



MASSACHUSETTS

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts is an Independent Licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

Medical Policy

Minimally Invasive Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery

Table of Contents

- [Policy: Commercial](#)
- [Policy: Medicare](#)
- [Authorization Information](#)
- [Coding Information](#)
- [Description](#)
- [Policy History](#)
- [Information Pertaining to All Policies](#)
- [References](#)

Policy Number: 553

BCBSA Reference Number: 7.01.62A

NCD/LCD: NA

Related Policies

None

Policy

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

Minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass graft surgery (MIDCAB) may be considered **MEDICALLY NECESSARY**.

Other techniques for minimally invasive coronary artery bypass graft surgery, including but not limited to PACAB, hybrid CABG, or TECAB techniques, are **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**.

	Outpatient
Commercial Managed Care (HMO and POS)	This procedure is performed in the inpatient setting.
Commercial PPO and Indemnity	This procedure is performed in the inpatient setting.
Medicare HMO BlueSM	This procedure is performed in the inpatient setting.
Medicare PPO BlueSM	This procedure is performed in the inpatient setting.

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:

HCPCS Codes

HCPCS Codes	Code Description
S2205	Minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass surgery involving mini-thoracotomy or mini-sternotomy surgery, performed under direct vision; using arterial graft(s), single coronary arterial graft
S2206	Minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass surgery involving mini-thoracotomy or mini-sternotomy surgery, performed under direct vision; using arterial graft(s), two coronary arterial grafts
S2207	Minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass surgery involving mini-thoracotomy or mini-sternotomy surgery, performed under direct vision; using venous graft only, single coronary venous graft
S2208	Minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass surgery involving mini-thoracotomy or mini-sternotomy surgery, performed under direct vision; using single arterial graft and venous graft(s), single venous graft
S2209	Minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass surgery involving mini-thoracotomy or mini-sternotomy surgery, performed under direct vision; using two arterial grafts and single venous graft

Description

There are currently variations on techniques that are classified as “minimally invasive” coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgery. The surgery can be done under direct vision, with a mini-sternotomy or a mini-thoracotomy approach. These types of direct procedures have been termed minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass (MIDCAB). MIDCAB is performed without cardiopulmonary bypass by slowing the heart rate to 40 beats per minute to minimize motion in the surgical field. The performance of a coronary bypass on a beating heart increases the technical difficulty of the procedure, particularly in terms of the quality of the vessel anastomosis. In MIDCAB, the predominant re-anastomosis performed uses the native internal mammary artery to bypass the left anterior descending (LAD) coronary artery. Bypass of the right coronary artery may also be possible in patients with suitable anatomy.

The surgery can also be performed endoscopically, whereby the internal structures are visualized on a video monitor, and the entire procedure is performed without direct visualization of the operative field. Cardiopulmonary bypass may or may not be used with this technique. This variation of minimally invasive CABG is called port access coronary artery bypass (PACAB) or total endoscopic coronary artery bypass (TECAB). Using this approach, theoretically, all sides of the heart can be approached. In many instances, only a single bypass of the LAD artery is performed, although multivessel bypass of the left and right coronary artery has been performed.

Summary

Given the clinical data summarized earlier in this document and the clinical support, MIDCAB (CABG with anastomoses hand sewn under direct vision) may be considered medically necessary. Given both the

limited clinical data and the lack of clinical support, other minimally invasive approaches to CABG, such as TECAB are considered investigational.

Policy History

Date	Action
3/2020	Policy updated with literature review through March 1, 2020, references added. Policy statements unchanged.
4/2016	Clarified coding information.
5/1/12	New policy describing ongoing coverage and non-coverage.

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](#)

