Total Artificial Hearts and Implantable Ventricular Assist Devices

Policy #  00246  
Original Effective Date: 01/20/2010  
Current Effective Date: 12/12/2022

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.

Long-Term Devices

Destination Therapy

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider implantable ventricular assist devices (VADs) with U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval or clearance as destination therapy for adult individuals with end-stage heart failure who meet the following criteria to be eligible for coverage.**

Patient Selection Criteria

Coverage eligibility will be considered when all of the following criteria are met:

- New York Heart Association (NYHA) Class III heart failure with dyspnea upon mild physical activity or NYHA Class IV;
- Left ventricular ejection fraction ≤ 25%;
- Inotrope-dependent; OR cardiac index <2.2 liters/min/m2, while not on inotropes and also meeting one of the following:
  - On optimal medical management, based on current heart failure practice guidelines for at least 45 of the last 60 days and are failing to respond OR
  - Advanced heart failure for at least 14 days and dependent on intra-aortic balloon pump for ≥7 days.
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Short-Term Devices

Bridge to Transplantation
Based on review of available data, the Company may consider implantable VADs with U.S. FDA approval or clearance as a bridge to heart transplantation for individuals who are currently listed as heart transplantation candidates and not expected to survive until a donor heart can be obtained, or are undergoing evaluation to determine candidacy for heart transplantation to be eligible for coverage:**

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider implantable VADs with FDA approval or clearance, including humanitarian device exemptions as a bridge to heart transplantation in children 16 years old or younger who are currently listed as heart transplantation candidates and not expected to survive until a donor heart can be obtained, or are undergoing evaluation to determine candidacy for heart transplantation to be eligible for coverage:**

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider total artificial hearts (TAHs) with FDA approved devices as a bridge to heart transplantation for individuals with biventricular failure who have no other reasonable medical or surgical treatment options, who are ineligible for other univentricular or biventricular support devices, and are currently listed as heart transplantation candidates or are undergoing evaluation to determine candidacy for heart transplantation, and not expected to survive until a donor heart can be obtained to be eligible for coverage:**

Post cardiomyotomy Setting/Bridge to Recovery
Based on review of available data, the Company considers implantable VADs with FDA approval or clearance in the post cardiomyotomy setting in patients who are unable to be weaned off cardiopulmonary bypass to be eligible for coverage.**

When Services Are Considered Investigational
Coverage is not available for investigational medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products.
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Other Indications
Based on review of available data, the Company considers other applications of implantable VADs or TAHs including, but not limited to, the use of TAHs as destination therapy to be investigational.* The use of non-FDA-approved or cleared implantable VADs or TAHs is considered to be investigational.*

Based on review of available data, the Company considers Percutaneous VADs for all indications to be investigational.*

Policy Guidelines
The intent of treatment may evolve over the course of treatment; for example, there is not necessarily a strict delineation between bridge to transplant and destination therapy.

Only 2 ventricular assist devices (VADs) have approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the pediatric population. The DeBakey VAD Child device and the Berlin Heart EXCOR Pediatric VAD have FDA approval through the humanitarian device exemption process. The DeBakey VAD is indicated for use in children ages 5 to 16 years who are awaiting a heart transplant (ie, a bridge to transplant) while the Berlin Heart EXCOR VAD is indicated for children with severe isolated left ventricular or biventricular dysfunction who are candidates for cardiac transplant and require circulatory support.

In general, candidates for bridge to transplant implantable VADs are those who are considered appropriate heart transplant candidates but who are unlikely to survive the waiting period until a human heart donor is available. Some studies have included the following hemodynamic selection criteria: either a left atrial pressure of 20 mm Hg or a cardiac index of less than 2.0 L/min/m while receiving maximal medical support. Patients with VADs are classified by the United Network for Organ Sharing as status I (ie, persons who are most ill and are considered the highest priority for transplant).

The median duration for time on the device is between 20 and 120 days. Contraindications for bridge to transplant VADs and total artificial hearts include conditions that would generally exclude patients for heart transplant. Such conditions are chronic irreversible hepatic, renal, or respiratory failure; systemic infection; coagulation disorders, and inadequate
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Due to potential problems with adequate function of the VAD or total artificial heart, implantation is also contraindicated in patients with uncorrected valvular disease. (heart transplantation) for further discussion of heart transplant candidacy.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services requires that “Beneficiaries receiving a VAD must be managed by an explicitly identified, cohesive, multidisciplinary team of medical professionals with appropriate qualifications, training, and experience. The team embodies collaboration and dedication across medical specialties to offer optimal patient-centered care. Collectively, the team must ensure that patients and caregivers have the knowledge and support necessary to participate in informed decision making. The team members must be based at the facility and must include individuals with experience working with patients before and after placement of a VAD.

