BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama

Name of Blue Advantage Policy:

Bi-Ventricular Pacemakers (Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy) for the Treatment of Heart Failure

Policy #: 055
Latest Review Date: May 2022
Category: Surgery

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:

Effective for dates of service on or after June 8, 2018:

Blue Advantage will treat **biventricular pacemakers, with or without an accompanying implantable cardiac defibrillator (i.e., a combined biventricular pacemaker/ICD)** as a **covered** benefit **for the treatment of heart failure (HF)** when **ALL** of the following criteria are met:

New York Heart Association (NYHA) Class III or IV

- Left ventricular ejection fraction ≤ 35%.
- Sinus rhythm
- Individuals treated with guideline-directed medical therapy*

AND

- Either QRS duration of ≥ 120 msec**-or left bundle branch block

New York Heart Association (NYHA) Class II

- Left ventricular ejection fraction ≤30%
- Sinus rhythm
- Individuals treated with guideline-directed medical therapy*

AND

- Either QRS duration of ≥120msec** or left bundle branch block

Blue Advantage individuals who do not meet the criteria outlined above, but have an indication for a ventricular pacemaker, biventricular pacemakers with or without an accompanying implantable cardiac defibrillator (i.e., a combined biventricular pacemaker/ICD) will **meet** Blue Advantage's medical criteria for coverage **as an alternative to a right ventricular pacemaker in individuals who meet ALL of the following criteria**:

- NYHA class I, II, III, or IV heart failure
- Left ventricular ejection fraction ≤50%
- The presence of atrioventricular block with requirement for a high percentage of ventricular pacing***
- Individuals treated with guideline directed medical therapy**

*Guideline-directed medical therapy for heart failure is outlined in 2013 American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association guidelines for the management of heart failure.

**The FDA-labeled indications for QRS duration vary by device. For some devices, FDA approval is based on QRS duration of ≥130 (e.g., InSync® device), while for others, it is based on QRS duration ≥120 msec (e.g., Guidant). These differences in QRS duration arise from differences in the eligibility criteria in the trials on which the FDA approval is based.

***Atrioventricular block with a requirement for a high percentage of ventricular pacing is considered to be present when there is either:

- 3rd degree atrioventricular block; OR

- 2nd degree atrioventricular block or a PR interval of 300ms or more when paced at 100 beats per minute.

Blue Advantage will treat a **combined biventricular pacemaker and implantable cardiac defibrillator (ICD)** as a **covered benefit** for individuals who meet criteria for **BOTH** a biventricular pacemaker and an ICD. **Please see CMS National Coverage Determination (NCD) 20.4 for criteria for the ICD.**

Blue Advantage will treat **biventricular pacemakers, with or without an accompanying implantable cardiac defibrillator,** as a **non-covered** benefit and as **investigational.**

- Treatment for individuals with NYHA class I heart failure who do not meet the above criteria
- Including but not limited to the following:
  - atrial Fibrillation
  - unstable angina
  - myocardial infarction
  - prior coronary artery revascularization or angioplasty within the past 3 months

Blue Advantage will treat **intrathoracic fluid monitoring sensor as a component of a biventricular pacemaker** as a **non-covered benefit** and as **investigational.**

Blue Advantage will treat **triple-site** (triventricular) **CRT**, using an **additional pacing lead** as a **non-covered benefit** and as **investigational.**

Blue Advantage will treat **cardiac resynchronization therapy with wireless left ventricular endocardial pacing** as a **non-covered benefit** and as **investigational.**

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:

Cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT), which consists of synchronized pacing of the left and right ventricles, is intended to treat patients with heart failure and dyssynchronous ventricular contractions. Treatment involves placement of a device that paces both ventricles and which coordinates ventricular pacing to maximize cardiac pumping function and left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF).

Heart Failure
An estimated 6 million adults in the US 20 years of age and older had heart failure between 2015 and 2018. The prevalence continues to increase over time with aging of the population. Prevalence of disease is higher in women than men 80 years of age and older. It is estimated that 20% to 30% of patients with heart failure have intraventricular conduction disorders resulting in a contraction pattern that is not coordinated and a wide QRS interval on the electrocardiogram. This abnormality appears to be associated with increased morbidity and mortality.

Treatment
Biventricular pacemakers using 3 leads (1 in the right atrium, 1 endocardial in the right ventricle, 1 epicardial for the left ventricle), also known as cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT), have been investigated as a technique to coordinate the contraction of the ventricles, thus improving patients' hemodynamic status. Originally developed CRT devices typically used 2 ventricular leads for biventricular pacing. Devices and implantation techniques have been developed to allow for multisite pacing, with the goal of improving CRT response. This may be accomplished in 1 of 2 ways: through the use of multiple leads within the coronary sinus (triventricular pacing) or through the use of multipolar left ventricular pacing leads, which can deliver pacing stimuli at multiple sites. Wireless left ventricular endocardial pacing is also being evaluated for patients who are not candidates for or do not respond to standard epicardial pacing leads.

KEY POINTS:
The most recent literature review was updated through April 5, 2022.

