



**BlueCross BlueShield
of Alabama**

Name of Blue Advantage Policy:
Adoptive Immunotherapy

Policy #: 105

Latest Review Date: October 2022

Category: Medical

ARCHIVED EFFECTIVE 11/1/2023

BACKGROUND:

Blue Advantage medical policy does not conflict with Local Coverage Determinations (LCDs), Local Medical Review Policies (LMRPs) or National Coverage Determinations (NCDs) or with coverage provisions in Medicare manuals, instructions or operational policy letters. In order to be covered by Blue Advantage the service shall be reasonable and necessary under Title XVIII of the Social Security Act, Section 1862(a)(1)(A). The service is considered reasonable and necessary if it is determined that the service is:

1. *Safe and effective;*
2. *Not experimental or investigational*;*
3. *Appropriate, including duration and frequency that is considered appropriate for the service, in terms of whether it is:*
 - *Furnished in accordance with accepted standards of medical practice for the diagnosis or treatment of the patient's condition or to improve the function of a malformed body member;*
 - *Furnished in a setting appropriate to the patient's medical needs and condition;*
 - *Ordered and furnished by qualified personnel;*
 - *One that meets, but does not exceed, the patient's medical need; and*
 - *At least as beneficial as an existing and available medically appropriate alternative.*

Routine costs of qualifying clinical trial services with dates of service on or after September 19, 2000 which meet the requirements of the Clinical Trials NCD are considered reasonable and necessary by Medicare. Providers should bill **Original Medicare for covered services that are related to **clinical trials** that meet Medicare requirements (Refer to Medicare National Coverage Determinations Manual, Chapter 1, Section 310 and Medicare Claims Processing Manual Chapter 32, Sections 69.0-69.11).*

POLICY:

Blue Advantage will treat **all adoptive immunotherapy techniques intended to enhance autoimmune effects** as a **non-covered benefit** and as **investigational** for the indications included, but not limited to, cancers associated with Epstein-Barr virus, Cytomegalovirus-associated cancers, nasopharyngeal cancer, renal cell carcinoma, gastric cancer, colorectal cancer, hepatocellular carcinoma, non-small-cell lung cancer, melanoma, glioblastoma multiforme, medullary thyroid cancer, pancreatic cancer, and cancers treated with autologous peripheral T lymphocytes containing tumor antigen-specific T cell receptors.

Note: CAR-T Therapy is addressed in [NCD 110.24](#).

Blue Advantage does not approve or deny procedures, services, testing, or equipment for our members. Our decisions concern coverage only. The decision of whether or not to have a certain test, treatment or procedure is one made between the physician and his/her patient. Blue Advantage administers benefits based on the members' contract and medical policies. Physicians should always exercise their best medical judgment in providing the care they feel is most appropriate for their patients. Needed care should not be delayed or refused because of a coverage determination.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURE OR SERVICE:

The spontaneous regression of certain cancers (e.g., renal cell carcinoma, melanoma) supports the idea that a patient's immune system can delay tumor progression and, on rare occasions, can eliminate tumors altogether. These observations have led to research into various immunologic therapies designed to stimulate a patient's own immune system. Adoptive immunotherapy is a method of activating lymphocytes and/or other types of cells for the treatment of cancer and other diseases. Cells are removed from the patient, processed for some period of time, and then infused back into the patient.

Allogeneic cell transplantation following nonmyeloablative conditioning of the recipient (known as reduced-intensity conditioning or RIC) may also be referred to as "adoptive immunotherapy" in the literature. However, RIC cell transplantation relies on a donor-versus-malignancy effect of donor lymphocytes. In contrast, the adoptive immunotherapy techniques described in this policy enhance autoimmune effects primarily. The use of RIC in stem-cell transplantation is discussed for specific cancers in individual policies related to cell transplantation.

Adoptive immunotherapy uses "activated" lymphocytes as a treatment modality. Both nonspecific and specific lymphocyte activation are used therapeutically. Nonspecific, polyclonal proliferation of lymphocytes by cytokines (immune system growth factors), also called autolymphocyte therapy, increases the number of activated lymphocytes.

