Medical Policy

Percutaneous Left Atrial Appendage Closure Devices for Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation
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Related Policies
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- Open and Thoracoscopic Approaches to Treat Atrial Fibrillation and Atrial Flutter (Maze and Related Procedures), #356

Policy

Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, and Indemnity

The use of a device with U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval for percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (e.g., the Watchman or Amplatzer Amulet) may be considered MEDICALLY NECESSARY for the prevention of stroke in individuals with atrial fibrillation when the following criteria are met:

- There is an increased risk of stroke and systemic embolism based on CHADS\textsuperscript{2} or CHA\textsubscript{2}DS\textsubscript{2}-VASc score and systemic anticoagulation therapy is recommended; AND
- The long-term risks of systemic anticoagulation outweigh the risks of the device implantation.

The balance of risks and benefits associated with percutaneous implantation of the Watchman or Amplatzer Amulet device for stroke prevention, as an alternative to systemic anticoagulation, must be made on an individual basis.

Bleeding is the primary risk associated with systemic anticoagulation. A number of risk scores have been developed to estimate the risk of significant bleeding in patients treated with systemic anticoagulation. An example is the HAS-BLED score, which is validated to assess the annual risk of significant bleeding in patients with atrial fibrillation treated with warfarin.\textsuperscript{1} Scores range from 0 to 9, based on a number of clinical characteristics (see Table PG1).

Table PG1: Clinical Components of the HAS-BLED Bleeding Risk Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Clinical Characteristic</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Adapted from Pisters et al (2010) HAS-BLED: Hypertension, Abnormal renal/liver function, Stroke, Bleeding history or predisposition, Labile INR (international normalized ratio), Elderly, Drugs/alcohol concomitantly.

The risk of major bleeding in individuals with scores of 3, 4, and 5 has been reported at 3.74 per 100 patient-years, 8.70 per 100 patient-years, and 12.5 per 100 patient-years, respectively. Scores of 3 or greater are considered to be associated with a high risk of bleeding, potentially signaling the need for closer monitoring of individuals for adverse events, closer monitoring of international normalized ratio, or differential dose selections of oral anticoagulants or aspirin.

The use of a device with FDA approval for percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (e.g., the Watchman or Amplatzer Amulet) for stroke prevention in individuals who do not meet the above criteria is considered INVESTIGATIONAL.

The use of other percutaneous left atrial appendage closure devices, including but not limited to the Lariat, and Amplatzer Cardiac Plug devices, for stroke prevention in individuals with atrial fibrillation is considered INVESTIGATIONAL.

Prior Authorization Information

Inpatient
- For services described in this policy, precertification/preauthorization IS REQUIRED for all products if the procedure is performed inpatient.

Outpatient
- For services described in this policy, see below for products where prior authorization might be required if the procedure is performed outpatient.

| Commercial Managed Care (HMO and POS) | Prior authorization is not required. |
| Commercial PPO and Indemnity         | Prior authorization is not required. |

CPT Codes / HCPCS Codes / ICD Codes

Inclusion or exclusion of a code does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member’s contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage as it applies to an individual member.

Providers should report all services using the most up-to-date industry-standard procedure, revenue, and diagnosis codes, including modifiers where applicable.

The following codes are included below for informational purposes only; this is not an all-inclusive list.

The above medical necessity criteria MUST be met for the following codes to be covered for Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, Indemnity, Medicare HMO Blue and Medicare PPO Blue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT codes:</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33340</td>
<td>Percutaneous transcatheter closure of the left atrial appendage with endocardial implant, including fluoroscopy, transseptal puncture, catheter placement(s), left atrial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description
Atrial Fibrillation and Stroke
Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common type of irregular heartbeat, affecting at least 2.7 million people in the U.S. Risk of AF has been found to be lower in Black, Hispanic and Asian patients relative to White patients, including following adjustment for demographic and AF risk factors.\textsuperscript{1,2} Stroke is the most serious complication of AF. The estimated incidence of stroke in nontreated patients with AF is 5% per year; despite a lower risk of AF, Black and Hispanic patients have an increased risk of stroke compared with White patients.\textsuperscript{3,4} Stroke associated with AF is primarily embolic, tends to be more severe than the typical ischemic stroke, and causes higher rates of mortality and disability. As a result, stroke prevention is a main goal of AF treatment.

Stroke in AF occurs primarily as a result of thromboembolism from the left atrium. The lack of atrial contractions in AF leads to blood stasis in the left atrium, and this low flow state increases the risk for thrombosis. The area of the left atrium with the lowest blood flow in AF, and, therefore, the highest risk of thrombosis is the left atrial appendage (LAA). It has been estimated that 90% of left atrial thrombi occur in the LAA.