References

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Minimally invasive coronary artery bypass graft surgery. TEC Assessments 1997; Volume 12, Tab 13.
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Minimally invasive coronary artery bypass graft – update. TEC Assessments 1998; Volume 13, Tab 15.
3. Diegeler A, Thiele H, Falk V et al. Comparison of stenting with minimally invasive bypass surgery for stenosis of the left anterior descending coronary artery. N Engl J Med 2002; 347(8): 561-6.
4. Thiele H, Oettel S, Jacobs S et al. Comparison of bare-metal stenting with minimally invasive bypass surgery for stenosis of the left anterior descending artery; a five-year follow-up. Circulation 2005; 112(22):3445-50.
5. Drenth DJ, Winter JB, Veeger NJ et al. Minimally invasive coronary artery bypass grafting versus percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty with stenting in isolated high-grade stenosis of the proximal left anterior descending artery: six months' angiographic and clinical follow-up of a prospective randomized study. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2002; 124(1):130-5.
6. Reeves BC, Angelini GD, Bryan AJ et al. A multi-centre randomised controlled trial of minimally invasive direct coronary bypass grafting versus percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty with stenting for proximal stenosis of the left anterior descending coronary artery. Health Technol Assess 2004; 8(16):1-43.
7. Kim JW, Lim DS, Sun K et al. Stenting or MIDCAB using ministernotomy for revascularization of proximal left anterior descending artery? Int J Cardiol 2005; 99(3):437-41.
8. Hong SJ, Lim D-S, Seo HS et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention with drug-eluting stent implantation vs. minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass (MIDCAB) in patients with left anterior descending coronary artery stenosis. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2005; 64(1):75-81.
9. Cisowski M, Drzewiecki J, Drzewiecka-Gerber A et al. Primary stenting versus MIDCAB: preliminary report - comparison of two methods of revascularization in single left anterior descending coronary artery stenosis. Ann Thorac Surg 2002; 74(4):S1334-9.
10. Aziz O, Rao C, Panesar SS et al. Meta-analysis of minimally invasive internal thoracic artery bypass versus percutaneous revascularization for isolated lesions of the left anterior descending artery. BMJ 2007; 334(7594):617-24.
11. Bainbridge D, Cheng D, Martin J et al. Does off-pump or minimally invasive coronary artery bypass reduce mortality, morbidity, and resource utilization when compared with percutaneous coronary intervention? A meta-analysis of randomized trials. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2007; 133(3):623-31.
12. Jaffery Z, Kowalski M, Weaver WD et al. A meta-analysis of randomized control trials comparing minimally invasive direct coronary bypass grafting versus percutaneous coronary intervention for stenosis of the proximal left anterior descending artery. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg, 2007; 31(4):691-7.

13. Thiele H, Neumann-Schriedewind P, Jacobs S et al. Randomized comparison of minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass surgery versus sirolimus-eluting stenting in isolated proximal left anterior descending coronary artery stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2009; 53(25):2324-31.
14. Kofidis T, Emmert MY, Paeschke HG et al. Long-term follow-up after minimal invasive direct coronary artery bypass grafting procedure: a multi-factorial retrospective analysis at 1000 patient-years. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg* 2009; 9(6):990-4.
15. Kettering K. Minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass grafting" a meta-analysis. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)* 2008; 49(6):793-800.
16. Dogan S, Graubitz K, Aybek T et al. How safe is the port access technique in minimally invasive coronary artery bypass grafting? *Ann Thorac Surg* 2002; 74(5):1537-43.
17. Mishra YK, Wasir H, Sharma KK. Totally endoscopic coronary artery bypass surgery. *Asian Cardiovasc Thorac Ann* 2006; 14(6):447-51.
18. de Canniere D, Wimmer-Greinecker G, Cichon R et al. Feasibility, safety, and efficacy of totally endoscopic coronary artery bypass grafting: multicenter European experience. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2007; 134(3):710-6.
19. Argenziano M, Katz M, Bonatti J et al. Results of the prospective multicenter trial of robotically assisted totally endoscopic coronary artery bypass grafting. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2006; 81(5):1666-75.
20. Kappert U, Tugtekin SM, Cichon R et al. Robotic totally endoscopic coronary artery bypass: a word of caution implicated by a five-year follow-up. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2008; 135(4):857-62.
21. Shroyer AL, Grover FL, Hattler B et al. On-pump versus off-pump coronary-artery bypass surgery. *N Engl J Med* 2009; 361(19):1827-37.
22. Puskas JD, Mack JM, Smith CR. Letter to the editor. On-pump versus off-pump CABG. *N Engl J Med* 2010; 362(9):851.
23. Bonatti J, Schachner T, Bonaros N et al. Simultaneous hybrid coronary revascularization using totally endoscopic left internal mammary artery bypass grafting and placement of rapamycin eluting stents in the same interventional session. The COMBINATION pilot study. *Cardiology* 2008; 110(2):92-5.
24. <http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00366015> . Accessed February 2010.
25. Yang M, Xiao LB, Gao ZS. Clinical Effect and Prognosis of Off-Pump Minimally Invasive Direct Coronary Artery Bypass. *Med Sci Monit.* 2017 Mar 3;23:1123-1128.