persistent) or permanent. Additionally, high-degree AV block is a form of second-degree AV block in which the conduction ratio is high representing multiple atrial contractions that are not conducting to the ventricle; however, there is still some AV conduction and as such is not a third-degree AV block. Third-degree AV block is a complete block of the electrical signals; while the ventricles contract on their own, the consequences are reduced and irregular heart rate and reduced cardiac output.

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

Individuals with rare episodes of AV block or sinus arrest generally do not require pacing intervention, although symptomatic individuals might have significant need for pacing. The MicraTM VR and AveirTM devices are indicated when there is infrequent AV block. The MicraTM AV device is indicated with infrequent or chronic AV block. These definitions come from the intended use definitions of the devices and clinical input. Note that there is no strict definition of the frequency of episodes or the degree of symptoms.

VDD Pacing

VDD pacing is a pacing mode used in pacemakers whereby sensing occurs in both the atrium and ventricle, with pacing only occurring in the ventricle. The first letter (V) indicates that the Ventricle is the pacing chamber, the second letter (D) indicates that both the atrium and ventricle are the sensing chambers, and the third letter (D) indicates that the mode of operation is dual (inhibited and triggered). Uses of VDD pacing include pacemaker syndrome where there is reduced coordination between the atrial and ventricular contractions resulting in lower cardiac output, and when individuals with an implant have complete AV block with preserved sinus functioning. VDD is used in dual chamber transvenous pacemakers and in single-chamber ventricular pacemakers with leads that float in the atrium for sensing. The MicraTM AV leadless pacemaker supports VDD pacing.

Atrioventricular Synchrony

Devices that support maintenance of AV synchrony can sense atrial electrical activity and pace the ventricular chamber accordingly. Pacemakers maintaining AV synchrony may lead to less morbidity and mortality than ventricular stimulation alone and reduce the risk of pacemaker syndrome. The MicraTM AV device provides AV synchronous ventricular pacing similar to a transvenous VDD system. The implanted device depends on the appropriate sensing of atrial mechanical signals to achieve AV synchrony. The level of AV synchrony may vary in individual patients and may not be predictable prior to implant. The manufacturer cautions that loss of AV synchrony can be caused by the interference of mechanical vibrations stemming from patient activities and environments.

Pacemaker Syndrome

In pacemaker syndrome there is reduced coordination between atrial contraction and ventricular contraction, resulting in reduced cardiac output. The syndrome is most commonly seen in the setting of a single-chamber ventricular pacemaker with ventricular sensing and pacing, as with no atrial sensing the ventricles contract at the programmed rate independently from atrial contraction.

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

Device Retrieval and Replacement

Leadless pacemakers have a limited lifespan. Removal of devices can be complicated by encapsulation due to fibrosis. Devices can instead be deactivated and remain in place, with another device implanted. Use of deactivated and activated devices might result in electromagnetic interference. Based on bench testing, the current recommendation for device end of service care includes adding a replacement device with or without explantation of the deactivated implant. Explantation of the deactivated implant should be performed by a clinician with expertise in the removal of implanted leads. Use of co-implanted deactivated and activated devices has not been clinically tested, and as such Plans will need to consider the medical necessity of repeat implantation. The AveirTM device features helix-based active fixation designed to facilitate device removal with a dedicated retrieval catheter; however, limited data are available on retrieval success rates.

Mechanical Interference

For axillary transvenous pacemakers, there is a concern that leads or the generator could be impacted by the recoil of using a firearm (e.g., rifles or shotguns). Thus leadless cardiac pacemakers can provide an alternative for patients who suffer lead fracture or malfunction from mechanical stress and may be considered when axillary venous access is present only on a side of the body that would not allow use of equipment producing such mechanical stress (e.g., a firearm).

Background/Overview

Conventional Pacemakers

Pacemakers are intended to be used as a substitute for the heart's intrinsic pacing system to correct cardiac rhythm disorders. By providing an appropriate heart rate and heart rate response, cardiac pacemakers can reestablish effective circulation and more normal hemodynamics that are compromised by a slow heart rate. Pacemakers vary in system complexity and can have multiple functions as a result of the ability to sense and/or stimulate both the atria and the ventricles.

Transvenous pacemakers or pacemakers with leads (hereinafter referred to as conventional pacemakers) consist of 2 components: a pulse generator (ie, battery component) and electrodes (ie, leads). The pulse generator consists of a power supply and electronics that can provide periodic electrical pulses to stimulate the heart. The generator is commonly implanted in the infraclavicular region of the anterior chest wall and placed in a pre-pectoral position; in some cases, a subpectoral

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

position is advantageous. The unit generates an electrical impulse, which is transmitted to the myocardium via the electrodes affixed to the myocardium to sense and pace the heart as needed.

Conventional pacemakers are also referred to as single-chamber or dual-chamber systems. In single-chamber systems, only 1 lead is placed, typically in the right ventricle. In dual-chamber pacemakers, 2 leads are placed - one in the right atrium and the other in the right ventricle. Single-chamber ventricular pacemakers are more common.

Annually, approximately 200,000 pacemakers are implanted in the U.S. and 1 million worldwide. Implantable pacemakers are considered life-sustaining, life-supporting class III devices for patients with a variety of bradyarrhythmias. Pacemaker systems have matured over the years with well-established, acceptable performance standards. As per the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the early performance of conventional pacemaker systems from implantation through 60 to 90 days have usually demonstrated acceptable pacing capture thresholds and sensing. Intermediate performance (90 days through more than 5 years) has usually demonstrated the reliability of the pulse generator and lead technology. Chronic performance (5 to 10 years) includes a predictable decline in battery life and mechanical reliability, but a vast majority of patients receive excellent pacing and sensing free of operative or mechanical reliability failures.