T Lymphocytes and Killer Cells

Initially, this treatment was performed by harvesting peripheral lymphokine-activated killer (LAK) cells and activating them in vitro with the T-cell growth factor interleukin-2 (IL-2) and other cytokines. More recent techniques yield select populations of cytotoxic T-lymphocytes

with specific reactivity to tumor antigens. Peripheral lymphocytes are propagated in vitro with antigen-presenting dendritic cells that have been pulsed with tumor antigens. Alternatively, innate tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TIL) from the tumor biopsy are propagated in vitro with IL-2 and anti-CD3 antibody, a T-cell activator. Expansion of TIL for clinical use is labor intensive and requires laboratory expertise. Only a few cancers are infiltrated by T cells in significant numbers; of these, TIL can be expanded in only approximately 50% of cases. These factors limit the widespread applicability of TIL treatment. Cytokine-induced killer (CIK) cells have recently been recognized as a new type of anti-tumor effector cells, which can proliferate rapidly in vitro, with stronger anti-tumor activity and broader spectrum of targeted tumor than other reported anti-tumor effector cells.

Cellular Therapy and Dendritic Cell Infusions

The major research challenge in adoptive immunotherapy is to develop immune cells with anti-tumor reactivity in quantities sufficient for transfer to tumor-bearing patients. In current trials, two methods are studied: adoptive cellular therapy (ACT) and antigen-loaded dendritic cell infusions.

ACT is “the administration of a patient’s own (autologous) or donor (allogeneic) anti-tumor lymphocytes following a lymphodepleting preparative regimen.” Protocols vary, but include these common steps:

- 1) lymphocyte harvesting (either from peripheral blood or from tumor biopsy)
- 2) propagation of tumor-specific lymphocytes in vitro using various immune modulators
- 3) selection of lymphocytes with reactivity to tumor antigens with enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA)
- 4) lymphodepletion of the host with immunosuppressive agents
- 5) adoptive transfer (i.e., transfusion) of lymphocytes back into the tumor-bearing host

Dendritic cell-based immunotherapy uses autologous dendritic cells (ADC) to activate a lymphocyte-mediated cytotoxic response against specific antigens in vivo. ADCs harvested from the patient are either pulsed with antigen or transfected with a viral vector bearing a common cancer antigen. The activated ADCs are then transfused back into the patient, where they present antigen to effector lymphocytes (CD4⁺ T cells, CD8⁺ T cells, and in some cases, B cells). This initiates a cytotoxic response against the antigen and against any cell expressing the antigen. In cancer immunotherapy, ADCs are pulsed with tumor antigens; effector lymphocytes then mount a cytotoxic response against tumor cells expressing these antigens.

In an attempt to further regulate the host immune system, recent protocols use various cytokines (e.g., IL-7 and IL-15 instead of IL-2) to propagate lymphocytes. Protocols also differ in the extent of host lymphodepletion induced prior to transfusing the lymphocytes to the tumor-bearing host.

KEY POINTS:

The most recent literature search was performed through August 24, 2022.

Summary of Evidence

Cytotoxic T Lymphocytes

For individuals with Epstein-Barr virus-associated cancers who receive cytotoxic T lymphocytes, the evidence includes 2 small, prospective noncomparative cohort studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The cohort studies have shown a treatment response to infused cytotoxic T lymphocytes directed against cancer-associated viral antigens. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: large, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with Cytomegalovirus-associated cancers who receive cytotoxic T lymphocytes, the evidence includes a single case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. In the absence of an RCT comparing cytotoxic T lymphocytes with standard of care, no conclusions can be made. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Cytotoxic-Induced Killer Cells

For individuals with nasopharyngeal carcinoma who receive CIK cells, the evidence includes a single RCT. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The RCT reported a numerically favorable but statistically insignificant effect on progression-free survival and overall survival. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with renal cell carcinoma who receive CIK cells, the evidence includes multiple RCTs. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The largest of the RCTs reported statistically significant gains in progression-free survival and overall survival with CIK cell-based immunotherapy compared with interleukin-2 plus interferon- α -2. This body of evidence is limited by the context of the studies (non-U.S.) and choice of a nonstandard comparator. The other 2 RCTs have also reported response rates in favor of CIK therapy with inconsistent effect on survival. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and