The team must include, at a minimum:
- At least 1 physician with cardiothoracic surgery privileges and individual experience implanting at least 10 durable, intracorporeal, left ventricular assist devices over the course of the previous 36 months with activity in the last year.
- At least 1 cardiologist trained in advanced heart failure with clinical competence in medical- and device-based management including VADs, and clinical competence in the management of patients before and after placement of a VAD.
- A VAD program coordinator.
- A social worker.
- A palliative care specialist.”

Background/Overview
Heart Failure
According to a 2022 report from the American Heart Association and based on data collected from 2015 to 2018, roughly 6 million Americans ages 20 years or older had heart failure during that time frame. Prevalence of heart failure is projected to affect more than 8 million people 18 years of age and older by the year 2030. Between 2015 and 2018, the prevalence of heart failure was highest in non-Hispanic Black males. Based on data from the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA), in those without baseline cardiovascular disease, Black individuals had the highest risk of developing heart failure (4.6 per 1000 person-years), followed by Hispanic
(3.5 per 1000 person-years), White (2.4 per 1000 person-years), and Chinese individuals (1.0 per 1000 person-years). Similar findings were demonstrated in the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) Community Surveillance data, in which Black men and women had the highest burden of new-onset heart failure cases and the highest-age adjusted 30-day case fatality rate in comparison to White men and women. Higher risk reflected differential prevalence of hypertension, diabetes, and low socio-economic status.

Heart failure may be the consequence of a number of etiologies, including ischemic heart disease, cardiomyopathy, congenital heart defects, or rejection of a heart transplant. The reduction of cardiac output is considered to be severe when systemic circulation cannot meet the body's needs under minimal exertion. Heart transplantation improves quality of life and has survival rates at 1, 3, and 5 years of about 91%, 85%, and 78%, respectively. The number of candidates for transplants exceeds the supply of donor organs; thus the interest in the development of mechanical devices.

**FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval**

**U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)**

A number of implantable ventricular assist devices (VADs) and artificial heart systems have been U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved through a Humanitarian Device Exemption, 510(k), or premarket approval regulatory pathway. This section discusses currently marketed devices.

FDA maintains a list of recent device recalls at [https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/medical-device-recalls/2021-medical-device-recalls](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/medical-device-recalls/2021-medical-device-recalls)

**Ventricular Assist Devices**

Implantable VADs are attached to the native heart, which may have enough residual capacity to withstand a device failure in the short term. In reversible heart failure conditions, the native heart may regain some function, and weaning and explanting of the mechanical support system after months of use has been described. VADs can be classified as internal or external, electrically or pneumatically powered, and pulsatile or continuous-flow. Initial devices were pulsatile, mimicking the action of a beating heart. More recent devices may use a pump, which provides continuous flow. Continuous devices may move blood in a rotary or axial flow.
Surgically implanted VADs represent a method of providing mechanical circulatory support for patients not expected to survive until a donor heart becomes available for transplant or for whom transplantation is contraindicated or unavailable. VADs are most commonly used to support the left ventricle but right ventricular and biventricular devices may be used. The device is larger than most native hearts, and therefore the size of the patient is an important consideration; the pump may be implanted in the thorax or abdomen or remain external to the body. Inflow to the device is attached to the apex of the failed ventricle, while outflow is attached to the corresponding great artery (aorta for the left ventricle, a pulmonary artery for the right ventricle). A small portion of the ventricular wall is removed for insertion of the outflow tube; extensive cardiotomy affecting the ventricular wall may preclude VAD use.

The intent of treatment may evolve over the course of treatment; for example, there is not necessarily a strict delineation between bridge to transplant and destination therapy, and transplant eligibility can change.

Table 1 lists the VADs currently available in the US. The HeartWare VAD System was discontinued in June 2021 due to evidence from observational studies demonstrating a higher frequency of neurological adverse events and mortality with the system compared to other commercially available left VADs.