Summary of Evidence
For individuals who have NYHA class III or IV heart failure with an LVEF of 35% or less who are in sinus rhythm, treated with guideline-directed medical therapy, and have either LBBB or a QRS interval of 150 ms or more who receive CRT with or without defibrillator, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. There is a large body of clinical trial evidence supporting the use of CRT in patients with NYHA class III or IV heart failure. The RCTs have consistently reported that CRT reduces mortality, improves functional status, and improves quality of life for patients with NYHA class III or IV heart failure. Multiple subgroup analyses of RCTs have demonstrated that the benefit of CRT is mainly restricted to patients with LBBB or QRS interval greater than 150 ms. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have NYHA class II heart failure with a left ventricular ejection fraction of 30% or less who are in sinus rhythm, treated with guideline-directed medical therapy, and have either LBBB or a QRS interval of 150 ms or more who receive CRT with or without defibrillator, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. For patients with NYHA class II heart failure, at least 4 RCTs assessing CRT have been published. A mortality benefit was reported in 1 of the 4 trials, the Resynchronization-Defibrillation for Ambulatory Heart Failure Trial. None of the other 3 RCTs

reported a mortality difference, but a subgroup analysis of the MADIT-CRT trial reported a mortality benefit for patients with LBBB. Among other outcome measures, hospitalizations for heart failure showed consistent reductions, but quality of life and functional status did not improve The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have NYHA class I heart failure who receive CRT with or without defibrillator, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. Few patients with NYHA class I heart failure have been included in RCTs. The MADIT-CRT trial included 265 patients with class I. While the treatment effect on death and hospitalization favored combined implantable cardiac defibrillator plus CRT devices vs implantable cardiac defibrillator alone for class I patients, the confidence interval was large and included a 25% to 30% increase in events. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in net health outcomes.

For individuals who have NYHA class I, II, III or IV heart failure with left ventricular ejection fraction of 50% or less and the presence of atrioventricular block with requirement for a high percentage of ventricular pacing, treated with guideline-directed medical therapy, who receive CRT with or without defibrillator, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. For patients who have atrioventricular nodal block, some degree of left ventricular dysfunction, and who would not necessarily meet conventional criteria for CRT but would require ventricular pacing, a large RCT has demonstrated improvements in heart failure-related hospitalizations and urgent care visits among patients treated with CRT instead of RV pacing alone. For patients who require ventricular pacing but have no left ventricular dysfunction, results of a small RCT have suggested that biventricular pacing is associated with improved measures of cardiac function, but the trial was small and underpowered to detect differences in clinical outcomes. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with atrial fibrillation and heart failure who receive CRT, the evidence consists of 6 RCTs and a registry study. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. Results from RCTs have reported conflicting results, with 3 reporting improvements for patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) and others reporting no significant improvements. A registry study reported significant improvements in mortality and hospitalizations for patients with heart failure and AF treated with CRT plus defibrillator compared with ICD alone. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the health outcomes.

For individuals who have heart failure and atrioventricular (AV) nodal block who receive CRT, the evidence includes RCTs. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. One large RCT demonstrated that CRT led to reductions in heart failure-related hospitalizations and urgent care visits among patients with heart failure and AV block but who would not necessarily meet conventional criteria for CRT. For patients who require ventricular pacing but have no left

ventricular dysfunction, results of a small RCT have suggested that biventricular pacing is associated with improved measures of cardiac function, but the trial was small and underpowered to detect differences in clinical outcomes. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have heart failure who receive triple-site CRT, the evidence includes small RCTs and a meta-analysis that included nonrandomized studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. The available RCTs have reported improved outcomes on at least 1 measure of functional status or quality of life with triple-site CRT compared to conventional CRT. However, the trials are small and have methodologic limitations. In addition, outcomes reported differed across studies. Triple-site CRT was also associated with higher radiation exposure and a greater number of additional procedures postimplantation. Larger, high-quality RCTs are needed to better define the benefit-risk ratio for triple-site CRT compared to conventional CRT. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcomes.

For individuals who have heart failure who receive CRT combined with remote fluid monitoring, the evidence includes 3 RCTs. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. Three RCTs have reported no improvement in outcomes associated with remote fluid monitoring for patients with heart failure. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcomes.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

American College of Cardiology et al.

The ACC and American Heart Association and Heart Rhythm Society (2019) published joint guidelines on the evaluation and management of patients with bradycardia and cardiac conduction delay. These guidelines included the following recommendations on CRT (see Table 1).

Table 1. Joint Guidelines on Treatment of Patients with Bradycardia and Cardiac Conduction Delay

Recommendation	COR	LOE
"In patients with atrioventricular block who have an indication for permanent pacing with a LVEF between 36% and 50% and are expected to require ventricular pacing more than 40% of the time, it is reasonable to choose pacing methods that maintain physiologic ventricular activation (e.g., cardiac resynchronization therapy [CRT] or His bundle pacing) over right ventricular pacing."	IIa	B-R^{SR}
"In patients with atrioventricular block who have an indication for permanent pacing with a LVEF between 36% and 50% and are expected to require ventricular pacing less than 40% of the time, it is reasonable to choose right ventricular pacing	IIa	B-R

Recommendation	COR	LOE
over pacing methods that maintain physiologic ventricular activation (e.g., CRT or His bundle pacing)."		

COR: class of recommendation; LOE: level of evidence; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction.

A focused update to 2008 guidelines for device-based treatment of cardiac rhythm abnormalities was published jointly by ACC Foundation, American Heart Association, and Heart Rhythm Society in 2012. The ACC and American Heart Association (2013) subsequently published guidelines for the management of heart failure. These guidelines made recommendations on CRT for heart failure that are in line with those made by the ACC, American Heart Association, and Heart Rhythm Society related to CRT for heart failure in 2012. The ACC, American Heart Association, and Heart Failure Society of America published guidelines on the management of heart failure (2022) this year to replace the 2013 guidelines. These most recent recommendations on CRT for heart failure from the guidelines are included in Table 2.