Even though the safety profile of conventional pacemakers is excellent, they are associated with complications particularly related to leads. Most safety data on the use of conventional pacemakers come from registries from Europe, particularly from Denmark where all pacemaker implants are recorded in a national registry. These data are summarized in Table 1. It is important to recognize that valid comparison of complication rates is limited by differences in definitions of complications, which results in a wide variance of outcomes, as well as by the large variance in follow-up times, use of single-chamber or dual-chamber systems, and data reported over more than 2 decades. As such, the following data are contemporary and limited to single-chamber systems when reported separately.

In many cases when a conventional pectoral approach is not possible, alternative approaches such as epicardial pacemaker implantation and trans-iliac approaches have been used. Cohen et al (2001) reported outcomes from a retrospective analysis of 123 patients who underwent 207 epicardial lead implantations. Congenital heart disease was present in 103 (84%) of the patients. Epicardial leads were followed for 29 months (range, 1 to 207 months). Lead failure was defined as the need for

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

replacement or abandonment due to pacing or sensing problems, lead fracture, or phrenic/muscle stimulation. The 1-, 2-, and 5-year lead survival was 96%, 90%, and 74%, respectively. Epicardial lead survival in those placed by a subxiphoid approach was 100% at 1 year and at 10 years, by the sternotomy approach (93.9% at 1 year and 75.9% at 10 years) and lateral thoracotomy approach (94.1% at 1 year and 62.4% at 10 years).

Doll et al (2008) reported results of a randomized controlled trial comparing epicardial implantation versus conventional pacemaker implantation in 80 patients with indications for cardiac resynchronization therapy. The authors reported that the conventional pacemaker group had a significantly shorter intensive care unit stay, less blood loss, and shorter ventilation times while the epicardial group had less exposure to radiation and less use of contrast medium. The left ventricular pacing threshold was similar in the 2 groups at discharge but longer in the epicardial group during follow-up. Adverse events were also similar in the 2 groups. The following events were experienced by 1 (3%) patient each in the epicardial group: pleural puncture, pneumothorax, wound infection, acute respiratory distress syndrome, and hospital mortality.

As a less invasive alternative to the epicardial approach, the trans-iliac approach has also been utilized. Data using trans-iliac approach is limited. Multiple other studies with smaller sample size report a wide range of lead longevity.

Harake et al (2018) reported a retrospective analysis of 5 patients who underwent a transvenous iliac approach (median age, 26.9 years). Pacing indications included AV block in 3 patients and sinus node dysfunction in 2 patients. After a median follow-up of 4.1 years (range, 1.0 to 16.7 years), outcomes were reported for 4 patients. One patient underwent device revision for lead position-related groin discomfort; a second patient developed atrial lead failure following a Maze operation and underwent lead replacement by the iliac approach. One patient underwent heart transplantation 6 months after implant with only partial resolution of pacing-induced cardiomyopathy. Tsutsumi et al (2010) reported a case series of 4 patients from Japan in whom conventional pectoral approach was precluded due to recurrent lead infections (n=1), superior vena cava obstruction following cardiac surgery (n=2) and a postoperative dermal scar (n=1). The mean follow-up was 24 months and the authors concluded the iliac vein approach was satisfactory and less invasive alternative to epicardial lead implantation. However, the authors reported that the incidence of atrial lead dislodgement using this approach in the literature ranged from 7% to 21%. Experts who provided

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Louisiana

Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

clinical input reported that trans-iliac or surgical epicardial approach requires special expertise and long-term performance is suboptimal.

Table 1. Reported Complication Rates with Conventional Pacemakers

Complications	Rates, % ^{8,9,10,a}
Traumatic complications	
RV perforation	0.2 to 0.8
RV perforation with tamponade	0.07 to 0.4
Pneumo(hemo)thorax	0.7 to 2.2
Pocket complications	
Including all hematomas, difficult to control bleeding, infection, discomfort, skin erosion	4.75
Including only those requiring invasive correction or reoperation	0.66 to 1.0
Lead-related complications	
Including lead fracture, dislodgement, insulation problem, infection, stimulation threshold problem, diaphragm or pocket stimulation, other	1.6 to 3.8
All system-related infections requiring reoperation or extraction	0.5 to 0.7

Adapted from U.S. Food and Drug Administration executive summary memorandum (2016).

^a Rates are for new implants only and ventricular single-chamber devices when data were available. Some rates listed in this column are for single- and dual-chamber devices when data were not separated in the publication. Note that Micra transcatheter pacing system is a single-chamber device. RV: right ventricle.

Potential Advantages of Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers Over Conventional Pacemakers

The potential advantages of leadless pacemakers fall into 3 categories: avoidance of risks associated with intravascular leads in conventional pacemakers, avoidance of risks associated with pocket

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

creation for placement of conventional pacemakers, and an additional option for patients who require a single-chamber pacer.

Lead complications include lead failure, lead fracture, insulation defect, pneumothorax, infections requiring lead extractions and replacements that can result in a torn subclavian vein or the tricuspid valve. In addition, there are risks of venous thrombosis and occlusion of the subclavian system from the leads. Use of a leadless system eliminates such risks with the added advantage that a patient has vascular access preserved for other medical conditions (eg, dialysis, chemotherapy).

Pocket complications include infections, erosions, and pain that can be eliminated with leadless pacemakers. Further, a leadless cardiac pacemaker may be more comfortable and appealing because unlike conventional pacemakers, patients are unable to see or feel the device or have an implant scar on the chest wall.

Leadless pacemakers may also be a better option than surgical endocardial pacemakers for patients with no vascular access due to renal failure or congenital heart disease.

Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers in Clinical Development

Leadless pacemakers are self-contained in a hermetically sealed capsule. The capsule houses a battery and electronics to operate the system. Similar to most pacing leads, the tip of the capsule includes a fixation mechanism and a monolithic controlled-release device. The controlled-release device elutes a glucocorticosteroid to reduce acute inflammation at the implantation site. Leadless pacemakers have rate-responsive functionality, and current device longevity estimates are based on bench data. Estimates have suggested that these devices may last over 10 years, depending on the programmed parameters.