Table 1. Available Ventricular Assist Devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>FDA Clearance</th>
<th>PMA, HDE, or 510(k) No.</th>
<th>Indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thoratec IVAD</td>
<td>Thoratec</td>
<td>Aug 2004</td>
<td>PMA Supp</td>
<td>P870072</td>
<td>Bridge to transplant and post cardiotomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBakey VAD Child</td>
<td>MicroMed</td>
<td>Feb 2004</td>
<td>HDE</td>
<td>H030003</td>
<td>Bridge to transplant in children 5-16 y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device Name</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Approval Type</th>
<th>PMA Numbers</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HeartMate II</td>
<td>Thoratec</td>
<td>Apr 2008</td>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>P060040</td>
<td>Bridge to transplant and destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CentriMag</td>
<td>Thoratec</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>P170038</td>
<td>Post cardiotomy, bridge to decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Heart EXCOR Pediatric VAD</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Jun 2017</td>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>P160035</td>
<td>Bridge to transplant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeartMate 3 Left Ventricular Assist System</td>
<td>Thoratec</td>
<td>Aug 2017 Oct 2018</td>
<td>PMA PMA</td>
<td>P160054 P160054/S008</td>
<td>Bridge to transplant Destination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDA: U.S. Food and Drug Administration; HDE: humanitarian device exemption; PMA: premarket approval; VAD: ventricular assist device.

**Total Artificial Heart**

The total artificial heart (TAH) is a biventricular device that completely replaces the function of the diseased heart. An internal battery requires frequent recharging from an external power source. Many systems use a percutaneous power line, but a transcutaneous power-transfer coil allows for a system without lines traversing the skin, possibly reducing the risk of infection. Because the native heart must be removed, failure of the device is synonymous with cardiac death.

Currently the Syncardia Temporary Total Artificial Heart (Syncardia Systems) is the only Total Artificial Heart available in the US (Table 2). The AbioCor Total Artificial Heart was FDA approved under the Humanitarian Device Exemption program in 2006, but is no longer being marketed or in development.
Table 2. Available Total Artificial Heart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>FDA Clearance</th>
<th>PMA No.</th>
<th>Indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SynCardia Temporary Total Artificial Heart (Formerly CardioWest Total Artificial Heart and Jarvik Total Artificial Heart)</td>
<td>SynCardia Systems</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>510(k)</td>
<td>P030011</td>
<td>Bridge to transplant in cardiac transplant-eligible candidates at risk of imminent death from biventricular failure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDA: U.S. Food and Drug Administration; PMA: premarket approval.

Percutaneous Ventricular Assist Devices

Some circulatory assist devices are placed percutaneously (i.e., are not implanted). They may be referred to as percutaneous VADs (pVADs). Two different pVADs have been developed, the TandemHeart and the Impella device (Table 3). In the TandemHeart System, a catheter is introduced through the femoral vein and passed into the left atrium via transseptal puncture. Oxygenated blood is then pumped from the left atrium into the arterial system via the femoral artery. The Impella device is introduced through a femoral artery catheter. In this device, a small pump is contained within the catheter placed into the left ventricle. Blood is pumped from the left ventricle, through the device, and into the ascending aorta. Devices in which most of the system's components are external to the body are for short-term use (6 hours to 14 days) only, due to the increased risk of infection and need for careful, in-hospital monitoring. Adverse events associated with pVAD include access site complications such as bleeding, aneurysms, or leg ischemia. Cardiovascular complications can also occur, such as perforation, myocardial infarction, stroke, and arrhythmias.
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Table 3. Available Percutaneous Ventricular Assist Devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>FDA Clearance</th>
<th>PMA, FDA Clear. No.</th>
<th>Indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TandemHeart</td>
<td>Cardiac Assist</td>
<td>Sep 2011</td>
<td>510(k)</td>
<td>K110493</td>
<td>Temporary left ventricular bypass of ≤6 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impella Recover LP 2.5</td>
<td>Abiomed</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>510(k)</td>
<td>K063723</td>
<td>Partial circulatory support using extracorporeal bypass control unit for ≤6 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impella 2.5 System</td>
<td>Abiomed</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>P140003</td>
<td>Temporary ventricular support for ≤6 h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDA: U.S. Food and Drug Administration; PMA: premarket approval.

**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.

A ventricular assist device (VAD) is mechanical support attached to the native heart and vessels to augment cardiac output. The total artificial heart (TAH) replaces the native ventricles and is attached to the pulmonary artery and aorta; the native heart is typically removed. Both the VAD and TAH may be used as a bridge to heart transplantation or as destination therapy. The VAD has also been used as a bridge to recovery in patients with reversible conditions affecting cardiac output.