Table 2. Joint Guidelines on Device-Based Treatment of Cardiac Rhythm Abnormalities

Recommendation	COR	LOE
CRT is indicated for patients who have LVEF less than or equal to 35%, sinus rhythm, LBBB with a QRS duration greater than or equal to 150 ms, and NYHA class II, III, or ambulatory IV symptoms on GDMT	I	B[a]
CRT can be useful for patients who have LVEF less than or equal to 35%, sinus rhythm, LBBB with a QRS duration 120 to 149 ms, and NYHA class II, III, or ambulatory IV symptoms on GDMT	IIa	B[b]
CRT can be useful for patients who have LVEF less than or equal to 35%, sinus rhythm, a non-LBBB pattern with a QRS duration greater than or equal to 150 ms, and NYHA class II, III, or ambulatory class IV symptoms on GDMT	IIa	B[a]
CRT is reasonable in patients with high-degree or complete heart block and LVEF of 36% to 50%	IIa	B[a]
CRT can be useful in patients with atrial fibrillation and LVEF less than or equal to 35% on GDMT if a) the patient requires ventricular pacing or otherwise meets CRT criteria and b) AV nodal ablation or pharmacologic rate control will allow near 100% ventricular pacing with CRT	IIa	B[b]
CRT can be useful for patients on GDMT who have LVEF less than or equal to 35% and are undergoing new or replacement device placement with anticipated requirement for significant (>40%) ventricular pacing	IIa	B[b]

CRT may be considered for patients who have LVEF less than or equal to 30%, ischemic etiology of heart failure, sinus rhythm, LBBB with a QRS duration of greater than or equal to 150 ms, and NYHA class I symptoms on GDMT	IIb	B[b]
CRT may be considered for patients who have LVEF less than or equal to 35%, sinus rhythm, a non-LBBB pattern with QRS duration 120 to 149 ms, and NYHA class III/ambulatory class IV on GDMT	IIb	B[b]
CRT is not recommended in patients with QRS duration less than 120 ms	III[c]	B[a]
CRT is not recommended for patients with NYHA class I or II symptoms and non-LBBB pattern with QRS duration less than 150 ms	II[c]	B[b]
CRT-Dis not indicated for patients whose comorbidities and/or frailty limit survival with good functional capacity to less than 1 year	II[c]	C[d]

AV: atrioventricular; COR: class of recommendation; CRT: cardiac resynchronization therapy; CRT-D: cardiac resynchronization therapy with defibrillation; GDMT: guideline-directed medical therapy; LBBB: left bundle
branch block; LOE: level of evidence; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; NYHA: New York Heart Association.

[a]Moderate quality evidence from 1 or more RCTs.

[b]Moderate-quality evidence from 1 or more well-designed, well-executed nonrandomized studies, observational studies, or registry studies.

[c]No benefit.

[d]Limited data.

Heart Failure Society of America
The Heart Failure Society of America released comprehensive guidelines on the management of heart failure in 2010. The guidelines include the following recommendations related to the use of CRT:

Table 3. Guidelines on Management of Heart Failure

Recommendation	**LOE**
Biventricular pacing therapy is recommended for patients in sinus rhythm with a widened QRS interval (≥120 ms) and severe LV systolic dysfunction (LVEF ≤35%) who have persistent, moderate to severe HF (NYHA III) despite optimal medical therapy.	A

Biventricular pacing therapy may be considered for patients with atrial fibrillation with a widened QRS interval (≥120 ms) and severe LV systolic dysfunction LVEF ≤35% who have persistent, moderate to severe HF (NYHA III) despite optimal medical therapy	B
Selected ambulatory NYHA IV patients in sinus rhythm with QRS ≥120 ms and LV systolic dysfunction may be considered for biventricular pacing therapy	B
Biventricular pacing therapy may be considered in patients with reduced LVEF and QRS ≥150 ms who have NYHA I or II HF symptoms.	B
In patients with reduced LVEF who require chronic pacing and in whom frequent ventricular pacing is expected, biventricular pacing may be considered.	C

HF: heart failure; LOE: level of evidence; LV: left ventricular; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; NYHA: New York Heart Association.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
The NICE (2014) guidance provided recommendations on CRT for heart failure. The recommendations for patients with left ventricular ejection fraction of 35% or less are listed in Table 4.

Table 4. Guidelines on Management of Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy for Heart Failure

Indication	Recommendation
NYHA class I-IV with QRS interval <120 ms	CRT not recommended
NYHA class IV with QRS interval 120 to 149 ms and without LBBB	CRT-P recommended
NYHA class II-III with QRS interval 120 to 149 ms and with LBBB	CRT-D recommended
NYHA class III-IV with QRS interval 120 to 149 ms and with LBBB	CRT-P recommended
NYHA class I-III with QRS interval ≥150 ms (with or without LBBB)	CRT-D recommended
NYHA class III-IV with QRS interval ≥150 ms (with or without LBBB)	CRT-P recommended

CRT: cardiac resynchronization therapy; CRT-D: cardiac resynchronization therapy with implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; CRT-P: cardiac resynchronization therapy with pacemaker; LBBB: left bundle branch block; NYHA: New York Heart Association.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations
Not applicable

KEY WORDS:

InSync®, Biventricular Pacemaker, biventricular pacing, congestive heart failure (CHF), pacemaker, cardiac resynchronization, CRT, cardiac resynchronization therapy, Viva™ Quad XT, Viva Quad S, Attain Performa®, Dynagen, Inogen, OptiVol™, Triple site CRT, Triventricular Pacemaker, intrathoracic fluid monitoring sensor; WiSE-CRT, EBR Systems

APPROVED BY GOVERNING BODIES:

There are numerous CRT devices, combined implantable cardiac defibrillator (ICD) plus CRT devices (CRT-D), and combined CRT plus fluid monitoring devices. Some of the devices are discussed here. For example, in 2001, a stand-alone biventricular pacemaker (InSync® Biventricular Pacing System, Medtronic) received approval by U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the premarket approval (PMA) process for the treatment of patients with New York Heart Association (NYHA) Class III or IV heart failure, on a stable pharmacologic regimen, who also have a QRS duration of 130 ms or longer and a left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) of 35% or less. Both Guidant (CONTAK CD® CRT-D System) and Medtronic (InSync® ICD Model 7272) have received FDA approval through the PMA process for combined cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillators for patients at high risk of sudden cardiac death due to ventricular arrhythmias and who have NYHA Class III or IV heart failure with LVEF of 35% or less, QRS duration 130 ms or longer (≥120 ms for the Guidant device), and remain symptomatic despite a stable, optimal heart failure drug therapy. In 2006, Biotronik Inc. received premarket approval through the FDA for its combined ICD/CRT device with ventricular pacing leads (Tupos LV/ATx CRT-D/Kronos LV-T CRT-D systems); in 2013, the company received FDA approval for updated ICD/CRT devices (Ilesto/Iforia series).

On the basis of the MADIT-CRT study, indications for three Guidant (Boston Scientific) CRT-defibrillator devices (Cognis®, Livian®, and Contak Renewal devices) were expanded to include patients with heart failure who receive stable optimal pharmacologic therapy for heart failure and who meet any one of the following classifications:

- Moderate-to-severe heart failure (NYHA class III or IV) with ejection fraction less than 35% and QRS duration greater than 120ms.
- Left bundle branch block with QRS greater than or equal to 130ms, ejection fraction less than 30%, and mild (NYHA class II) ischemic or nonischemic heart failure or asymptomatic (NYHA class I) ischemic heart failure.

In April 2014, FDA further expanded the indications for multiple Medtronic CRT devices to include patients with NYHA functional class I, II, or III heart failure, who have LVEF of 50% or less on stable, optimal heart failure medical therapy, if indicated, and have AV block that is expected to require a high percentage of ventricular pacing that cannot be managed with algorithms to minimize right ventricular pacing. The expanded indication was based on data from the BLOCK-HF study, a Medtronic-sponsored RCT to evaluate the use of CRT in patients with NYHA class I, II, or III heart failure, LVF ≤50%, and AV block.

Several CRT devices incorporate a fourth lead, providing quadripolar pacing. The Medtronic VIVA™ Quad XT and the Viva Quad S incorporate a fourth lead, the Medtroinc Attain

Performa® left ventricular lead, which received clearance for marketing from FDA in August 2014. The Dynagen™ X4 and Inogen™ X4 devices incorporate a fourth lead. Other CRT devices with quadripolar leads have been approved for use outside of the United States (e.g. St. Jude Quartet™ left ventricular lead).

Multiple devices manufactured by Medtronic combine a CRT with the OpitVol™ monitoring system. For example, in 2005, the InSync Sentry® system received FDA approval through the supplemental premarket approval (PMA) process. This combined biventricular pacemaker/ICD is also equipped to monitor intrathoracic fluid levels using bioimpedance technology, referred to as OptiVol™ Fluid Status Monitoring. Bioimpedance measures, defined as the electrical resistance of tissue to flow of current, are performed many times per day using a vector from the right ventricular coil on the lead in the right side of the heart to the implanted pacemaker devices; changes in bioimpedance reflect intrathoracic fluid status and are evaluated based on a computer algorithm. For example, changes in a patient's daily average of intrathoracic bioimpedance can be monitored; differences in the daily average compared with a baseline are reported as the OptiVol Fluid Index. It has been proposed that these data may be used as an early warning system of cardiac decompensation or to provide additional feedback enabling a physician to further tailor medical therapy. (See medical policy #441 – Cardiac Hemodynamic Monitoring for the Management of Heart Failure in the Outpatient Setting for stand alone devices)

The WiSE-CRT (EBR Systems) provides CRT with a small wireless electrode that is implanted within the left ventricle and controlled by ultrasound. It has European CE approval and is being studied in a multicenter pivotal trial.

BENEFIT APPLICATION:

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

CURRENT CODING:

CPT codes:

0515T	Insertion of wireless cardiac stimulator for left ventricular pacing, including device interrogation and programming, and imaging supervision and interpretation, when performed; complete system (includes electrode and generator [transmitter and battery]) (Effective 01/01/2019)
0516T	Insertion of wireless cardiac stimulator for left ventricular pacing, including device interrogation and programming, and imaging supervision and interpretation, when performed; electrode only (Effective 01/01/2019)
0517T	Insertion of wireless cardiac stimulator for left ventricular pacing, including device

	interrogation and programming, and imaging supervision and interpretation, when performed; pulse generator component(s) (battery and/or transmitter) only (Effective 01/01/2019)
0518T	Removal of only pulse generator component(s) (battery and/or transmitter) of wireless cardiac stimulator for left ventricular pacing (Effective 01/01/2019)
0519T	Removal and replacement of wireless cardiac stimulator for left ventricular pacing; pulse generator component(s) (battery and/or transmitter) (Effective 01/01/2019)
0520T	Removal and replacement of wireless cardiac stimulator for left ventricular pacing; pulse generator component(s) (battery and/or transmitter), including placement of a new electrode (Effective 01/01/2019)
0521T	Interrogation device evaluation (in person) with analysis, review and report, includes connection, recording, and disconnection per patient encounter, wireless cardiac stimulator for left ventricular pacing (Effective 01/01/2019)
0522T	Programming device evaluation (in person) with iterative adjustment of the implantable device to test the function of the device and select optimal permanent programmed values with analysis, including review and report, wireless cardiac stimulator for left ventricular pacing (Effective 01/01/2019)
33207	Insertion of new or replacement of permanent pacemaker with transvenous electrode(s); ventricular
33208	Insertion or replacement of permanent pacemaker with transvenous electrode(s); atrial and ventricular
33213	Insertion of pacemaker pulse generator only; with existing dual leads
33217	Insertion of 2 transvenous electrodes, permanent pacemaker or implantable defibrillator
33221	Insertion of pacemaker pulse generator only; with existing multiple leads
33224	Insertion of pacing electrode, cardiac venous system, for left ventricular pacing, with attachment to previously placed pacemaker or pacing cardioverter-defibrillator pulse generator (including revision of pocket, removal insertion and/or replacement of existing generator)
33225	Insertion of pacing electrode, cardiac venous system, for left ventricular pacing, at time of insertion of implantable defibrillator or pacemaker pulse generator (i.e., upgrade to dual