Three systems are currently being evaluated in clinical trials: (1) the Micra Transcatheter Pacing System (Medtronic), (2) the Aveir VR Leadless Pacemaker (Abbott; formerly Nanostim, St. Jude Medical); and (3) the WiCS Wireless Cardiac Stimulation System (EBR Systems). The first 2 devices are free-standing capsule-sized devices that are delivered via femoral venous access using a steerable delivery sheath. However, the fixing mechanism differs between the 2 devices. In the Micra Transcatheter Pacing System, the fixation system consists of 4 self-expanding nitinol tines, which anchor into the myocardium; for the Aveir device, there is a screw-in helix that penetrates into the myocardium. In both devices, the cathode is steroid eluting and delivers pacing current; the anode is

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

located in a titanium case. The third device, WiCS system differs from the other devices; this system requires implanting a pulse generator subcutaneously near the heart, which then wirelessly transmits ultrasound energy to a receiver electrode implanted in the left ventricle. The receiver electrode converts the ultrasound energy and delivers electrical stimulation to the heart sufficient to pace the left ventricle synchronously with the right.

Of these 3, only the Micra and Aveir single-chamber transcatheter pacing systems are approved by the FDA and commercially available in the U.S. Multiple clinical studies of the Aveir predecessor device, Nanostim, have been published but trials have been halted due to the migration of the docking button in the device and premature battery depletion. These issues have since been addressed with the Aveir device.

The Micra is about 26 mm in length and introduced using a 23 French catheter via the femoral vein to the right ventricle. It weighs about 2 grams and has an accelerometer-based rate response.

The Aveir is about 42 mm in length and introduced using an 25 French catheter to the right ventricle. It also weighs about 3 grams and uses a temperature-based rate response sensor.

FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

In April 2016, the MicraTM† transcatheter pacing system (Medtronic) was approved by the FDA through the premarket approval process (PMA number: P150033) for use in patients who have experienced one or more of the following conditions:

- symptomatic paroxysmal or permanent high-grade arteriovenous block in the presence of atrial fibrillation
- paroxysmal or permanent high-grade arteriovenous block in the absence of atrial fibrillation, as an alternative to dual-chamber pacing, when atrial lead placement is considered difficult, high-risk, or not deemed necessary for effective therapy
- symptomatic bradycardia-tachycardia syndrome or sinus node dysfunction (sinus bradycardia or sinus pauses), as an alternative to atrial or dual-chamber pacing, when atrial lead placement is considered difficult, high-risk, or not deemed necessary for effective therapy.

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

In January 2020, the Micra AV Transcatheter Pacing System Model MC1AVR1 and Application Software Model SW044 were approved as a PMA supplement (S061) to the Micra system described above. The Micra AV includes an enhanced algorithm to provide AV synchronous pacing.

In November 2021, the FDA issued a letter to health care providers regarding the risk of major complications related to cardiac perforation during implantation of leadless pacing systems. Specifically, the FDA states that "real-world use suggests that cardiac perforations associated with Micra leadless pacemakers are more likely to be associated with serious complications, such as cardiac tamponade or death, than with traditional pacemakers."

In March 2022, the Aveir^{TM†} VR Leadless Pacemaker was approved by the FDA through the premarket approval process (PMA number: P150035) for use in patients with bradycardia and:

- normal sinus rhythm with only rare episodes of atrioventricular block or sinus arrest
- chronic atrial fibrillation
- severe physical disability.

Rate-Modulated Pacing is indicated for patients with chronotropic incompetence, and for those who would benefit from increased stimulation rates concurrent with physical activity.

Rationale/Source

This medical policy was developed through consideration of peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval status, nationally accepted standards of medical practice and accepted standards of medical practice in this community, technology evaluation centers, reference to federal regulations, other plan medical policies, and accredited national guidelines.

Pacemakers are intended to be used as a substitute for the heart's intrinsic pacing system to correct cardiac rhythm disorders. Conventional pacemakers consist of 2 components: a pulse generator and electrodes (or leads). Pacemakers are considered life-sustaining, life-supporting class III devices for patients with a variety of bradyarrhythmias. Even though the efficacy and safety profile of conventional pacemakers are excellent, in a small proportion of patients, they may result in lead complications and the requirement for a surgical pocket. Further, some patients are medically ineligible for conventional pacemakers due to lack of venous access and recurrent infection. Leadless

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

pacemakers are single-unit devices that are implanted in the heart via femoral access, thereby eliminating the potential for complications as a result of leads and surgical pocket. The Micra and Aveir single-chamber transcatheter pacing systems are the only commercially available leadless pacemakers in the U.S. approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals with a guidelines-based indication for a ventricular pacing system who are medically eligible for a conventional pacing system who receive a single-chamber transcatheter pacing system, the evidence includes pivotal prospective cohort studies, a post approval prospective cohort study, a Medicare registry, and a retrospective FDA database analysis. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Results at 6 months and 1 year for the Micra pivotal study reported high procedural success (>99%) and device effectiveness (pacing capture threshold met in 98% of patients). Most of the system- or procedure-related complications occurred within 30 days. At 1 year, the incidence of major complications did not increase substantially from 6 months (3.5% at 6 months vs. 4% at 1 year). Results of the Micra post approval study were consistent with the pivotal study and showed a lower incidence of major complications up to 30 days post implantation as well as 1 year (1.5% and 2.7%, respectively). In both studies, the point estimates of major complications were lower than the pooled estimates from 6 studies of conventional pacemakers used as a historical comparator. While Micra device eliminates lead- and surgical pocket-related complications, its use can result in potentially more serious complications related to implantation and release of the device (traumatic cardiac injury) and less serious complications related to the femoral access site (groin hematomas, access site bleeding). Initial data from a Medicare registry found a significantly higher rate of pericardial effusion and/or perforation within 30 days in patients with the leadless Micra pacemaker compared to patients who received a transvenous device; however, overall 6-month complication rates were significantly lower in the Micra group in the adjusted analysis ($p=.02$). In a real-world study of Medicare patients, the Micra device was associated with a 41% lower rate of reinterventions and a 32% lower rate of chronic complications compared with transvenous pacing, with no significant difference in adjusted all-cause mortality at 3 years despite the higher comorbidity index for patients implanted with a Micra device. However, patients receiving the Micra device experienced significantly more other complications, driven by higher rates of pericarditis. No significant differences were noted in the composite endpoint of time to heart failure hospitalization or death for the full cohort ($p=.28$) or the subgroup without a history of heart failure ($p=.98$). It is also unclear whether all patients were considered medically eligible for a conventional pacing system. A single-arm study of the Micra AV

