



**BlueCross BlueShield
of Alabama**

Name of Blue Advantage Policy:
Focal Treatments for Prostate Cancer

Policy #: 596

Latest Review Date: September 2023

Category: Surgery

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 Blue will treat the use of any focal or subtotal therapy modality to treat individuals with localized prostate cancer as a non-covered benefit and as investigational.

*****Refer also to Blue Advantage policy 178: *MRI-Guided Focused Ultrasound (MRgFUS)***

*****Refer also to Blue Advantage NCD for *Cryosurgery of Prostate (230.9)***

*****Refer also to Blue Advantage policy 119: *Radiofrequency Ablation of Solid Tumors Excluding Liver Tumors***

*****Refer also to Blue Advantage policy 337: *Oncologic Applications of Photodynamic Therapy, Including Barrett's Esophagitis***

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:

Prostate cancer is the second most common cancer diagnosis men receive in the United States, and the behavior of localized prostate cancer can prove difficult to predict on a case-by-case basis. Most men with the cancer undergo whole-gland treatments, which can often lead to substantial adverse effects. In an effort to reduce tumor burden and minimize morbidity associated with radical treatment, investigators have developed a therapy known as focal treatment. Focal treatment seeks to ablate either an “index” lesion (defined as the largest cancerous lesion with the highest-grade tumor), or, alternatively, to ablate nonindex lesions and other areas where cancer has been known to occur. Addressed in this review are several ablative methods used to remove cancerous lesions in localized prostate cancer (e.g., focal laser ablation, high-intensity focused ultrasound [HIFU], cryoablation, radiofrequency ablation [RFA], photodynamic therapy). All methods, except focal laser ablation, use ultrasound guidance to focus on the tumor (focal laser ablation uses magnetic resonance imaging to guide the probe).

Prostate Cancer

Prostate cancer is the second most common cancer diagnosed among men in the U.S. According to the National Cancer Institute, nearly 268,490 new cases are estimated to be diagnosed in the U.S. in 2022, associated with around 34,500 deaths. Prostate cancer is more likely to develop in older men and in non-Hispanic Black men. About 6 in 10 cases are diagnosed in men who are ≥ 65 years of age, and it is rare in men < 40 years of age. Autopsy studies in the pre-prostate-specific antigen (PSA) screening era identified incidental cancerous foci in 30% of men 50 years of age, with incidence reaching 75% at age 80 years. However, the National Cancer Institute Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program data have shown that age-adjusted cancer-specific mortality rates for men with prostate cancer declined from 40 per 100,000 in 1992 to 19

per 100,000 in 2018. This decline has been attributed to a combination of earlier detection via PSA screening and improved therapies.

Diagnosis

From a clinical standpoint, different types of localized prostate cancers may appear similar during initial diagnosis. However, prostate cancer often exhibits varying degrees of risk progression that may not be captured by accepted clinical risk categories (eg, D'Amico criteria) or prognostic tools based on clinical findings (eg, PSA titers, Gleason grade, or tumor stage). In studies of conservative management, the risk of localized disease progression based on prostate cancer-specific survival rates at 10 years may range from 15% to 20% to perhaps 27% at 20-year follow-up. Among elderly men (≥ 70 years) with this type of low-risk disease, comorbidities typically supervene as a cause of death; these men will die from the comorbidities of prostate cancer rather than from cancer itself. Other very similar-appearing low-risk tumors may progress unexpectedly and rapidly, quickly disseminating and becoming incurable.

Treatments

The divergent behavior of localized prostate cancers creates uncertainty about whether to treat immediately. A patient may choose definitive treatment upfront. Surgery (radical prostatectomy) or external-beam radiotherapy (EBRT) are most commonly used to treat patients with localized prostate cancer. Complications most commonly reported with radical prostatectomy or EBRT and with the greatest variability are incontinence (0%-73%) and other genitourinary toxicities (irritative and obstructive symptoms); hematuria (typically $\leq 5\%$); gastrointestinal and bowel toxicity, including nausea and loose stools (25%-50%); proctopathy, including rectal pain and bleeding (10%-39%); and erectile dysfunction, including impotence (50%-90%).