	chamber system) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure
33226	Repositioning of previously implanted cardiac venous system (left ventricular) electrode (including removal, insertion and/or replacement of existing generator)
33228	Removal of permanent pacemaker pulse generator with replacement of pacemaker pulse generator; dual lead system
33229	Removal of permanent pacemaker pulse generator with replacement of pacemaker pulse generator; multiple lead system
33233	Removal of permanent pacemaker pulse generator only

REFERENCES:

1. Abraham WT, Compton S, Haas G, et al. Intrathoracic impedance vs daily weight monitoring for predicting worsening heart failure events: results of the Fluid Accumulation Status Trial (FAST). Congest Heart Fail. Mar-Apr 2011; 17(2): 51-55.
2. Ali-Hassan-Sayegh S, Mirhosseini SJ, Karimi-Bondarabadi AA, et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with mild heart failure is a reversal therapy. Indian Heart J. Jan - Feb 2017; 69(1):112-118.
3. Al-Majed NS, McAlister FA, Bakal JA et al. Meta-analysis: cardiac resynchronization therapy for patients with less symptomatic heart failure. Ann Intern Med 2011. [ePub ahead of print]
4. Anselme F, Bordachar P, Pasquie JL, et al. Safety, feasibility, and outcome results of cardiac resynchronization with triple-site ventricular stimulation compared to conventional cardiac resynchronization. Heart Rhythm. Jan 2016;13(1):183-189.
5. Bencardino G, Di Monaco A, Russo E, et al. Outcome of Patients Treated by Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy Using a Quadripolar Left Ventricular Lead. Circ J. Feb 25 2016; 80(3):613-618.
6. Bertoldi EG, Polanczyk CA, Cunha V et al. Mortality reduction of cardiac resynchronization and implantable cardioverter-defibrillator therapy in heart failure: an updated meta-analysis. Does recent evidence change the standard of care? J Card Fail 2011; 17(10):860-6.
7. Bohm M, Drexler H, Oswald H, et al. Fluid status telemedicine alerts for heart failure: a randomized controlled trial. Eur Heart J. Nov 01 2016; 37(41):3154-3163.
8. Boriani G, Kranig W, Donal E, et al. A randomized double-blind comparison of biventricular versus left ventricular stimulation for cardiac resynchronization therapy: the Biventricular versus Left Univentricular Pacing with ICD Back-up in Heart Failure Patients (B-LEFT HF) trial. Am Heart J. Jun 2010; 159(6):1052-1058.e1051.

9. Brachmann J, Bohm M, Rybak K et al. Fluid status monitoring with a wireless network to reduce cardiovascular-related hospitalizations and mortality in heart failure: rationale and design of the OptiLink HF Study (Optimization of Heart Failure Management using OptiVol Fluid Status Monitoring and CareLink). Eur J Heart Fail 2011; 13(7):796-804.
10. Brignole M, Auricchio A, Baron-Esquivias G, et al. 2013 ESC Guidelines on cardiac pacing and cardiac resynchronization therapy: the Task Force on cardiac pacing and resynchronization therapy of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Developed in collaboration with the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA). Eur Heart J. Aug 2013;34(29):2281-2329.
11. Brignole M, Botto G, Mont L et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients undergoing atrioventricular junction ablation for permanent atrial fibrillation: a randomized trial. Eur Heart J 2011; 32(19):2420-9.
12. Brignole M, Pokushalov E, Pentimalli F, et al. A randomized controlled trial of atrioventricular junction ablation and cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with permanent atrial fibrillation and narrow QRS. Eur Heart J. Dec 01 2018; 39(45): 3999-4008.
13. Brignole M, Pentimalli F, Palmisano P, et al. AV junction ablation and cardiac resynchronization for patients with permanent atrial fibrillation and narrow QRS: the APAF-CRT mortality trial. Eur Heart J. Dec 07 2021; 42(46): 4731-4739.
14. Bryant AR, Wilton SB, Lai MP, et al. Association between QRS duration and outcome with cardiac resynchronization therapy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Electrocardiol. Mar 2013; 46(2): 147-155.
15. Chan JY, Fang F, Zhang Q, et al. Biventricular pacing is superior to right ventricular pacing in bradycardia patients with preserved systolic function: 2-year results of the PACE trial. Eur Heart J. Oct 2011; 32(20):2533- 2540.
16. Chen S, Ling Z, Kiuchi MG, et al. The efficacy and safety of cardiac resynchronization therapy combined with implantable cardioverter defibrillator for heart failure: a meta-analysis of 5674 patients. Europace. Jul 2013; 15(7): 992-1001.
17. Conraads VM, Tavazzi L, Santini M et al. Sensitivity and positive predictive value of implantable intrathoracic impedance monitoring as a predictor of heart failure hospitalizations: the SENSE-HF trial. European Heart Journal 2011.
18. Curtis AB, Worley SJ, Adamson PB, et al. Biventricular pacing for atrioventricular block and systolic dysfunction. N Engl J med. Apr 25 2013; 368 (17): 1585-1593.
19. Curtis AB, Worley SJ, Chung ES, et al. Improvement in clinical outcomes with biventricular versus right ventricular pacing: The BLOCK HF Study. J Am Coll Cardiol. May 10 2016; 67(18):2148-2157.
20. Diab IG, Hunter RJ, Kamdar R et al. Does ventricular dyssynchrony on echocardiography predict response to cardiac resynchronisation therapy? A randomised controlled study. Heart 2011; 97(17):1410-6.
21. Domenichini G, Rahneva T, Diab IG, et al. The lung impedance monitoring in treatment of chronic heart failure (the LIMIT-CHF study). Europace. Mar 2016; 18(3):428-435.
22. European Society of C, European Heart Rhythm A, Brignole M et al. 2013 ESC guidelines on cardiac pacing and cardiac resynchronization therapy: the task force on

cardiac pacing and resynchronization therapy of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Developed in collaboration with the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA). Europace 2013; 15(8):1070-118.

23. FDA. Approval Order: Biotronic PMA P050023. 2013. Available online at: www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf5/P050023S058A.pdf. Last accessed. Accessed April 8, 2021.
24. FDA. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data: Tupos LV/ATx CRT-D, Kronos LV-T CRT-D. 2006. Available online at: www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf5/P050023b.pdf. Accessed April 20, 2018.
25. FDA. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data, PMA P030054. 2005; www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf3/P030054b.pdf. Accessed April 20, 2018.
26. FDA. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data, PMA P030035. 2005; www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/dockets/05m0289/05m-0289-aav0001-03-SSED-vol1.pdf. Accessed March 31, 2016
27. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data: Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy Defibrillator (CRT-D). 2010; www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf/P010012S230b.pdf. Accessed April 8, 2021.
28. Foley PW, Patel K, Irwin N, et al. Cardiac resynchronisation therapy in patients with heart failure and a normal QRS duration: the RESPOND study. Heart. Jul 2011; 97(13):1041-1047.
29. Friedman DJ, Bao H, Spatz ES, et al. Association between a prolonged pr interval and outcomes of cardiac resynchronization therapy: a report from the National Cardiovascular Data Registry. Circulation. Nov 22 2016; 134(21):1617-1628.
30. Ganesan AN, Brooks AG, Roberts-Thomson KC et al. Role of AV nodal ablation in cardiac resynchronization in patients with coexistent atrial fibrillation and heart failure: a systematic review. J Am Coll Cardiol 2012; 59(8):719-26.
31. Gillis AM, Kerr CR, Philippon F. et al. Impact of cardiac resynchronization therapy on hospitalizations in the resynchronization-defibrillation for ambulatory heart failure trial. Circulation May 20 2014; 129(20): 2021-2030.
32. Gillis AM, Kerr CR, Philippon F, et al. Impact of cardiac resynchronization therapy on hospitalizations in the Resynchronization-Defibrillation for Ambulatory Heart Failure trial. Circulation. May 20 2014; 129(20): 2021-30.
33. Gold MR, Padhiar A, Mealing S, et al. Long-Term Extrapolation of Clinical Benefits Among Patients With Mild Heart Failure Receiving Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy: Analysis of the 5-Year Follow-Up From the REVERSE Study. JACC Heart Fail. Sep 2015; 3(9):691-700.
34. Goldenberg I, Hall WJ, Beck CA et al. Reduction of the risk of recurring heart failure events with cardiac resynchronization therapy: MADIT-CRT (Multicenter Automatic Defibrillator Implantation Trial With Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy). J Am Coll Cardiol 2011; 58(7):729-37.
35. Goldenberg I, Kutyifa V, Klein HU, et al. Survival with cardiac-resynchronization therapy in mild heart failure. N Engl J Med. May 1 2014; 370 (18): 1694-1701.

36. Gould J, Claridge S, Jackson T, et al. Standard care vs. TRIVEntricular pacing in Heart Failure (STRIVE HF): a prospective multicentre randomized controlled trial of triventricular pacing vs. conventional biventricular pacing in patients with heart failure and intermediate QRS left bundle branch block. Europace. Nov 22 2021.
37. Gula LJ, Wells GA, Yee R, et al. A novel algorithm to assess risk of heart failure exacerbation using ICD diagnostics: validation from RAFT. Heart Rhythm Sep 2014; 11(9): 1626-1631.
38. Hawkins NM, Petrie MC, MacDonald MR et al. Selecting patients for cardiac resynchronization therapy: electrical or mechanical dyssynchrony? Eur Heart J 2006; 27(11):1270-81.
39. Healey JS, Hohnloser SH, Exner DV et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with permanent atrial fibrillation: results from the resynchronization for ambulatory heart failure trial (RAFT). Circ Heart Fail. Sep 1 2012; 5(5): 566-570.
40. Heart Failure Society of America, Lindenfeld J, Albert NM et al. HFSA 2010 Comprehensive Heart Failure Practice Guideline. Journal of Cardiac Failure 2010; 16(6):e1-194.
41. Heidenreich PA, Bozkurt B, Aguilar D, et al. 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. J Am Coll Cardiol. May 03 2022; 79(17): e263-e421.
42. Hosseini SM, Moazzami K, Rozen G, et al. Utilization and in-hospital complications of cardiac resynchronization therapy: trends in the United States from 2003 to 2013. Eur Heart J. Mar 13 2017.
43. Innes Donald, et al. VDD pacing at short atrioventricular intervals does not improve cardiac output in patients with dilated heart failure. PACE, May 1994, Vol. 17, Part I, pp. 956-965.
44. IOM (Institute of Medicine). 2011. Clinical Practice Guidelines We Can Trust. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
45. Kalscheur MM, Saxon LA, Lee BK, et al. Outcomes of cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with intermittent atrial fibrillation or atrial flutter in the COMPANION trial. Heart Rhythm. Mar 17 2017.
46. Kang SH, Oh IY, Kang DY et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy and QRS duration: systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression. J Korean Med Sci. Jan 2015; 30(1): 24-33.
47. Khazanie P, Greiner MA, Al-Khatib SM, et al. Comparative effectiveness of cardiac resynchronization therapy among patients with heart failure and atrial fibrillation: findings from the National Cardiovascular Data Registry's Implantable Cardioverter-Defibrillator Registry. Circ Heart Fail. Jun 2016; 9(6).
48. Kusumoto FM, Schoenfeld MH, Barrett C, et al. 2018 ACC/AHA/HRS Guideline on the Evaluation and Management of Patients With Bradycardia and Cardiac Conduction Delay: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines, and the Heart Rhythm Society. J Am Coll Cardiol. Aug 20 2019; 74(7): 932-987.