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

device reported that 85.2% of individuals with complete AV block and normal sinus rhythm successfully achieved a >70% resting AV synchrony (AVS) rate at 1 month postimplant and that AVS rates could be further enhanced with additional device programming. However, clinically meaningful rates of AVS are unknown. Longer-term device characterization is planned in the Micra AV Post-Approval Registry through 3 years. The Aveir pivotal prospective cohort study primary safety and efficacy outcomes at 6 weeks exceeded performance goals for complication-free rate and composite success rate (96.0% and 95.9%, respectively). Results at 6 months were similar and at 1 year were 93.2% and 91.5%, respectively. Incidence of major complications at 1 year was 6.7% compared to 4.0% in the Micra pivotal trial. The 2-year survival estimate of 85.3% is based on Phase 1 performance with the predecessor Nanostim device. Considerable uncertainties and unknowns remain in terms of the durability of the devices and device end-of-life issues. Early and limited experience with the Micra device has suggested that retrieval of these devices is unlikely because in due course, the device will be encapsulated. There are limited data on device-device interactions (both electrical and mechanical), which may occur when there is a deactivated Micra device alongside another leadless pacemaker or when a leadless pacemaker and transvenous device are both present. Although the Aveir device is specifically designed to be retrieved when therapy needs evolve or the device needs to be replaced, limited data are available on retrieval outcomes. While the current evidence is encouraging, overall benefit with the broad use of FDA-approved single-chamber transcatheter pacing systems compared with conventional pacemakers has not been shown. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with a guidelines-based indication for a ventricular pacing system who are medically ineligible for a conventional pacing system who receive a single-chamber transcatheter pacing system, the evidence includes subgroup analysis of a pivotal prospective cohort study and a post approval prospective cohort study for the Micra device. It is unclear whether the Aveir pivotal study enrolled patients medically ineligible for a conventional pacing system. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Information on the outcomes in the subgroup of patients from the post approval study showed that the Micra device was successfully implanted in 98% to 99% of cases, and safety outcomes were similar to the original cohort. Even though the evidence is limited and long-term effectiveness and safety are unknown, the short-term benefits may outweigh the risks because the complex trade-off of adverse events for these devices needs to be assessed in the context of the life-saving potential of pacing systems for patients ineligible for conventional pacing systems. There are little data available

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

regarding outcomes associated with other alternatives to conventional pacemaker systems such as epicardial leads or transiliac placement. Epicardial leads are most relevant for the patient who is already going to have a thoracotomy for treatment of their underlying condition (e.g., congenital heart disease). Epicardial leads are associated with a longer intensive care unit stay, more blood loss, and longer ventilation times compared to conventional pacemaker systems. The evidence for transiliac placement is limited to small case series and the incidence of atrial lead dislodgement using this approach in the literature ranged from 7% to 21%. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Supplemental Information

Clinical Input from Physician Specialty Societies and Academic Medical Centers

While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process, through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted.

2023 Input

Clinical input was sought to help determine whether the use of an Aveir or Micra AV transcatheter pacing system for an individual with a guidelines-based indication for a ventricular pacing system would provide a clinically meaningful improvement in net health outcome and whether the use is consistent with generally accepted medical practice depending on individual medical eligibility for a conventional pacing system. In response to requests, clinical input was received from 2 respondents, including 1 specialty society-level response including physicians with academic medical center affiliation and 1 physician-level response with academic affiliation identified through a specialty society.

For individuals with a guidelines-based indication for a ventricular pacing system who are medically ineligible for a conventional pacing system who receive a Micra AV or Aveir transcatheter pacing system, clinical input supports this use provides a clinically meaningful improvement in net health outcomes and indicates this use is consistent with generally accepted medical practice in a subgroup of appropriately selected patients when both conditions below are met:

- The patient has significant bradycardia and:

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

- Normal sinus rhythm with rare episodes of 2° or 3° atrioventricular (AV) block or sinus arrest and severe physical disability or short expected lifespan; OR
 - Chronic atrial fibrillation.
- The patient has a significant contraindication precluding placement of conventional single-chamber ventricular pacemaker leads such as any of the following:
 - History of an endovascular or cardiovascular implantable electronic device (CIED) infection or who are at high risk for infection;
 - Limited access for transvenous pacing given venous anomaly, occlusion of axillary veins, or planned use of such veins for a semi-permanent catheter or current or planned use of an arteriovenous fistula for hemodialysis;
 - Presence of a bioprosthetic tricuspid valve.

For individuals with a guidelines-based indication for a ventricular pacing system who are medically eligible for a conventional pacing system who receive a Micra AV or Aveir transcatheter pacing system, clinical input indicates this use is consistent with generally accepted medical practice but reports mixed support that this use provides a clinically meaningful improvement in net health outcomes.