**Summary of Evidence**
Ventricular Assist Device
For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a VAD as a bridge to transplant, the evidence includes a randomized controlled trial, single-arm trials, and observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival (OS), symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life (QOL), and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. There is a substantial body of evidence from clinical trials and observational studies supporting implantable VADs as a bridge to transplant in patients with end-stage heart failure, possibly reducing mortality as well as improving QOL. These studies have reported that substantial numbers of patients have survived to transplant in situations in which survival would not be otherwise expected. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a VAD as destination therapy, the evidence includes randomized controlled trials and multiple single-arm studies. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. A well-designed trial with 2 years of follow-up data has demonstrated an advantage of implantable VADs as destination therapy for patients ineligible for a heart transplant. Despite an increase in adverse events, both mortality and QOL appear to be improved for these patients. A more recent trial comparing VADs has broader inclusion criteria and supports that criteria move away from use of transplant ineligibility, as treatment may evolve over the course of treatment. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Total Artificial Heart
For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a TAH as a bridge to transplant, the evidence includes case series. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Compared with VADs, the evidence for TAHs in these settings is less robust. However, given the lack of medical or surgical options for these patients and the evidence case series provide, TAH is likely to improve outcomes for a carefully selected population with end-stage biventricular heart failure awaiting transplant who are not appropriate candidates for a left VAD. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a TAH as destination therapy, the evidence includes 2 case series. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The body of evidence for TAHs as
destination therapy is too limited to draw conclusions. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

**Percutaneous Ventricular Assist Device**

For individuals with cardiogenic shock who receive a percutaneous VAD (pVAD), the evidence includes randomized controlled trials (RCTs), observational studies, and a systematic review. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Four RCTs of pVAD versus intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP) for patients in cardiogenic shock failed to demonstrate a mortality benefit and reported higher complication rates with pVAD use. Comparative observational studies and a long-term follow-up study were consistent with the RCT evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who undergo high-risk cardiac procedures who receive a pVAD, the evidence includes RCTs, observational studies, and systematic reviews of these trials. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Randomized controlled trials, controlled and uncontrolled observational studies, and systematic reviews of these studies have not demonstrated a benefit of pVAD used as ancillary support for patients undergoing high-risk cardiac procedures. Additionally, 2 nonrandomized studies have compared ventricular tachycardia (VT) ablation with pVAD or IABP. Both studies demonstrated that patients who had pVAD support spent less time in unstable VT than patients without pVAD support. However, the current evidence does not support conclusions about the use of pVAD for VT ablation. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with cardiogenic shock refractory to intra-aortic balloon pump therapy who receive a pVAD, the evidence includes case series. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Case series of patients with cardiogenic shock refractory to intra-aortic balloon pump have reported improved hemodynamic parameters following pVAD placement. However, these uncontrolled series do not provide evidence that pVADs improve mortality, and high rates of complications have been reported with pVAD use. 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.

2014 Input
In response to requests, input was received from 2 physician specialty societies and 5 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2014. Vetting focused on the use of percutaneous ventricular assist devices (pVADs) under the American Heart Association and American College of Cardiology guidelines (2013) and on the use of the total artificial heart as destination therapy. All providing input supported the use of implantable VADs as destination therapy subject to the guidelines in the policy statements. Most providing input considered total artificial hearts to be investigational for destination therapy; reviewers noted that there are limited clinical trial data to support the use of total artificial hearts as destination therapy.

Most providing input considered pVADs to be investigational as a "bridge to recovery" or "bridge to decision" and for all other indications. Some reviewers noted that pVADs may improve patients' hemodynamics better than other alternatives, such as an intra-aortic balloon pump, but are associated with more complications. Some noted that, despite a lack of evidence to indicate that pVADs improve overall outcomes, there may be cases when pVADs may be considered to support intervention or treatment for a life-threatening condition.

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

In 2020, the American Association for Thoracic Surgery and the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation published guidelines on selected topics in mechanical circulatory support, including recommendations on the use of pVADs (Table 4). The guideline authors noted, "Compared with IABP [intraaortic balloon pump], contemporary percutaneous circulatory support devices provide a significant increase in cardiac index and mean arterial pressure; however, reported 30-day outcomes are similar."

Table 4. 2020 Guidelines on Mechanical Circulatory Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>COE</th>
<th>LOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Percutaneous LV to aorta pumps of appropriate size should be considered for cardiogenic shock from primary LV failure.&quot;</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COE: class of evidence; LOE: level of evidence; LV: left ventricular.