the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with gastric cancer who receive CIK cells, the evidence includes 2 meta-analyses encompassing non-randomized trials. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Both meta-analyses reported statistically significant effect on disease-free survival, overall survival, quality of life, and progression free survival in favor of immunotherapy vs no immunotherapy. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with colorectal cancer who receive CIK cells, the evidence includes a single RCT and one meta-analysis. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Results of the RCT showed a statistically significant effect on overall survival in favor of immunotherapy vs chemotherapy alone. A meta-analysis that included both gastric cancer and CRC found improvements in OS and PFS in favor of CIK/DC-CIK compared to chemotherapy alone. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with hepatocellular carcinoma who receive CIK cells, the evidence includes meta-analyses that include RCTs and quasi-randomized trials. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Meta-analyses of these trials have reported improved overall survival rates when compared to conventional therapies alone, but they are limited by inclusion of studies from Asia only and heterogeneity in comparators. This body of evidence is limited by the context of the studies (non-U.S.), small sample sizes, heterogeneous treatment groups, and other methodologic weaknesses. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with non-small-cell lung cancer who receive CIK cells, the evidence includes multiple RCTs and a systematic review. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. A single systematic review of RCTs reported some benefits in median time to progression and median survival time. The included body of evidence trials in the systematic review is limited by the context of the studies (non-U.S.), small sample sizes, heterogeneous treatment groups, and other methodologic weaknesses. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric

trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Tumor-Infiltrating Lymphocytes

For individuals with melanoma who receive TILs, the evidence includes a meta-analysis of randomized and non-randomized trials. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The meta-analysis evaluating TIL with IL-2 in patients with cutaneous melanoma reported a ORR of 41%. Pooled 1-year overall survival rates ranged from 46.1% to 56.5% depending on the IL-2 dose level. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Dendritic Cells

For individuals with glioblastoma multiforme who receive dendritic cells, the evidence includes a systematic review of observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Because of the observational and noncomparative nature of the available evidence, it is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with non-small-cell lung cancer who receive dendritic cells, the evidence includes 2 RCTs and a meta-analysis. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The RCTs have generally reported some benefits in response rates and/or survival. The results of a meta-analysis of these trials also reported a statistical significant reduction in the hazard of death. Most trials were from Asia and did not use standard of care as the control arm. This body of evidence is limited by the context of the studies (non-U.S.), small sample sizes, heterogeneous treatment groups, and other methodologic weaknesses. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with medullary thyroid cancer who receive dendritic cells, the evidence includes one prospective noncomparative study. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. A small prospective noncomparative study in 10 medullary thyroid cancer patients treated with autologous dendritic cells has been published. There are no RCTs comparing dendritic cell-based adoptive

immunotherapy with standard of care and, therefore, no conclusions can be made. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with pancreatic cancer who receive dendritic cells, the evidence includes a small prospective noncomparative study. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The study reported on treatment outcomes for 5 patients with pancreatic cancer. Because of the noncomparative nature of the available evidence and small sample base, it is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Genetically Engineered T Cells Peripheral T Lymphocytes

For individuals with cancers who receive autologous peripheral T lymphocytes containing tumor antigen-specific T-cell receptors, the evidence includes multiple small observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Multiple observational studies have examined autologous peripheral T lymphocytes containing tumor antigen-specific T-cell receptors in melanoma, Hodgkin and non-Hodgkin lymphoma, prostate tumors, and neuroblastoma. Because of the noncomparative nature of the available evidence with a small sample size, it is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusion. To establish efficacy, the following is needed: larger, well-conducted, multicentric trials with adequate randomization procedures, blinded assessments, centralized oversight, and the use of an appropriate standard of care as the control arm showing treatment benefit. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

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

National Comprehensive Cancer Network

Current guidelines from the National Comprehensive Cancer Network do not include recommendations for adoptive immunotherapy to treat cancers of the bladder, central nervous system, head and neck, hepatobiliary system, kidney, pancreatic, stomach, thyroid⁴, melanoma, or non-small-cell lung cancer.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force has not addressed the treatment of adoptive immunotherapy.

KEY WORDS:

Adoptive immunotherapy (AI), lymphokine-activated killer (LAK) cell therapy, tumor-infiltrating lymphocyte (TIL) therapy, autolymphocyte therapy (ALT), leukopheresis, and interleukin-2 (IL-2), cytotoxic T-lymphocytes, genetically engineered T-cells, cytokine-induced killer cells, T-Cell Receptor Therapy, TCR, adoptive cellular therapy, ACT, CIK, antigen-loaded autologous dendritic cells, ADC.