2019 Input

Clinical input was sought to help determine whether the use of leadless cardiac pacemakers for individuals with a guidelines-based indication for a ventricular pacing system would provide a clinically meaningful improvement in net health outcome and whether the use is consistent with generally accepted medical practice. In response to requests, clinical input was received from 2 respondents, including 1 specialty society-level response and 1 physician-level response identified through specialty societies including physicians with academic medical center affiliations.

For individuals with a guidelines-based indication for a ventricular pacing system who are medically ineligible for a conventional pacing system who receive a Micra transcatheter pacing system, clinical input supports this use provides a clinically meaningful improvement in net health outcomes and indicates this use is consistent with generally accepted medical practice in a subgroup of appropriately selected patients when both conditions below are met:

- The patient has symptomatic paroxysmal or permanent high-grade arteriovenous block or symptomatic bradycardia-tachycardia syndrome or sinus node dysfunction (sinus bradycardia or sinus pauses).

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

- The patient has a significant contraindication precluding placement of conventional single-chamber ventricular pacemaker leads such as any of the following:
 - History of an endovascular or CIED infection or who are very high-risk for infection
 - Limited access for transvenous pacing given venous anomaly, occlusion of axillary veins or planned use of such veins for a semi-permanent catheter or current or planned use of an arteriovenous fistula for hemodialysis
 - Presence of a bioprosthetic tricuspid valve

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

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

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

In 2018, the NICE issued evidence-based recommendations on leadless cardiac pacemaker implantation for adults with bradyarrhythmias. The guidance states that the evidence "on the safety of leadless cardiac pacemaker implantation for bradyarrhythmias shows that there are serious but well-recognized complications. The evidence on efficacy is inadequate in quantity and quality:

- For people who can have conventional cardiac pacemaker implantation, leadless pacemakers should only be used in the context of research;
- For people in whom a conventional cardiac pacemaker implantation is contraindicated following a careful risk assessment by a multidisciplinary team, leadless cardiac pacemakers should only be used with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent and audit or research."

The guidance is awaiting development as of April 2023 with expected publication in June 2024.

Heart Rhythm Society

In 2020, the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS), along with the International Society for Cardiovascular Infectious Diseases (ISCVID) and several other Asian, European and Latin American societies, endorsed the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) international consensus document on

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

how to prevent, diagnose, and treat cardiac implantable electronic device infections. The consensus states that for patients at high risk of device-related infections, avoiding a transvenous system, and implanting an epicardial system, may be preferential. It makes the following statements regarding leadless pacemakers:

- 'There is hope that 'leadless' pacemakers will be less prone to infection and can be used in a similar manner [as epicardial systems] in high-risk patients.'
- 'In selected high-risk patients, the risk of infection with leadless pacemakers appears low. The device also seems safe and feasible in patients with pre-existing [cardiovascular implantable electronic device] infection and after extraction of infected leads.'

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid (CMS) cover leadless pacemakers under coverage with evidence development criteria when procedures are performed in prospective longitudinal studies approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) using "leadless pacemakers...in accordance with the FDA approved label for devices that have either:

- An associated ongoing FDA approved post-approval study; or
- Completed an FDA post-approval study.

Each study must be approved by CMS and as a fully-described, written part of its protocol, must address the following research questions:

- What are the peri-procedural and post-procedural complications of leadless pacemakers?
- What are the long term outcomes of leadless pacemakers?
- What are the effects of patient characteristics (age, gender, comorbidities) on the use and health effects of leadless pacemakers?"

The following 6 studies are currently approved by CMS:

1. Aveir VR Coverage With Evidence Development Post-Approval Study (NCT05336877); CMS approval date: 6/2/22;
2. Effectiveness of the EMPOWERTM Modular Pacing System and EMBLEMTM Subcutaneous ICD to Communicate Antitachycardia Pacing (NCT04798768); CMS approval date: 1/20/22;

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

3. The LEADLESS II IDE Study (Phase II): A Safety and Effectiveness Trial for a Leadless Pacemaker System (NCT04559945); CMS approval date: 3/16/21;
4. Longitudinal Coverage with Evidence Development Study on Micra AV Leadless Pacemakers (Micra AV CED) (NCT04235491); CMS approval date: 2/5/2020;
5. The Micra CED Study (NCT03039712); CMS approval date: 03/09/17; and
6. Micra Transcatheter Pacing System Post-Approval Registry (NCT02536118); CMS approval date: 02/09/17.

See Table 2 for additional details.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
<i>Ongoing</i>			
NCT04559945 ^{a,b}	The LEADLESS II IDE Study (Phase II): A Safety and Effectiveness Trial for a Leadless Pacemaker System	326	Aug 2023 (ongoing)
NCT05528029	International Leadless Pacemaker Registry (i-LEAPER)	2000	Dec 2024 (recruiting)
NCT04253184 ^a	Micra AV Transcatheter Pacing System Post-Approval Registry (Micra AV PAS)	802	Apr 2025 (ongoing)
NCT05498376	The Leadless AV Versus DDD Pacing Study: A Randomized Controlled Single-center Trial on Leadless Versus Conventional Cardiac Dual-chamber Pacing (LEAVE DDD)	100	Feb 2026 (recruiting)

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Louisiana

Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

NCT04235491 ^{a,b}	Longitudinal Coverage With Evidence Development Study on Micra AV Leadless Pacemakers (Micra AV CED)	37000	Jun 2027 (ongoing)
NCT04051814	A Retrospective Trial to Evaluate the Micra Pacemaker	500	May 2025 (recruiting)
NCT03039712 ^{a,b}	Longitudinal Coverage With Evidence Development Study on Micra Leadless Pacemakers (Micra CED)	37000	Jun 2027 (ongoing)
NCT04926792	Taiwan Registry for Leadless Pacemaker	300	Jun 2025 (not yet recruiting)
NCT05252702 ^a	Aveir Dual-Chamber Leadless i2i IDE Study	550	Nov 2025 (recruiting)
NCT02536118 ^{a,b}	Micra Transcatheter Pacing System Post-Approval Registry	3100	Aug 2026 (ongoing)
NCT05336877 ^{a,b}	Aveir Single-Chamber Leadless Pacemaker Coverage With Evidence Development (ACED) Post-Approval Study	8744	Jan 2028 (recruiting)
NCT04798768 ^{a,b}	Effectiveness of the EMPOWER ^{TM†} Modular Pacing System and EMBLEM TM Subcutaneous ICD to Communicate Antitachycardia Pacing (MODULAR ATP)	300	Dec 2030 (recruiting)

NCT: national clinical trial.
^a Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.
^b Denotes CMS-approved study.