Treatment
Pharmacologic
The main treatment for stroke prevention in AF is anticoagulation, which has proven efficacy. The risk for stroke among patients with AF is evaluated using several factors. Two commonly used scores, the CHADS\textsubscript{2} score and the CHA\textsubscript{2}DS\textsubscript{2}-VASc score are described below in Table 1. Warfarin is the predominant agent in clinical use. A number of newer anticoagulant medications, including dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban have received U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval for stroke prevention in nonvalvular AF and have demonstrated noninferiority to warfarin in clinical trials. While anticoagulation is effective for stroke prevention, it carries an increased risk of bleeding. Also, warfarin requires frequent monitoring and adjustments as well as lifestyle changes. Newer agents do not require the frequent monitoring seen with warfarin therapy; however, specific reversal agents do not exist for all of these agents. The 2018 American College of Chest Physicians guidelines (updated from 2012) recommend that CHA\textsubscript{2}DS\textsubscript{2}-VASc be used to evaluate stroke risk, and patients initially identified as having a low stroke risk should not be given antithrombotic therapy. In addition, they recommend bleeding risk assessments be given to every patient at every patient contact and that “potentially modifiable bleeding risk factors” should be the initial focus.

Table 1. CHADS\textsubscript{2} and CHA\textsubscript{2}DS\textsubscript{2}-VASc Scores to Predict Ischemic Stroke Risk in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Clinical Characteristics</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Congestive heart failure (signs/symptoms of heart failure confirmed with objective evidence of cardiac dysfunction)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hypertension (resting blood pressure &gt;140/90 mmHg on at least 2 occasions or current antihypertensive pharmacologic treatment)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Age ≥75 y</td>
<td>1 (CHADS\textsubscript{2}) 2 (CHA\textsubscript{2}DS\textsubscript{2}-VASc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Diabetes (fasting glucose &gt;125 mg/dL or treatment with oral hypoglycemic agent and/or insulin)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Stroke or transient ischemic attack (includes any history of cerebral ischemia)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vascular disease (prior myocardial infarction, peripheral arterial disease, or aortic plaque)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Age 65-74 y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bleeding is the primary risk associated with systemic anticoagulation. Risk scores have been developed to estimate the risk of significant bleeding in patients treated with systemic anticoagulation, such as the HAS-BLED score, which has been validated to assess the annual risk of significant bleeding in patients with AF treated with warfarin. The score ranges from 0 to 9, based on clinical characteristics, including the presence of hypertension, renal and liver function, history of stroke, bleeding, labile international normalized ratios, age, and drug/alcohol use. Scores of 3 or greater are considered to be associated with a high risk of bleeding, potentially signaling the need for closer monitoring of patients for adverse risks, closer monitoring of international normalized ratios, or differential dose selections of oral anticoagulants or aspirin.

Surgery
Surgical removal, or exclusion, of the LAA is often performed in patients with AF who are undergoing open heart surgery for other reasons. Percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (LAAC) devices have been developed as a nonpharmacologic alternative to anticoagulation for stroke prevention in AF. The devices may prevent stroke by occluding the LAA, thus preventing thrombus formation.

Several versions of LAA occlusion devices have been developed. The PLAATO system (ev3 Endovascular) was the first device to be approved by the FDA for LAA occlusion. The device was discontinued in 2007 for commercial reasons, and intellectual property was sold to manufacturers of the Watchman system. The Watchman Left Atrial Appendage System (Boston Scientific) is a self-expanding nickel titanium device. It has a polyester covering and fixation barbs for attachment to the endocardium. Implantation is performed percutaneously through a catheter delivery system, using venous access and transseptal puncture to enter the left atrium. Transesophageal echocardiography and fluoroscopy are used to guide the procedure. Following implantation, patients receive anticoagulation with warfarin or alternative agents for approximately 1 to 2 months. After this period, patients are maintained on antiplatelet agents (i.e., aspirin and/or clopidogrel) indefinitely. The Watchman FLX device is a next-generation Watchman device that is also FDA-approved for LAAC. This device is based on the design of the Watchman device, is fully recapturable and repositionable, and was made to occlude a wider size range of LAA than the original Watchman device. The Amplatzer cardiac plug (St. Jude Medical), is FDA-approved for closure of atrial septal defects but not for LAAC. A second-generation device developed for the specific indication of LAAC, the Amplatzer Amulet (Abbott), received FDA approval in August 2021. The Amplatzer Amulet consists of a nitinol mesh disc to seal the ostium of the LAA and a nitinol mesh distal lobe, to be positioned within the LAA. The device is preloaded within a delivery sheath. The Percutaneous LAA Transcatheter Occlusion device (ev3) has also been evaluated in research studies but has not received FDA approval. The Occlutech ™ (Occlutech) Left Atrial Appendage Occluder has received a CE mark for coverage in Europe. The Cardioblate ™ closure device (Medtronic) is currently being tested in clinical studies.

The Lariat Loop Applicator is a suture delivery device approved by the FDA, intended to close a variety of surgical wounds. It is not specifically approved for LAAC. While the Watchman and other devices are implanted in the endocardium, the Lariat is a non-implant epicardial device.

In September 2021, the FDA sent a letter to healthcare providers indicating that women undergoing percutaneous LAA closure may be at higher risk of adverse procedural outcomes than men. This was based on an analysis of registry data from 49,357 patients who underwent LAA closure with the Watchman device. When adjusted for multiple confounding factors, the study found women were more likely than men to experience any adverse event, major adverse events, and major bleeding. Women also had a significantly higher risk of death (adjusted odds ratio [OR], 2.01; 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.31 to 3.09) but absolute risk was low for both women and men (0.3% vs. 0.1%). In their letter, the FDA stated that they believe the benefits continue to outweigh the risks for approved LAA closure devices when used in accordance with their instructions for use.