APPROVED BY GOVERNING BODIES:

Adoptive immunotherapy is not a U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-regulated procedure.

BENEFIT APPLICATION:

Coverage is subject to member's specific benefits. Group specific policy will supersede this policy when applicable.

CURRENT CODING:

CPT codes:

0708T	Intradermal cancer immunotherapy; preparation and initial injection (effective for dates of service 1/1/22 and after)
0709T	; each additional injection (effective for dates of service 1/1/22 and after)

HCPCS codes:

S2107	Adoptive immunotherapy, i.e., development of specific anti-tumor reactivity (e.g., tumor infiltrating lymphocyte therapy) per course of treatment
-------	---

REFERENCES:

- 1) Bachleitner-Hofmann T, Friedl J, Hassler M et al. Pilot trial of autologous dendritic cells loaded with tumor lysate(s) from allogeneic tumor cell lines in patients with metastatic medullary thyroid carcinoma. Oncol Rep 2009; 21(6):1585-92.

- 2) Bedrosian I, Mick R, Xu S et al. Intranodal administration of peptide-pulsed mature dendritic cell vaccines results in superior CD8⁺ T-cell function in melanoma patients. *J Clin Oncol* 2003; 21(20):3826-35.
- 3) Bollard CM, Gottschalk S, Torrano V, et al. Sustained complete responses in patients with lymphoma receiving autologous cytotoxic T lymphocytes targeting Epstein-Barr virus latent membrane proteins. *J Clin Oncol*. Mar 10 2014; 32 (8):798-808.
- 4) Bregy A, Wong TM, Shah AH et al. Active immunotherapy using dendritic cells in the treatment of glioblastoma multiforme. *Cancer Treat Rev* 2013; 39(8):891-907.
- 5) Brentjens RJ, Davila ML, Riviere I, et al. CD19-targeted T cells rapidly induce molecular remissions in adults with chemotherapy-refractory acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Sci Transl Med*. Mar 20 2013; 5 (177):177ra138.
- 6) Cai XR, Li X, Lin JX, et al. Autologous transplantation of cytokine-induced killer cells as an adjuvant therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma in Asia: an update meta-analysis and systematic review. *Oncotarget*. May 09 2017; 8(19):31318-31328.
- 7) Cao J, Kong FH, Liu X, et al. Immunotherapy with dendritic cells and cytokine-induced killer cells for hepatocellular carcinoma: A meta-analysis. *World J Gastroenterol*. Jul 21 2019; 25(27): 3649-3663.
- 8) Chen R, Deng X, Wu H, et al. Combined immunotherapy with dendritic cells and cytokine-induced killer cells for malignant tumors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int Immunopharmacol*. Oct 2014; 22 (2):451-464.
- 9) Chia WK, Teo M, Wang WW, et al. Adoptive T-cell transfer and chemotherapy in the first-line treatment of metastatic and/or locally recurrent nasopharyngeal carcinoma. *Mol Ther*. Jan 2014; 22 (1):132-139.
- 10) Chung MJ, Park JY, Bang S, et al. Phase II clinical trial of ex vivo-expanded cytokine-induced killer cells therapy in advanced pancreatic cancer. *Cancer Immunol Immunother*. Sep 2014; 63 (9):939-946.
- 11) Cui J, Wang N, Zhao H, et al. Combination of radiofrequency ablation and sequential cellular immunotherapy improves progression-free survival for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. *Int J Cancer*. Jan 15 2014; 134 (2):342-351.
- 12) Dafni U, Michielin O, Lluesma SM, et al. Efficacy of adoptive therapy with tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes and recombinant interleukin-2 in advanced cutaneous melanoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Oncol*. Dec 01 2019; 30(12): 1902-1913.
- 13) Du H, Yang J, Zhang Y. Cytokine-induced killer cell/dendritic cell combine with cytokine-induced killer cell immunotherapy for treating advanced gastrointestinal cancer. *BMC Cancer*. Apr 28 2020; 20(1): 357.
- 14) Hirooka Y, Itoh A, Kawashima H et al. A combination therapy of gemcitabine with immunotherapy for patients with inoperable locally advanced pancreatic cancer. *Pancreas* 2009; 38(3): e69-74.
- 15) Hontscha C, Borck Y, Zhou H et al. Clinical trials on CIK cells: first report of the international registry on CIK cells (IRCC). *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2011; 137(2):305-10.