References

1. Reddy VY, Exner DV, Cantillon DJ, et al. Percutaneous Implantation of an Entirely Intracardiac Leadless Pacemaker. N Engl J Med. Sep 17, 2015; 373(12): 1125-35. PMID 26321198

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

2. Udo EO, Zuithoff NP, van Hemel NM, et al. Incidence and predictors of short- and long-term complications in pacemaker therapy: the FOLLOWPACE study. *Heart Rhythm*. May 2012; 9(5): 728-35. PMID 22182495
3. Haight PJ, Stewart RE, Saarel EV, et al. Lateral thoracotomy for epicardial pacemaker placement in patients with congenital heart disease. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg*. May 01, 2018; 26(5): 845-851. PMID 29300890
4. Cohen MI, Bush DM, Vetter VL, et al. Permanent epicardial pacing in pediatric patients: seventeen years of experience and 1200 outpatient visits. *Circulation*. May 29, 2001; 103(21): 2585-90. PMID 11382728
5. Doll N, Piorkowski C, Czesla M, et al. Epicardial versus transvenous left ventricular lead placement in patients receiving cardiac resynchronization therapy: results from a randomized prospective study. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Aug 2008; 56(5): 256-61. PMID 18615370
6. Harake DE, Shannon KM, Aboulhosn JA, et al. Transvenous pacemaker implantation after the bidirectional Glenn operation for patients with complex congenital disease. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Mar 2018; 29(3): 497-503. PMID 29240293
7. Tsutsumi, K. , Hashizume, K. , Kimura, N. , Taguchi, S. , Inoue, Y. , Kashima, I. and Takahashi, R. (2010), Permanent Pacemaker Implantation via the Iliac Vein: An Alternative in 4 Cases with Contraindications to the Pectoral Approach. *Journal of Arrhythmia*, 26: 55-61. doi:10.1016/S1880-4276(10)80037-7
8. Healey JS, Toff WD, Lamas GA, et al. Cardiovascular outcomes with atrial-based pacing compared with ventricular pacing: meta-analysis of randomized trials, using individual patient data. *Circulation*. Jul 04, 2006; 114(1): 11-7. PMID 16801463
9. Kirkfeldt RE, Johansen JB, Nohr EA, et al. Risk factors for lead complications in cardiac pacing: a population-based cohort study of 28,860 Danish patients. *Heart Rhythm*. Oct 2011; 8(10): 1622-8. PMID 21699827
10. Kirkfeldt RE, Johansen JB, Nohr EA, et al. Complications after cardiac implantable electronic device implantations: an analysis of a complete, nationwide cohort in Denmark. *Eur Heart J*. May 2014; 35(18): 1186-94. PMID 24347317
11. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FDA Executive Summary Memorandum. General Issues: Leadless Pacemaker Devices Prepared for the February 18, 2016 meeting of the Circulatory System Devices Advisory Panel Gaithersburg Hilton; Gaithersburg, MD. 2016; <https://www.fda.gov/media/95842/download>.

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Louisiana

Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

12. American Heart Association. Statement of the American Heart Association to the Food and Drug Administration Circulatory System Devices Panel February 18, 2016: Leadless Cardiac Pacemaker Devices. 2016; <https://www.fda.gov/media/95586/download>.
13. Reddy VY, Miller MA, Knops RE, et al. Retrieval of the Leadless Cardiac Pacemaker: A Multicenter Experience. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. Dec 2016; 9(12). PMID 27932427
14. Reddy VY, Knops RE, Sperzel J, et al. Permanent leadless cardiac pacing: results of the LEADLESS trial. *Circulation*. Apr 08, 2014; 129(14): 1466-71. PMID 24664277
15. Knops RE, Tjong FV, Neuzil P, et al. Chronic performance of a leadless cardiac pacemaker: 1-year follow-up of the LEADLESS trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Apr 21, 2015; 65(15): 1497-504. PMID 25881930
16. Lakkireddy D, Knops R, Atwater B, et al. A worldwide experience of the management of battery failures and chronic device retrieval of the Nanostim leadless pacemaker. *Heart Rhythm*. Dec 2017; 14(12): 1756-1763. PMID 28705736
17. Sperzel J, Defaye P, Delnoy PP, et al. Primary safety results from the LEADLESS Observational Study. *Europace*. Sep 01, 2018; 20(9): 1491-1497. PMID 29365073
18. Reddy VY, Exner DV, Doshi R, et al. Primary Results on Safety and Efficacy From the LEADLESS II-Phase 2 Worldwide Clinical Trial. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol*. Jan 2022; 8(1): 115-117. PMID 34863657
19. Zuckerman B, Shein M, Paulsen J, et al. Circulatory System Devices Panel Meeting: Leadless Pacemakers. FDA Presentation. February 18, 2016; <https://www.fda.gov/media/95985/download>.
20. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data: Aveir Leadless Pacemaker (P150035). March 31, 2022; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf15/P150035B.pdf.
21. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Letter to Health Care Providers. Leadless Pacing Systems: Risk of Major Complications Related to Cardiac Perforation During Implantation. November 17, 2021; <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/letters-health-care-providers/leadless-pacing-systems-risk-major-complications-related-cardiac-perforation-during-implantation>.
22. Abbott. Press Releases: Abbott receives FDA approval for Aveir VR Leadless Pacemaker System to treat patients with slow heart rhythms. April 4, 2022; <https://abbott.mediaroom.com/2022-04-04-Abbott-Receives-FDA-Approval-for-Aveir-TM-VR-Leadless-Pacemaker-System-to-Treat-Patients-with-Slow-Heart-Rhythms>.