American College of Cardiology Foundation et al

In 2017, the American College of Cardiology Foundation, American Heart Association (AHA), and Heart Failure Society of American published a focused update of the 2013 recommendations released by the American College of Cardiology Foundation and AHA. Left ventricular assist device was 1 of several treatment options recommended for patients with refractory New York Heart Association class III or IV heart failure (stage D). If symptoms were not improved after guideline-directed management and therapy, which included pharmacologic therapy, surgical management and/or other devices, then a left ventricular assist device would be an additional treatment option.

The 2017 update focused on changes in sections regarding biomarkers, comorbidities, and prevention of heart failure, while many of the previous recommendations remained unchanged. The American College of Cardiology Foundation and AHA (2013) released guidelines for the management of heart failure that included recommendations related to the use of mechanical circulatory support (MCS), including both durable and nondurable MCS devices. The guidelines categorized pVADs and extracorporeal ventricular assist devices (VADs) as nondurable MCS devices. Since the 2017 update, these guidelines have been updated regularly, with the most
recent update occurring in 2022. Table 5 provides recommendations on MCS devices from the most recently updated guideline iteration.

### Table 5. AHA/ACC/HFSA Guidelines on Mechanical Circulatory Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>COE</th>
<th>LOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In select patients with advanced HFrEF with NYHA class IV symptoms who are</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deemed to be dependent on continuous intravenous inotropes or temporary MCS,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durable LVAD implantation is effective to improve functional status, QOL, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survival.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In select patients with advanced HFrEF who have NYHA class IV symptoms despite</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>B-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDMT, durable MCS can be beneficial to improve symptoms, improve functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class, and reduce mortality.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In patients with advanced HFrEF and hemodynamic compromise and shock,</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary MCS, including percutaneous and extracorporeal ventricular assist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devices, are reasonable as a 'bridge to recovery' or 'bridge to decision'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACC: American College of Cardiology; AHA: American Heart Association; COE: class of evidence; GDMT: guideline-directed medical therapy; HFrEF: heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; HFSA: Heart Failure Society of America; LOE: level of evidence; LVAD: left ventricular assist device; MCS: mechanical circulatory support; NYHA: New York Heart Association; QOL: quality of life; RCT: randomized controlled trial.  
A: high quality evidence from more than 1 RCT; B-R: Moderate-quality evidence from 1 or more RCTs; B-NR: Moderate-quality evidence from 1 or more well-designed, well-executed nonrandomized studies, observational studies, or registry studies.

**American Heart Association**

In 2012, the AHA published recommendations for the use of MCS. These guidelines defined nondurable MCS as IABPs, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, extracorporeal VADs, and pVADs. Table 6 lists recommendations made on indications for the use of MCS, including durable and nondurable devices.

### Table 6. 2012 Guidelines on Mechanical Circulatory Support
Recommendation | COE | LOE
--- | --- | ---
"MCS for BTT indication should be considered for transplant-eligible patients with end-stage HF who are failing optimal medical, surgical, and/or device therapies and at high risk of dying before receiving a heart transplantation." | I | B

"Implantation of MCS in patients before the development of advanced HF … is associated with better outcomes. Therefore, early referral of HF patients is reasonable." | IIA | B

"MCS with a durable, implantable device for permanent therapy or DT is beneficial for patients with advanced HF, high 1-year mortality resulting from HF, and the absence of other life-limiting organ dysfunction; who are failing medical, surgical, and/or device therapies; and who are ineligible for heart transplantation." | I | B

"Elective rather than urgent implantation of DT can be beneficial when performed after optimization of medical therapy in advanced HF patients who are failing medical, surgical, and/or device therapies." | IIA | C

"Urgent nondurable MCS is reasonable in hemodynamically compromised HF patients with end-organ dysfunction and/or relative contraindications to heart transplantation/durable MCS that are expected to improve with time and restoration of an improved hemodynamic profile." "These patients should be referred to a center with expertise in the management of durable MCS and patients with advanced HF." | IIA | C

"Patients who are ineligible for heart transplantation because of pulmonary hypertension related to HF alone should be considered for bridge to potential transplant eligibility with durable, long-term MCS." | IIA | B

BTT: bridge to transplant; COE: class of evidence; DT: destination therapy; HF: heart failure; LOE: level of evidence; MCS: mechanical circulatory support.

Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions et al
In 2015, the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, the Heart Failure Society of America, the Society of Thoracic Surgeons, and the American College of Cardiology published a joint clinical expert consensus statement on the use of percutaneous MCS devices in cardiovascular care. This statement addressed IABPs, left atrial-to-aorta assist device (eg, TandemHeart), left ventricle-to-aorta assist devices (eg, Impella), extracorporeal membrane
oxygenation, and methods of right-sided support. Specific recommendations were not made, but the statement reviews the use of MCS in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous intervention, those with cardiogenic shock, and those with acute decompensated heart failure.

**U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations**
Not applicable.

**Medicare National Coverage**
Medicare has a national coverage determination (NCD) for VADs. The NCD mandates coverage for VADs for the following indications:
- For support of blood circulation in the post cardiotomy setting, defined as the period following open-heart surgery.
  - If the VAD has U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval for that purpose and are used according to the FDA-labeled indication
- For short-term (e.g., bridge-to-recovery and bridge-to-transplant) or long-term (e.g., destination therapy) mechanical circulatory support for patients who meet the following criteria:
  - Have New York Heart Association (NYHA) Class IV heart failure; and
  - Have a left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤ 25%; and
  - Are inotrope dependent

  OR
  have a cardiac index < 2.2 L/min/m², while not on inotropes, and also meet 1 of the following:
  - Are on optimal medical management, based on current heart failure practice guidelines for at least 45 out of the last 60 days and are failing to respond; OR
  - Have advanced heart failure for at least 14 days and are dependent on an IABP or similar temporary mechanical circulatory support for at least 7 days.

"Beneficiaries receiving VADs for DT [destination therapy] must be managed by an explicitly identified cohesive, multidisciplinary team of medical professionals with the appropriate qualifications, training, and experience.... The team members must be based at the facility and
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must include individuals with experience working with patients before and after placement of a VAD."

"Facilities must be credentialed by an organization approved by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services."

Effective December 1, 2020, Artificial Hearts has been removed from the NCD Manual. Coverage determinations for artificial hearts and related devices shall be made by the Medicare Administrative Contractors.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 7.

Table 7. Summary of Key Trials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCT No.</th>
<th>Trial Name</th>
<th>Planned Enrollment</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCT01633502</td>
<td>Effects of Advanced Mechanical Circulatory Support in Patients With ST Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction Complicated by Cardiogenic Shock. The Danish Cardiogenic Shock Trial</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Jan 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT01627821a</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Jarvik 2000 Left Ventricular Assist System With Post-Auricular Connector--Destination Therapy Study</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Dec 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02232659a</td>
<td>SynCardia 70cc Temporary Total Artificial Heart (TAH-t) for Destination Therapy (DT)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>May 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02326402a</td>
<td>THEME Registry: TandemHeart Experiences and Methods</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Dec 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCT No.</th>
<th>Trial Name</th>
<th>Planned Enrollment</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCT01187368&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Prospective Multi-Center Randomized Study for Evaluating the EVAHEART™2 Left Ventricular Assist System: the COMPETENCE Trial</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Mar 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02387112</td>
<td>Early Versus Emergency Left Ventricular Assist Device Implantation in Patients Awaiting Cardiac Transplantation</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Dec 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT04768322</td>
<td>Left Ventricular Assist Device (LVAD) Versus Guideline Recommended Medical Therapy in Ambulatory Advanced Heart Failure Patients (GDMT)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Feb 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCT: national clinical trial.
<sup>a</sup> Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.
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**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 2021 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.

CPT is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association.
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Codes used to identify services associated with this policy may include (but may not be limited to) the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>33927, 33928, 33929, 33975, 33976, 33977, 33978, 33979, 33980, 33981, 33982, 33983, 33990, 33991, 33992, 33993, 33995, 33997, 93750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPCS</td>
<td>L8698, Q0477, Q0478, Q0479, Q0480, Q0481, Q0482, Q0483, Q0484, Q0485, Q0486, Q0487, Q0488, Q0489, Q0490, Q0491, Q0492, Q0493, Q0494, Q0495, Q0496, Q0497, Q0498, Q0499, Q0500, Q0501, Q0502, Q0503, Q0504, Q0506, Q0507, Q0508, Q0509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD-10 Diagnosis</td>
<td>I09.81, I11.0, I13.0, I13.2, I50.20-I50.23, I50.30-I50.33, I50.40-I50.43, I50.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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. 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,
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would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury, disease or its symptoms, and that are:

   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.