49. Kutyifa V, Stockburger M, Daubert JP, et al. PR interval identifies clinical response in patients with non-left bundle branch block: a multicenter automatic defibrillator implantation trial-cardiac resynchronization therapy substudy. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol. Aug 2014; 7(4): 645-651.
50. Lenarczyk R, Kowalski O, Sredniawa B et al. Implantation feasibility, procedure-related adverse events and lead performance during 1-year follow-up in patients undergoing triple-site cardiac resynchronization therapy: a substudy of TRUST CRT randomized trial. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol 2012; 23(11):1228-36.
51. Lin J, Buhr KA, Kipp R. Effect of PR interval on outcomes following cardiac resynchronization therapy: a secondary analysis of the COMPANION trial. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. Feb 2017; 28(2):185-191.
52. Linde C, Gold MR, Abraham WT et al. Long term impact of cardiac resynchronization therapy in mild heart failure: 5 year results from the resynchronization reverses remodeling in systolic left ventricular dysfunction (REVERSE) study. Eur Heart J. Sep 2013; 34(33): 2592-2599.
53. Lindenfeld J, Albert NM, Boehmer JP, et al. HFSA 2010 Comprehensive Heart Failure Practice Guideline. J Card Fail. Jun 2010; 16(6): e1-194.
54. Luthje L, Vollmann D, Seegers J, et al. A randomized study of remote monitoring and fluid monitoring for the management of patients with implanted cardiac arrhythmia devices. Europace. Aug 2015; 17(8):1276-1281.
55. Martinelli Filho M, de Siqueira SF, Costa R, et al. Conventional versus biventricular pacing in heart failure and bradyarrhythmia: the COMBAT study. J Card Fail. Apr 2010; 16(4):293-300.
56. Muto C, Solimene F, Gallo P et al. A randomized study of cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator versus dual-chamber implantable cardioverter-defibrillator in ischemic cardiomyopathy with narrow QRS: the NARROW-CRT study. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol 2013; 6(3):538-45.
57. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Implantable cardioverter defibrillators and cardiac resynchronisation therapy for arrhythmias and heart failure, technology appraisal guidance [TA314]. 2014; www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta314. Accessed April 5, 2021.
58. Nery PB, Ha AC, Keren A et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with left ventricular systolic dysfunction and right bundle branch block: a systematic review. Heart Rhythm 2011; 8(7):1083-7.
59. Ogano M, Iwasaki YK, Tanabe J et al. Antiarrhythmic effect of cardiac resynchronization therapy with triple-site biventricular stimulation. Europace 2013; 15(10):1491-8.
60. Pappone C, Calovic Z, Vicedomini G, et al. Improving cardiac resynchronization therapy response with multipoint left ventricular pacing: Twelve-month follow-up study. Heart Rhythm. Jun 2015; 12(6):1250-1258.
61. Peterson PN, Greiner MA, Qualls LG et al. QRS duration, bundle-branch block morphology, and outcomes among older patients with heart failure receiving cardiac resynchronization therapy. JAMA 2013; 310(6):617-26.