- 16) Humphries C. Adoptive cell therapy: Honing that killer instinct. *Nature*. Dec 19 2013; 504 (7480): S13-15.
- 17) Johnson LA, Morgan RA, Dudley ME et al. Gene therapy with human and mouse T-cell receptors mediates cancer regression and targets normal tissues expressing cognate antigen. *Blood* 2009; 114(3):535-46.
- 18) Khammari A, Labarrière N, Vignard V et al. Treatment of metastatic melanoma with autologous Melan-A/Mart-1-specific cytotoxic T lymphocyte clones. *J Invest Dermatol* 2009; 129(12):2835-42.
- 19) Kimura H, Iizasa T, Ishikawa A, Shingyouji M, et al. Prospective phase II study of post-surgical adjuvant chemo-immunotherapy using autologous dendritic cells and activated killer cells from tissue culture of tumor-draining lymph nodes in primary lung cancer patients. *Anticancer Res*, Mar-Apr 2008; 28(2B): 1229-1238.
- 20) Lacy MQ, Wettstein P, Gastineau DA et al. Dendritic cell-based idotype vaccination in post-transplant multiple myeloma. *Blood* 1999; 94(10 suppl part 1):122a.
- 21) Lee JH, Lee JH, Lim YS, et al. Adjuvant immunotherapy with autologous cytokine-induced killer cells for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Gastroenterology*. Jun 2015; 148(7):1383-1391 e1386.
- 22) Leplina OY, Stupak, VV, Kozlov, YP, et al. Use of interferon-alpha-induced dendritic cells in the therapy of patients with malignant brain gliomas. *Bull Exp Biol Med*, April 2007; 143(4): 528-534.
- 23) Li JJ, Gu MF, Pan K et al. Autologous cytokine-induced killer cell transfusion in combination with gemcitabine plus cisplatin regimen chemotherapy for metastatic nasopharyngeal carcinoma. *J Immunother* 2012; 35(2):189-95.
- 24) Liao LM, Ashkan K, Tran DD, et al. First results on survival from a large Phase 3 clinical trial of an autologous dendritic cell vaccine in newly diagnosed glioblastoma. *J Transl Med*. May 29 2018; 16 (1):142.
- 25) Liu L, Zhang W, Qi X et al. Randomized study of autologous cytokine-induced killer cell immunotherapy in metastatic renal carcinoma. *Clin Cancer Res* 2012; 18(6):1751-9.
- 26) Maude SL, Teachey DT, Porter DL, et al. CD19-targeted chimeric antigen receptor T-cell therapy for acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Blood*. Jun 25 2015; 125(26):4017-4023.
- 27) Motta MR, Castellani S, Rizzi S et al. Generation of dendritic cells from CD14+ monocytes positively selected by immunomagnetic adsorption for multiple myeloma patients enrolled in a clinical trial of anti-idiotypic vaccination. *Br J Haematol* 2003; 121(2):240-50.
- 28) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology: bladder cancer. Version 2.2022. Updated May 20, 2022.
- 29) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: central nervous system cancers, Version 1.2022. www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/cns.pdf.
- 30) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: gastric cancer, Version 2.2022. www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/gastric.pdf.