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

23. Ritter P, Duray GZ, Zhang S, et al. The rationale and design of the Micra Transcatheter Pacing Study: safety and efficacy of a novel miniaturized pacemaker. *Europace*. May 2015; 17(5): 807-13. PMID 25855677
24. Ritter P, Duray GZ, Steinwender C, et al. Early performance of a miniaturized leadless cardiac pacemaker: the Micra Transcatheter Pacing Study. *Eur Heart J*. Oct 01, 2015; 36(37): 2510-9. PMID 26045305
25. Tjong FVY, Beurskens NEG, de Groot JR, et al. Health-related quality of life impact of a transcatheter pacing system. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Dec 2018; 29(12): 1697-1704. PMID 30168233
26. Reynolds D, Duray GZ, Omar R, et al. A Leadless Intracardiac Transcatheter Pacing System. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 11, 2016; 374(6): 533-41. PMID 26551877
27. Lloyd M, Reynolds D, Sheldon T, et al. Rate adaptive pacing in an intracardiac pacemaker. *Heart Rhythm*. Feb 2017; 14(2): 200-205. PMID 27871854
28. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data (SSED): Micra Transcatheter Pacing System (PMS P150033). 2016; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf15/P150033B.pdf.
29. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). Circulatory System Devices Panel Meeting (transcript). February 18, 2016. <https://www.fda.gov/media/96285/download>.
30. Medtronic. Meet Micra AV (brochure). 2022; https://www.medtronic.com/content/dam/medtronic-com/01_crhf/brady/pdfs/micra-physician-portfolio-brochure.pdf.
31. Grubman E, Ritter P, Ellis CR, et al. To retrieve, or not to retrieve: System revisions with the Micra transcatheter pacemaker. *Heart Rhythm*. Dec 2017; 14(12): 1801-1806. PMID 28713024
32. Roberts PR, Clementy N, Al Samadi F, et al. A leadless pacemaker in the real-world setting: The Micra Transcatheter Pacing System Post-Approval Registry. *Heart Rhythm*. Sep 2017; 14(9): 1375-1379. PMID 28502871
33. El-Chami MF, Brock Johansen J, Zaidi A, et al. Leadless Pacemaker Implant in Patients with Pre-Existing Infections: Results from the Micra Post-Approval Registry. Paper presented at: Heart Rhythm Scientific Sessions. 2018 May 10; Boston, MA.
34. El-Chami MF, Al-Samadi F, Clementy N, et al. Updated performance of the Micra transcatheter pacemaker in the real-world setting: A comparison to the investigational study and a transvenous historical control. *Heart Rhythm*. Dec 2018; 15(12): 1800-1807. PMID 30103071

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

35. El-Chami MF, Garweg C, Iacopino S, et al. Leadless pacemaker implant, anticoagulation status, and outcomes: Results from the Micra Transcatheter Pacing System Post-Approval Registry. *Heart Rhythm*. Feb 2022; 19(2): 228-234. PMID 34757189
36. El-Chami MF, Shinn T, Bansal S, et al. Leadless pacemaker implant with concomitant atrioventricular node ablation: Experience with the Micra transcatheter pacemaker. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Mar 2021; 32(3): 832-841. PMID 33428248
37. Piccini JP, El-Chami M, Wherry K, et al. Contemporaneous Comparison of Outcomes Among Patients Implanted With a Leadless vs Transvenous Single-Chamber Ventricular Pacemaker. *JAMA Cardiol*. Oct 01, 2021; 6(10): 1187-1195. PMID 34319383
38. El-Chami MF, Bockstedt L, Longacre C, et al. Leadless vs. transvenous single-chamber ventricular pacing in the Micra CED study: 2-year follow-up. *Eur Heart J*. Mar 21, 2022; 43(12): 1207-1215. PMID 34788416
39. Crossley GH, Piccini JP, Longacre C, et al. Leadless versus transvenous single-chamber ventricular pacemakers: 3 year follow-up of the Micra CED study. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Apr 2023; 34(4): 1015-1023. PMID 36807378
40. Hauser RG, Gornick CC, Abdelhadi RH, et al. Major adverse clinical events associated with implantation of a leadless intracardiac pacemaker. *Heart Rhythm*. Jul 2021; 18(7): 1132-1139. PMID 33713856
41. Hauser RG, Gornick CC, Abdelhadi RH, et al. Leadless pacemaker perforations: Clinical consequences and related device and user problems. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Feb 2022; 33(2): 154-159. PMID 34953099
42. Chinitz LA, El-Chami MF, Sagi V, et al. Ambulatory atrioventricular synchronous pacing over time using a leadless ventricular pacemaker: Primary results from the AccelAV study. *Heart Rhythm*. Jan 2023; 20(1): 46-54. PMID 36075532
43. Steinwender C, Khelae SK, Garweg C, et al. Atrioventricular Synchronous Pacing Using a Leadless Ventricular Pacemaker: Results From the MARVEL 2 Study. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol*. Jan 2020; 6(1): 94-106. PMID 31709982
44. Reddy VY, Exner DV, Doshi R, et al. 1-Year Outcomes of a Leadless Ventricular Pacemaker: The LEADLESS II (Phase 2) Trial. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol*. Mar 13, 2023. PMID 36951813
45. Duray GZ, Ritter P, El-Chami M, et al. Long-term performance of a transcatheter pacing system: 12-Month results from the Micra Transcatheter Pacing Study. *Heart Rhythm*. May 2017; 14(5): 702-709. PMID 28192207
46. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Post-Approval Studies (PAS) Database: The Aveir VR RWE Study. April 2022;

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Louisiana

Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpma/pma_pas.cfm?c_id=6952&t_id=580926.