62. Rogers DP, Lambiase PD, Lowe MD et al. A randomized double-blind crossover trial of triventricular versus biventricular pacing in heart failure. Eur J Heart Fail 2012; 14(5):495-505.
63. Ruschitzka F, Abraham WT, Singh JP et al. Cardiac-resynchronization therapy in heart failure with a narrow QRS complex. New England Journal of Medicine 2013; 369(15):1395-405.
64. Santangeli P, Di Biase L, Pelargonio G, et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with mild heart failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Interv Card Electrophysiol. Nov 2011; 32(2):125-135.
65. Sekiguchi Y, Tada H, Yoshida K et al. Significant increase in the incidence of ventricular arrhythmic events after an intrathoracic impedance change measured with a cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator. Circ J 2011; 75(11):2614-20.
66. Shah RM, Patel D, Molnar J, et al. Cardiac-resynchronization therapy in patients with systolic heart failure and QRS interval</= 130ms: insights from a meta-analysis. Europace Feb 2015; 17(2): 267-273.
67. Sipahi I, Carrigan TP, Rowland DY et al. Impact of QRS duration on clinical event reduction with cardiac resynchronization therapy: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Arch Intern Med 2011; 171(16):1454-62.
68. Sipahi I, Chou JC, Hyden M et al. Effect of QRS morphology on clinical event reduction with cardiac resynchronization therapy: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Am Heart J. Feb 2012; 163(2): 260-267.
69. Stavrakis S, Lazzara R, Thadani U. The benefit of cardiac resynchronization therapy and QRS duration: a meta-analysis. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. Feb 2012; 23(2): 163-168.
70. Stockburger M, Moss AJ, Klein HU, et al. Sustained clinical benefit of cardiac resynchronization therapy in non LBBB patients with prolonged PR-interval: MADIT-CRT long-term follow-up. Clin Res Cardiol. Nov 2016; 105(11):944-952.
71. Sun WP, Li CL, Guo JC, et al. Long-term efficacy of implantable cardiac resynchronization therapy plus defibrillator for primary prevention of sudden cardiac death in patients with mild heart failure: an updated metaanalysis. Heart Fail Rev. Jul 2016; 21(4):447-453.
72. Tang AS, Wells GA, Talajic M et al. Cardiac-resynchronization therapy for mild-to-moderate heart failure. N Engl J Med 2010; 363(25):2385-95.
73. Thibault B, Ducharme A, Harel F, et al. Left ventricular versus simultaneous biventricular pacing in patients with heart failure and a QRS complex >/=120 milliseconds. Circulation. Dec 20 2011; 124(25):2874-2881.
74. Thibault B, harel F, Ducharme A, et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with heart failure and a QRS complex <120 milliseconds: the evaluation of resynchronization therapy for heart failure (LESSER-EARTH) trial. Circulation. Feb 26 2013; 127(8): 873-881.
75. Tracy CM, Epstein AE, Darbar D et al. 2012 ACCF/AHA/HRS Focused Update of the 2008 Guidelines for Device-Based Therapy of Cardiac Rhythm Abnormalities: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task

Force on Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. Circulation 2012; 126(14):1784-800.

76. Tsao CW, Aday AW, Almarzooq ZI, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2022 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. Circulation. Feb 22 2022; 145(8): e153-e639.
77. Tu R, Zhong G, Zeng Z et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with mild heart failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Cardiovasc Drugs Ther 2011; 25(4):331-40.
78. van Geldorp IE, Vernooy K, Delhaas T, et al. Beneficial effects of biventricular pacing in chronically right ventricular paced patients with mild cardiomyopathy. Europace. Feb 2010; 12(2):223-229.
79. van Rees JB, de Bie MK, Thijssen J et al. Implantation-related complications of implantable cardioverter-defibrillators and cardiac resynchronization therapy devices: a systematic review of randomized clinical trials. J Am Coll Cardiol 2011; 58(10):995-1000.
80. Wells G, Parkash R, Healey JS et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. CMAJ 2011; 183(4):421-9.
81. Whellan DJ, Ousdigian KT, Al-Khatib SM et al. Combined Heart Failure Device Diagnostics Identify Patients at Higher Risk of Subsequent Heart Failure Hospitalizations Results From PARTNERS HF (Program to Access and Review Trending Information and Evaluate Correlation to Symptoms in Patients With Heart Failure) Study. Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2010; 55(17):1803-10.
82. Wilton SB, Leung AA, Ghali WA et al. Outcomes of cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with versus those without atrial fibrillation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Heart Rhythm 2011; 8(7):1088-94.
83. Woods B, Hawkins N, Mealing S, et al. Individual patient data network meta-analysis of mortality effects of implantable cardiac devices. Heart. Nov 2015; 101(22):1800-1806.
84. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, eta l. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of heart failure: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American heart Association Task Force on practice guidelines. Circulation. Oct 15 2013; 128(16): 1810-1852.
85. Yin J, Hu H, Wang Y, et al. Effects of atrioventricular nodal ablation on permanent atrial fibrillation patients with cardiac resynchronization therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Cardiol. Nov 2014; 37(11): 707-715.
86. Yu CM, Fang F, Luo XX, et al. Long term follow up results of the pacing to avoid cardiac enlargement (PACE) trial. Eur J Heart Fail. Sep 2014; 16(9): 1016-1025.
87. Yu CM, Wang L, Stadler R et al. Impedance based prediction of CHF admission precedes symptoms in heart failure patients. Pacing Clin Electrophysiol 2004; 1(suppl):S213.
88. Zhang B, Guo J, Zhang G. Comparison of triple-site ventricular pacing versus conventional cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with systolic heart failure: A meta-analysis of randomized and observational studies. J Arrhythmia. 2018;34:55-64.

89. Zusterzeel R, Seizman KA, Sanders WE, eta l. Cardiac resynchronization therapy in women: us food and drug administration meta-analysis of patient level data. JAMA Intern Med. Aug 2014; 174(8): 1340-1348.

POLICY HISTORY:

Adopted for Blue Advantage, March 2005
Available for comment May 12-June 27, 2005
Medical Policy Group, August 2006
Medical Policy Group, August 2009
Available for comment July 17-August 31, 2009
Medical Policy Group, October 2009
Available for comment October 20-December 3, 2009
Medical Policy Group, April 2011
Available for comment May 11 – June 27, 2011
Medical Policy Group, November 2011
Medical Policy Group, April 2012
Medical Policy Group, April 2013
Available for comment May 22 through July 6, 2013
Medical Policy Group, April 2014
Medical Policy Group, December 2014
Medical Policy Group, June 2015
Available for comment June 4 through July 18, 2015
Medical Policy Group, June 2016
Medical Policy Group, December 2016
Medical Policy Group, June 2017
Medical Policy Group, June 2018
Available for comment June 11 through July 25, 2018
Medical Policy Group, December 2018, 2019 CPT Coding Update
Medical Policy Group, June 2019
Medical Policy Group, June 2020: Added CPT codes 33207 and 33217
Medical Policy Group, May 2021
Medical Policy Group, May 2022