- 31) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: head and neck cancers, Version 2.2022.
www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/head-and-neck.pdf.
- 32) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: hepatobiliary cancers, Version 2.2022.
www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/hepatobiliary.pdf.
- 33) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: Hodgkin lymphoma, version 1.2017.
www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/hodgkins.pdf.
- 34) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: kidney cancer, Version 1.2021.
www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/kidney.pdf.
- 35) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: cutaneous melanoma, Version 3.2022.
www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/cutaneous_melanoma.pdf.
- 36) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: non-Hodgkin's lymphomas, version 2.2018.
www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/nhl.pdf.
- 37) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: non-small cell lung cancer, Version 3.2022.
www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/nscl.pdf.
- 38) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: pancreatic adenocarcinoma, Version 1.2022.
www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/pancreatic.pdf.
- 39) National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: thyroid carcinoma, Version 2.2022.
www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/thyroid.pdf.
- 40) Ngo MC, Rooney CM, Howard JM, et al. Ex vivo gene transfer for improved adoptive immunotherapy of cancer. *Hum Mol Genet* 2011; 20(R1): R93-9.
- 41) Ochi T, Fujiwara H, Yasukawa M. Requisite considerations for successful adoptive immunotherapy with engineered T-lymphocytes using tumor antigen-specific T-cell receptor gene transfer. *Expert Opin Biol Ther* 2011; 11(6):699-713.
- 42) Oelke M, Krueger C, and Schneck JP. Technological advances in adoptive immunotherapy. *Drugs of Today* 2005; 41(1): 13-21.
- 43) Ohtani T, Yamada Y, Furuhashi A, et al. Activated cytotoxic T-lymphocyte immunotherapy is effective for advanced oral and maxillofacial cancers. *Int J Oncol*. Nov 2014; 45 (5):2051-2057.
- 44) Pinthus JH, Waks T, Malina V et al. Adoptive immunotherapy of prostate cancer bone lesions using redirected effector lymphocytes. *J Clin Invest* 2004; 114(12):1774-81.
- 45) Pule MA, Savoldo B, Myers GD, et al. Virus-specific T cells engineered to coexpress tumor-specific receptors: persistence and antitumor activity in individuals with neuroblastoma. *Nat Med* 2008; 14(11):1264-70.

- 46) Rosenberg SA, Restifo NP, Yang JC et al. Adoptive cell transfer: a clinical path to effective cancer immunotherapy. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2008; 8(4):299-308.
- 47) Rosenberg SA, Yang JC, Sherry RM et al. Durable complete responses in heavily pretreated patients with metastatic melanoma using T-cell transfer immunotherapy. *Clin Cancer Res* 2011; 17(13):4550-7.
- 48) Santin AD, Bellone S, Palmieri M et al. Induction of tumor-specific cytotoxicity in tumor infiltrating lymphocytes by HPV16 and HPV18 E7-pulsed autologous dendritic cells in patients with cancer of the uterine cervix. *Gynecol Oncol* 2003; 89(2):271-80.
- 49) Savoldo B, Rooney CM, Di Stasi A et al. Epstein Barr virus specific cytotoxic T lymphocytes expressing the anti-CD30zeta artificial chimeric T-cell receptor for immunotherapy of Hodgkin disease. *Blood* 2007; 110(7):2620-30.
- 50) Schuessler A, Smith C, Beagley L, et al. Autologous T-cell therapy for cytomegalovirus as a consolidative treatment for recurrent glioblastoma. *Cancer Res.* Jul 1 2014; 74(13):3466-3476.
- 51) Shi L, Zhou Q, Wu J et al. Efficacy of adjuvant immunotherapy with cytokine-induced killer cells in patients with locally advanced gastric cancer. *Cancer Immunol Immunother* 2012; 61(12):2251-9.
- 52) Shi SB, Ma TH, Li CH et al. Effect of maintenance therapy with dendritic cells: cytokine-induced killer cells in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *Tumori* 2012; 98(3):314-9.
- 53) Straten P, Becker JC. Adoptive cell transfer in the treatment of metastatic melanoma. *J Invest Dermatol* 2009; 129(12):2743-5.
- 54) Su Z, Dannull J, Heiser A et al. Immunological and clinical responses in metastatic renal cancer patients vaccinated with tumor RNA-transfected dendritic cells. *Cancer Res* 2003; 63(9):2127-33.
- 55) Tallen G, Ratei R, Mann G, et al. Long-term outcome in children with relapsed acute lymphoblastic leukemia after time-point and site-of-relapse stratification and intensified short-course multidrug chemotherapy: results of trial ALL-REZ BFM 90. *J Clin Oncol.* May 10 2010; 28(14):2339-2347.
- 56) Tang X, Liu T, Zang X et al. Adoptive cellular immunotherapy in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2013; 8(5):e62847.
- 57) Tanyi JL, Chu CS. Dendritic cell-based tumor vaccinations in epithelial ovarian cancer: a systematic review. *Immunotherapy* 2012; 4(10):995-1009.
- 58) Till BG, Jensen MC, Wang J et al. Adoptive immunotherapy for indolent non-Hodgkin lymphoma and mantle cell lymphoma using genetically modified autologous CD20-specific T cells. *Blood* 2008; 112(6):2261-71.
- 59) Timmerman JM, Czerwinski DK, Davis TA et al. Idiotypic-pulsed dendritic cell vaccination for B-cell lymphoma: clinical and immune response in 35 patients. *Blood* 2002; 99(5):1517-29.
- 60) Triozzi PL, Khurram R, Aldrich WA et al. Intratumoral injection of dendritic cells derived in vitro in patients with metastatic cancer. *Cancer* 2000; 89(12):2646-54.