47. El-Chami MF, Johansen JB, Zaidi A, et al. Leadless pacemaker implant in patients with pre-existing infections: Results from the Micra post approval registry. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. Apr 2019; 30(4): 569-574. PMID 30661279
48. Garg A, Koneru JN, Fagan DH, et al. Morbidity and mortality in patients precluded for transvenous pacemaker implantation: Experience with a leadless pacemaker. Heart Rhythm. Dec 2020; 17(12): 2056-2063. PMID 32763431
49. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Leadless cardiac pacemaker implantation for bradyarrhythmias [IPG626]. August 29, 2018; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg626>.
50. Blomström-Lundqvist C, Traykov V, Erba PA, et al. European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) international consensus document on how to prevent, diagnose, and treat cardiac implantable electronic device infections-endorsed by the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS), the Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS), the Latin American Heart Rhythm Society (LAHRS), International Society for Cardiovascular Infectious Diseases (ISCVID) and the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ESCMID) in collaboration with the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). Europace. Apr 01, 2020; 22(4): 515-549. PMID 31702000
51. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Decision Memo for Leadless Pacemakers (CAG-00448N). 2017; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-decision-memo.aspx?NCAId=285>.
52. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Coverage with Evidence Development: Leadless Pacemakers. 2017; <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Coverage/Coverage-with-Evidence-Development/Leadless-Pacemakers>. Updated June 30, 2022.

Policy History

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 10/03/2019 | Medical Policy Committee review |
| 10/09/2019 | Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. New policy. |
| 10/01/2020 | Medical Policy Committee review |
| 10/07/2020 | Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage. |

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Louisiana

Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

10/07/2021	Medical Policy Committee review
10/13/2021	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
10/06/2022	Medical Policy Committee review
10/11/2022	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
06/06/2023	Coding update
10/05/2023	Medical Policy Committee review
10/11/2023	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage changed from investigational to eligible for coverage for the Micra VR single-chamber transcatheter pacing system and The Micra AV single-chamber transcatheter pacing system with criteria. Added investigational statement for the Aveir single-chamber transcatheter pacing system.
12/13/2023	Coding update

Next Scheduled Review Date: 10/2024

Coding

The five character codes included in the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines are obtained from Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®)®, copyright 2022 by the American Medical Association (AMA). CPT is developed by the AMA as a listing of descriptive terms and five character identifying codes and modifiers for reporting medical services and procedures performed by physician.

The responsibility for the content of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines is with Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and no endorsement by the AMA is intended or should be implied. The AMA disclaims responsibility for any consequences or liability attributable or related to any use, nonuse or interpretation of information contained in Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines. Fee schedules, relative value units, conversion factors and/or related components are not assigned by the AMA, are not part of CPT, and the AMA is not recommending their use. The AMA does not directly or indirectly practice medicine or dispense medical services. The AMA assumes no liability for data contained or not contained herein. Any use of CPT outside of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines should refer to the most current Current Procedural Terminology which contains the complete and most current listing of CPT codes and descriptive terms. Applicable FARS/DFARS apply.

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Louisiana

Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

CPT is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association.

Codes used to identify services associated with this policy may include (but may not be limited to) the following:

Code Type	Code
CPT	0795T, 0796T, 0797T, 0798T, 0799T, 0800T, 0801T, 0802T, 0803T 0804T 33274, 33275 Add codes effective 01/01/2024: 0823T, 0824T, 0825T, 0826T
HCPCS	No codes
ICD-10 Diagnosis	All related diagnoses

***Investigational** – A medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational if the effectiveness has not been clearly tested and it has not been incorporated into standard medical practice. Any determination we make that a medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational will be based on a consideration of the following:

- A. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product can be lawfully marketed without approval of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and whether such approval has been granted at the time the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is sought to be furnished; or
- B. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product requires further studies or clinical trials to determine its maximum tolerated dose, toxicity, safety, effectiveness, or effectiveness as compared with the standard means of treatment or diagnosis, must improve health outcomes, according to the consensus of opinion among experts as shown by reliable evidence, including:
 1. Consultation with technology evaluation center(s);
 2. Credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community; or
 3. Reference to federal regulations.

****Medically Necessary** (or “Medical Necessity”) - Health care services, treatment, procedures, equipment, drugs, devices, items or supplies that a Provider, exercising prudent clinical judgment, would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury, disease or its symptoms, and that are:

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.



Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Policy # 00688

Original Effective Date: 01/01/2020

Current Effective Date: 11/13/2023

- A. In accordance with nationally accepted standards of medical practice;
- B. Clinically appropriate, in terms of type, frequency, extent, level of care, site and duration, and considered effective for the patient's illness, injury or disease; and
- C. Not primarily for the personal comfort or convenience of the patient, physician or other health care provider, and not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of that patient's illness, injury or disease.

For these purposes, “nationally accepted standards of medical practice” means standards that are based on credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, Physician Specialty Society recommendations and the views of Physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas and any other relevant factors.

‡ Indicated trademarks are the registered trademarks of their respective owners.

NOTICE: If the Patient’s health insurance contract contains language that differs from the BCBSLA Medical Policy definition noted above, the definition in the health insurance contract will be relied upon for specific coverage determinations.

NOTICE: Medical Policies are scientific based opinions, provided solely for coverage and informational purposes. Medical Policies should not be construed to suggest that the Company recommends, advocates, requires, encourages, or discourages any particular treatment, procedure, or service, or any particular course of treatment, procedure, or service.

©2023 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and incorporated as Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company.

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 Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana.