Viscocanalostomy and Canaloplasty

Policy # 00280
Original Effective Date: 11/16/2010
Current Effective Date: 07/12/2021

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 use of canaloplasty as a method to reduce intraocular pressure (IOP) in patients with chronic primary open-angle glaucoma to be **eligible for coverage**** under the following conditions:

- Medical therapy has failed to adequately control intraocular pressure (IOP), AND
- The patient is not a candidate for any other intraocular pressure (IOP) lowering procedure (e.g. trabeculectomy or glaucoma drainage implant) due to a high risk for complications.

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 canaloplasty under all other conditions, including angle-closure glaucoma, to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers viscocanalostomy to be **investigational.***

Policy Guidelines

Tensioning devices are only able to reduce intraocular pressure to the mid-teens and may be inadequate when very low intraocular pressure is needed to reduce glaucoma damage.

Viscocanalostomy and Canaloplasty

Policy # 00280
Original Effective Date: 11/16/2010
Current Effective Date: 07/12/2021

Background/Overview

Impaired Aqueous Humor Drainage

In the primary (conventional) outflow pathway from the eye, aqueous humor passes through the trabecular meshwork, enters a space lined with endothelial cells (Schlemm canal), drains into collector channels, and then into the aqueous veins. Increases in resistance in the trabecular meshwork and/or the inner wall of Schlemm canal can disrupt the balance of aqueous humor inflow and outflow, resulting in an increase in intraocular pressure and glaucoma risk.

Treatment

Surgical intervention may be indicated in patients with glaucoma when the target intraocular pressure cannot be reached pharmacologically. Trabeculectomy (guarded filtration surgery) is the most established surgical procedure for glaucoma, allowing aqueous humor to directly enter the subconjunctival space. This procedure creates a subconjunctival reservoir with a filtering "bleb" on the eye, which can effectively reduce intraocular pressure, but is associated with numerous and sometimes sight-threatening complications (eg, leaks, hypotony, choroidal effusions and hemorrhages, hyphemas or bleb-related endophthalmitis) and long-term failure. Other surgical procedures (not addressed herein) include trabecular laser ablation and deep sclerectomy, which removes the outer wall of Schlemm canal and excises deep sclera and peripheral cornea.

More recently, the Trabectome™‡, an electrocautery device with irrigation and aspiration, has been used to selectively ablate the trabecular meshwork and inner wall of Schlemm canal without external access or creation of a subconjunctival bleb. Intraocular pressure with this ab interno procedure is typically higher than the pressure achieved with standard filtering trabeculectomy. Aqueous shunts may also be placed to facilitate drainage of aqueous humor. Complications from anterior chamber shunts include corneal endothelial failure and erosion of the overlying conjunctiva.

Alternative nonpenetrating methods being evaluated to treat glaucoma are viscocanalostomy and canaloplasty. Viscocanalostomy is a variant of deep sclerectomy and unroofs and dilates the Schlemm canal without penetrating the trabecular meshwork or anterior chamber. A high-viscosity viscoelastic solution (eg, sodium hyaluronate) is used to open the canal and create a passage from the canal to a scleral reservoir. It has been proposed that viscocanalostomy may lower intraocular pressure while avoiding bleb-related complications.

Viscocanalostomy and Canaloplasty

Policy # 00280
Original Effective Date: 11/16/2010
Current Effective Date: 07/12/2021

Canaloplasty, which evolved from viscocanalostomy, involves dilation and tension of the Schlemm canal with a suture loop between the inner wall of the canal and the trabecular meshwork. This ab externo procedure uses the iTrack illuminated microcatheter to access and dilate the length of the Schlemm canal and to pass the suture loop through the canal. An important difference between viscocanalostomy and canaloplasty is that canaloplasty attempts to open the entire length of the Schlemm canal, rather than one section.

Because aqueous humor outflow is pressure-dependent, the pressure in the reservoir and venous system is critical for reaching the target intraocular pressure. Therefore, some procedures may not reduce intraocular pressure below the pressure of the distal outflow system used (eg, <15 mm Hg), and are not indicated for patients for whom very low intraocular pressure is desired (eg, those with advanced glaucoma).

FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

In 2004, iTrack™‡ (iScience Interventional) was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process as a surgical ophthalmic microcannula that is indicated for the general purpose of "fluid infusion and aspiration, as well as illumination, during surgery." In 2008, iTrack was cleared by the FDA for "catheterization and viscodilation of [the] Schlemm canal to reduce intraocular pressure in adult patients with open angle glaucoma." FDA product code: MPA.

Rationale/Source

Glaucoma surgery is intended to reduce intraocular pressure when the target intraocular pressure cannot be reached with medications. Due to complications with established surgical approaches (eg, trabeculectomy), alternative surgical treatments (eg, transluminal dilation by viscocanalostomy or canaloplasty) are being evaluated for patients with glaucoma.

For individuals who have open-angle glaucoma who have failed medical therapy who receive viscocanalostomy, the evidence includes small randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing viscocanalostomy with trabeculectomy. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, quality of life, and medication use. Meta-analysis of these trials has indicated that trabeculectomy has a greater intraocular pressure lowering effect than viscocanalostomy. Reduction in intraocular pressure was greater with canaloplasty than viscocanalostomy in a small within-subject comparison.

Viscocanalostomy has not been shown to be as good as or better than established alternatives. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology is unlikely to improve the net health outcome.

For individuals who have open-angle glaucoma who have failed medical therapy who receive canaloplasty, the evidence includes an RCT, a comparative effectiveness review, and several case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, morbid events, quality of life, and medication use. The RCT found not only significantly higher complete success rates with trabeculectomy than with canaloplasty, but also higher complication rates. The qualified success rate (with medication) was similar between groups. A systematic review found that canaloplasty provided modest intraocular pressure reduction (to ~16 mm Hg) with minor intraoperative or postoperative complications. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Clinical input obtained in 2011 considered canaloplasty to be appropriate for a select group of patients, including those at risk for infection or hypotony, who have surface disease precluding the creation of good trabeculectomy bleb, or for whom a patch would not cover a glaucoma drainage device implant. In this clinical context, the evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Supplemental Information

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

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.

In response to requests on viscocanalostomy, input was received from 1 specialty medical society and 3 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2011. Although some considered viscocanalostomy to be medically necessary in a select group of patients who would be at risk for suffering a blinding complication with trabeculectomy, input was mixed. For example, 1

reviewer considered outcomes with viscocanalostomy to be inferior to other currently used nonpenetrating techniques.

In response to requests on canaloplasty, input was received from 1 specialty medical society and 2 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2011. One ophthalmology association provided a statement indicating that the case series cited are sufficient to show efficacy of canaloplasty to lower intraocular pressure to treat open-angle glaucoma. Other reviewers considered canaloplasty to be investigational but medically necessary for a select group of patients (eg, patients at risk for infection or hypotony, who have surface disease precluding the creation of good trabeculectomy bleb, or for whom a patch would not cover a glaucoma drainage device implant).

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 Academy of Ophthalmology
A technology assessment from the American Academy of Ophthalmology (2011) included canaloplasty in its review of novel glaucoma procedures. The Academy concluded that all the techniques and devices reviewed were still in the initial stage (≤5 years) of clinical experience and lacked widespread use, with only level III evidence (cohort studies) supporting the procedures. In addition to describing potential advantages and disadvantages of the procedure, it was noted that the long-term effects of a foreign body in the Schlemm canal are not known.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
In 2017, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) updated its 2008 guidance on canaloplasty for primary open-angle glaucoma. The current recommendation is that the "evidence on the safety and efficacy of ab externo canaloplasty for primary open-angle glaucoma is adequate is support the use of this procedure.…"

Similarly, in 2017, NICE updated its 2009 guidance on the diagnosis and management of chronic open-angle glaucoma. When comparing penetrating surgery (trabeculectomy) with nonpenetrating surgery (deep sclerectomy and viscocanalostomy), NICE found moderate-quality evidence that trabeculectomy is more effective than nonpenetrating surgery in reducing the number of eyes with an unacceptable intraocular pressure, but was more likely to cause cataract formation and persistent hypotony at 12- to 36-month follow-up. There was very low quality evidence that trabeculectomy is more effective than nonpenetrating surgery in reducing intraocular pressure from baseline to 6- and 12-month follow-up, but the effect size might have been too small to be clinically significant. The guidance recommended offering information on the risks and benefits associated with surgery and offering surgery (type not specified) with pharmacologic augmentation to people with chronic open-angle glaucoma at risk of progressing to sight loss, despite treatment.

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

Medicare National Coverage
There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
A search of ClinicalTrials.gov in February 2021 did not identify any ongoing or unpublished trials that would likely influence this review.

References

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, Medical Policy Reference Manual, "Viscocanalostomy and Canaloplasty". 9.03.26. April 2021.
2. Chai C, Loon SC. Meta-analysis of viscocanalostomy versus trabeculectomy in uncontrolled glaucoma. J Glaucoma. Oct-Nov 2010;19(8):519-527. PMID 20179632
3. Eldaly MA, Bunce C, Elsheikha OZ, et al. Non-penetrating filtration surgery versus trabeculectomy for open- angle glaucoma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Feb 15 2014;2(2):CD007059. PMID 24532137

4. Gilmour DF, Manners TD, Devonport H, et al. Viscocanalostomy versus trabeculectomy for primary open angle glaucoma: 4-year prospective randomized clinical trial. Eye (Lond). Sep 2009;23(9):1802-1807. PMID 17293790
5. Kobayashi H, Kobayashi K, Okinami S. A comparison of the intraocular pressure-lowering effect and safety of viscocanalostomy and trabeculectomy with mitomycin C in bilateral open-angle glaucoma. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. May 2003;241(5):359-366. PMID 12698257
6. Grieshaber MC, Peckar C, Pienaar A, et al. Long-term results of up to 12 years of over 700 cases of viscocanalostomy for open-angle glaucoma. Acta Ophthalmol. Jun 2015;93(4):362-367. PMID 25270165
7. Stangos AN, Mavropoulos A, Leuenberger PM, et al. The effect of learning curve on the surgical outcome of viscocanalostomy. J Glaucoma. Aug 2012;21(6):408-414. PMID 21673593
8. Mosaed S, Dustin L, Minckler DS. Comparative outcomes between newer and older surgeries for glaucoma. Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc. Dec 2009;107:127-133. PMID 20126489
9. Matlach J, Dhillon C, Hain J, et al. Trabeculectomy versus canaloplasty (TVC study) in the treatment of patients with open-angle glaucoma: a prospective randomized clinical trial. Acta Ophthalmol. Dec 2015;93(8):753-761. PMID 25847610
10. Klink T, Sauer J, Korber NJ, et al. Quality of life following glaucoma surgery: canaloplasty versus trabeculectomy. Clin Ophthalmol. Jan 2015;9:7-16. PMID 25565763
11. Ayyala RS, Chaudhry AL, Okogbaa CB, et al. Comparison of surgical outcomes between canaloplasty and trabeculectomy at 12 months' follow-up. Ophthalmology. Dec 2011;118(12):2427-2433. PMID 21856008
12. Lewis RA, von Wolff K, Tetz M, et al. Canaloplasty: circumferential viscodilation and tensioning of Schlemm's canal using a flexible microcatheter for the treatment of open-angle glaucoma in adults: interim clinical study analysis. J Cataract Refract Surg. Jul 2007;33(7):1217-1226. PMID 17586378
13. Lewis RA, von Wolff K, Tetz M, et al. Canaloplasty: circumferential viscodilation and tensioning of Schlemm canal using a flexible microcatheter for the treatment of open-angle glaucoma in adults: two-year interim clinical study results. J Cataract Refract Surg. May 2009;35(5):814-824. PMID 19393879
14. Lewis RA, von Wolff K, Tetz M, et al. Canaloplasty: Three-year results of circumferential viscodilation and tensioning of Schlemm canal using a microcatheter to treat open-angle glaucoma. J Cataract Refract Surg. Apr 2011;37(4):682-690. PMID 21420593

15. Shingleton B, Tetz M, Korber N. Circumferential viscodilation and tensioning of Schlemm canal (canaloplasty) with temporal clear corneal phacoemulsification cataract surgery for open-angle glaucoma and visually significant cataract: one-year results. J Cataract Refract Surg. Mar 2008;34(3):433-440. PMID 18299068
16. Koerber NJ. Canaloplasty in one eye compared with viscocanalostomy in the contralateral eye in patients with bilateral open-angle glaucoma. J Glaucoma. Feb 2012;21(2):129-134. PMID 21278587
17. Bull H, von Wolff K, Korber N, et al. Three-year canaloplasty outcomes for the treatment of open-angle glaucoma: European study results. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. Oct 2011;249(10):1537-1545. PMID 21732110
18. Grieshaber MC, Pienaar A, Olivier J, et al. Canaloplasty for primary open-angle glaucoma: long-term outcome. Br J Ophthalmol. Oct 2010;94(11):1478-1482. PMID 20962352
19. Brusini P. Canaloplasty in open-angle glaucoma surgery: a four-year follow-up. ScientificWorldJournal. Feb 2014;2014:469609. PMID 24574892
20. Voykov B, Blumenstock G, Leitritz MA, et al. Treatment efficacy and safety of canaloplasty for open-angle glaucoma after 5 years. Clin Experiment Ophthalmol. Nov 2015;43(8):768-771. PMID 25952140
21. Francis BA, Singh K, Lin SC, et al. Novel glaucoma procedures: a report by the American Academy of Ophthalmology. Ophthalmology. Jul 2011;118(7):1466-1480. PMID 21724045
22. National Institute for Health and Care Evidence (NICE). Ab externo canaloplasty for primary open-angle glaucoma [IPG591]. 2017; https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg591.
23. National Institute for Health and Care Evidence (NICE). Canaloplasty for primary open-angle glaucoma [IPG260]. 2008; https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg260.
24. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Glaucoma: diagnosis and management [NG81]. 2017; https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/NG81.
25. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Glaucoma: diagnosis and management of chronic open angle glaucoma and ocular hypertension [CG85]. 2009; https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg85.

Policy History

Original Effective Date: 11/16/2010
Current Effective Date: 07/12/2021
11/04/2010 Medical Policy Committee review

Viscocanalostomy and Canaloplasty

Policy # 00280
Original Effective Date: 11/16/2010
Current Effective Date: 07/12/2021

11/16/2010	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. New policy.
12/31/2010	Coding Updated
09/01/2011	Medical Policy Committee review
09/14/2011	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Title changed from "Canaloplasty for Primary Open Angel Glaucoma" to "Viscocanalostomy and Canaloplasty". Coverage for canaloplasty revised to be eligible under specified conditions. Viscocanalostomy added as investigational.
11/01/2012	Medical Policy Committee review
11/28/2012	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
11/07/2013	Medical Policy Committee review
11/20/2013	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
11/06/2014	Medical Policy Committee review
11/21/2014	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
08/03/2015	Coding update: ICD10 Diagnosis code section added; ICD9 Procedure code section removed.
10/29/2015	Medical Policy Committee review
11/16/2015	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
11/03/2016	Medical Policy Committee review
11/16/2016	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
01/01/2017	Coding update: Removing ICD-9 Diagnosis Codes
06/01/2017	Medical Policy Committee review
06/21/2017	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
06/07/2018	Medical Policy Committee review
06/20/2018	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
06/06/2019	Medical Policy Committee review
06/19/2019	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
06/04/2020	Medical Policy Committee review
06/10/2020	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
06/03/2021	Medical Policy Committee review
06/09/2021	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.

Next Scheduled Review Date: 06/2022

Viscocanalostomy and Canaloplasty

Policy # 00280
Original Effective Date: 11/16/2010
Current Effective Date: 07/12/2021

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 2020 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.

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

Code Type	Code
CPT	66174, 66175
HCPCS	No codes
ICD-10 Diagnosis	A00.0, H40.1-H40.249, Q15.0

*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 the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association technology assessment program (TEC) or other nonaffiliated 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:

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.

Viscocanalostomy and Canaloplasty

Policy # 00280
Original Effective Date: 11/16/2010
Current Effective Date: 07/12/2021

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.