- 61) Wang M, Cao JX, Pan JH, et al. Adoptive immunotherapy of cytokine-induced killer cell therapy in the treatment of non-small cell lung cancer. PLoS One. 2014; 9(11):e112662.
- 62) Wang X, Tang S, Cui X, et al. Cytokine-induced killer cell/dendritic cell-cytokine-induced killer cell immunotherapy for the postoperative treatment of gastric cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine (Baltimore). Sep 2018;97(36):e12230.
- 63) Xie F, Zhang X, Li H et al. Adoptive immunotherapy in postoperative hepatocellular carcinoma: a systemic review. PloS One 2012; 7(8):e42879.
- 64) Yang L, Ren B, Li H et al. Enhanced antitumor effects of DC-activated CIKs to chemotherapy treatment in a single cohort of advanced non-small-cell lung cancer patients. Cancer Immunol Immunother 2013; 62(1):65-73.
- 65) Zhang Y, Wang J, Wang Y, et al. Autologous CIK cell immunotherapy in patients with renal cell carcinoma after radical nephrectomy. Clin Dev Immunol. 2013; 2013: 195691.
- 66) Zhang G, Zhao H, Wu J, et al. Adoptive immunotherapy for non-small cell lung cancer by NK and cytotoxic T lymphocytes mixed effector cells: retrospective clinical observation. Int Immunopharmacol. Aug 2014; 21 (2):396-405.
- 67) Zhao H, Wang Y, Yu J, et al. Autologous cytokine-induced killer cells improves overall survival of metastatic colorectal cancer patients: results from a phase II clinical trial. Clin Colorectal Cancer. Sep 2016; 15(3):228-235.
- 68) Zhao X, Zhang Z, Li H, et al. Cytokine induced killer cell-based immunotherapies in patients with different stages of renal cell carcinoma. Cancer Lett. Jul 1 2015; 362(2):192-198.
- 69) Zhong JH, Ma L, Wu LC et al. Adoptive immunotherapy for postoperative hepatocellular carcinoma: a systematic review. Int J Clin Pract 2012; 66(1):21-7.

POLICY HISTORY:

Adopted for Blue Advantage, March 2005

Available for comment May 1-June 14, 2005

Medical Policy Group, April 2007

Medical Policy Group, January 2009

Medical Policy Group, June 2011

Medical Policy Group, March, 2012

Medical Policy Group, September 2013

Medical Policy Group, January 2014

Medical Policy Group, December 2014

Medical Policy Group, January 2016

Medical Policy Group, March 2016

Medical Policy Group, August 2017

Medical Policy Group, October 2017

Medical Policy Group, November 2017

Medical Policy Group, December 2017

Medical Policy Group, August 2018: Updates to Key Points and References; no change in policy statement.

Medical Policy Group, March 2019
Medical Policy Group, November 2019
Medical Policy Group, October 2020
Medical Policy Group, October 2021
Medical Policy Group, December 2021: 2022 annual coding update. New codes 0708T and 0709T added to the Current Coding section.
Medical Policy Group, October 2022
Medical Policy Group, November 2023: Archived effective 11/1/2023.

This medical policy is not an authorization, certification, explanation of benefits, or a contract. Eligibility and benefits are determined on a case-by-case basis according to the terms of the member's plan in effect as of the date services are rendered. All medical policies are based on (i) research of current medical literature and (ii) review of common medical practices in the treatment and diagnosis of disease as of the date hereof. Physicians and other providers are solely responsible for all aspects of medical care and treatment, including the type, quality, and levels of care and treatment.

This policy is intended to be used for adjudication of claims (including pre-admission certification, pre-determinations, and pre-procedure review) in Blue Cross and Blue Shield's administration of plan contracts.