Outcome Measures
The optimal study design for evaluating the efficacy of percutaneous LAAC for the prevention of stroke in AF is a randomized controlled trial (RCT) that includes clinically relevant measures of health outcomes. The rate of ischemic stroke during follow-up is the primary outcome of interest, along with rates of systemic embolization, cardiac events, bleeding complications, and death. For the LAAC devices, the appropriate comparison group could be oral anticoagulation, no therapy (for patients who have a prohibitive risk for oral anticoagulation), or open surgical repair.

 Ideally, percutaneous LAAC devices would represent an alternative to oral anticoagulation for the prevention of stroke in patients with AF. However, during the postimplantation period the LAAC device may be associated with increased thrombogenicity, therefore, anticoagulation is used during the periprocedural period. Most studies evaluating percutaneous LAAC devices have included patients who are eligible for anticoagulation.

**Summary**

**Description**

Stroke prevention in patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) is an important goal of treatment. Treatment with anticoagulant medications is the most common approach to stroke prevention. Because most embolic strokes originate from the left atrial appendage, occlusion of the left atrial appendage may offer a nonpharmacologic alternative to anticoagulant medications to lower the risk of stroke. Multiple percutaneously deployed devices are being investigated for left atrial appendage closure (LAAC). Two types of left atrial appendage devices (the Watchman and Amplatzer Amulet devices) have approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for stroke prevention in patients with AF.

**Summary of Evidence**

For individuals who have atrial fibrillation (AF) who are at increased risk for embolic stroke who receive an FDA-approved percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (LAAC) device (e.g., the Watchman or Amulet device), the evidence includes randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. The most relevant evidence for the Watchman device comes from 2 industry-sponsored RCTs comparing the Watchman device with anticoagulation alone. One trial reported noninferiority on a composite outcome of stroke, cardiovascular/unexplained death, or systemic embolism after 2 years of follow-up, with continued benefits with the Watchman device after 4 years of follow-up. The second trial did not demonstrate noninferiority for the same composite outcome but did demonstrate noninferiority of the Watchman device to warfarin for late ischemic stroke and systemic embolization. Patient-level meta-analyses at 5-year follow-up for the 2 Watchman trials reported that the Watchman device is noninferior to warfarin on the composite outcome of stroke, systemic embolism, and cardiovascular death. Also, the Watchman was associated with lower rates of major bleeding, particularly hemorrhagic stroke, and mortality over the long term. Evidence for the Amplatzer Amulet device comes from 2 RCTs comparing the Amulet and Watchman devices, one of which was a short-term trial that assessed periprocedural outcomes at 45 days. The second trial comparing the Amulet and Watchman devices found the Amulet device to be noninferior to the Watchman device after 18 months of follow-up for a composite efficacy outcome that included ischemic stroke or systemic embolism and for a composite safety outcome that included all-cause mortality, major bleeding or procedure-related complications. One additional RCT evaluated the use of either the Amplatzer Amulet or Watchman device versus anticoagulants; subgroup analyses according to device were not performed. After up to 4 years of follow-up, the study found LAAC with either the Watchman or Amulet was noninferior to anticoagulants for a composite outcome that included stroke, transient ischemic attack (TIA), systemic embolism, clinically significant bleeding, significant periprocedural or device-related complications, or cardiovascular mortality. Among patients in which the long-term risk of systemic anticoagulation exceeds the procedural risk of device implantation, the net health outcome will be improved. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have AF who are at increased risk for embolic stroke who receive a percutaneous LAAC device other than the Watchman device or Amplatzer Amulet device (e.g., Lariat or Amplatzer Cardiac Plug), the evidence includes several nonrandomized comparator studies and uncontrolled observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. One nonrandomized study that compared outcomes among patients undergoing LAAC with the Lariat device
with patients receiving anticoagulant or antiplatelet therapy reported fewer thromboembolic events in the
group receiving the Lariat device. Evidence from other observational studies of these devices which report
high procedural success but also numerous complications. In addition, these devices do not have U.S. FDA
approval for LAAC. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement
in the net health outcome.

**Policy History**
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<tr>
<th>Date</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
<td>7/2023</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Annual policy review. Policy statements clarified to include the FDA-approved Amplatzer Amulet device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2021</td>
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</tr>
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<td>5/2020</td>
<td>Medically necessary policy statement clarified to include non-valvular terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2018</td>
<td>Annual policy review. PLAAATO device removed from the investigational policy statement; device is no longer commercially available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2017</td>
<td>Annual policy review. New references added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2017</td>
<td>Clarified coding information for the 2017 code changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information Pertaining to All Blue Cross Blue Shield Medical Policies**

Click on any of the following terms to access the relevant information:

- Medical Policy Terms of Use
- Managed Care Guidelines
- Indemnity/PPO Guidelines
- Clinical Exception Process
- Medical Technology Assessment Guidelines
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