American Urological Association guidelines suggest state that for patients with low-risk prostate cancer, clinicians should recommend active surveillance. With this approach, patients forego immediate therapy but continue regular monitoring until signs or symptoms of disease progression are evident, at which point curative treatment is instituted.

Focal Treatment of Localized Prostate Cancer

Given significant uncertainty in predicting behavior of individual localized prostate cancers, and the substantial adverse effects associated with definitive treatments, investigators have sought a therapeutic “middle ground.” The latter seeks to minimize morbidity associated with radical treatment in those who may not actually require it while reducing tumor burden to an extent that reduces the chances for rapid progression to incurability. This approach is termed focal treatment, in that it seeks to remove - using any of several ablative methods described next - cancerous lesions at high risk of progression, leaving behind uninvolved glandular parenchyma. The overall goal of focal treatment is to minimize the risk of early tumor progression and preserve erectile, urinary and rectal functions by reducing damage to the neurovascular bundles, external sphincter, bladder neck, and rectum. Although focal treatment is offered as an alternative middle approach to management of localized prostate cancer, several key issues must be considered in choosing it. They include patient selection, lesion selection, therapy monitoring, and the modality used to ablate lesions.

Patient Selection

A proportion of men with localized prostate cancer have been reported to have, or develop, serious misgivings and psychosocial problems in accepting active surveillance, sometimes leading to inappropriately discontinuing it. Thus, appropriate patient selection is imperative for physicians who must decide whether to recommend active surveillance or focal treatment for patients who refuse radical therapy or for whom it is not recommended due to the a risk-benefit balance.

Lesion Selection

Proper lesion selection is a second key consideration in choosing focal treatment of localized prostate cancer. Although prostate cancer has always been regarded as a multifocal disease, clinical evidence shows that between 10% and 40% of men who undergo radical prostatectomy for presumed multifocal disease actually have a unilaterally confined discrete lesion, which, when removed, would “cure” the patient. This view presumably has driven the use of region-targeted focal treatment variants, such as hemiablation of the half of the gland containing tumor, or subtotal prostate ablation via the “hockey stick” method. While these approaches can be curative, the more extensive the treatment, the more likely the functional adverse outcomes would approach those of radical treatments.

The concept that clinically indolent lesions comprise most of the tumor burden in a patient with organ-confined prostate cancer led to development of a lesion-targeted strategy, which is referred to as “focal therapy” in this evidence review. This involves treating only the largest and highest-grade cancerous focus (referred to as the “index lesion”), which has been shown in pathologic studies to determine clinical progression of disease. This concept is supported by molecular genetics evidence that suggests a single index tumor focus is usually responsible for disease progression and metastasis. The index lesion approach leaves in place small foci less than 0.5 cm in volume, with Gleason score less than 7 that are considered unlikely to progress over a 10- to 20-year period. This also leaves available subsequent definitive therapies as needed should disease progress.

Identification of prostate cancer lesions-disease localization-particularly the index lesion, is critical to oncologic success of focal therapy; equally imperative to success is the ability to guide focal ablation energy to the tumor and assess treatment effectiveness are additionally important to treatment success. At present, no single modality meets the requirements for all 3 activities (disease localization, focal ablation energy to the tumor, assessment of treatment effectiveness). Systematic transrectal ultrasound (TRUS)–guided biopsy alone has been investigated, but is considered insufficient for patient selection or disease localization for focal therapy.

Multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (mp-MRI), typically including T1-, T2-, diffusion-weighted imaging, and dynamic contrast-enhanced imaging, has been recognized as a promising modality to risk-stratify prostate cancer and select patients and lesions for focal therapy. Evidence shows mp-MRI can detect high-grade, large prostate cancer foci with performance similar to transperineal prostate mapping (TPM) using a brachytherapy template. For example, for the primary end point definition (lesion, ≥ 4 mm; Gleason score, $\geq 3+4$), with TPM as the reference standard, sensitivity, negative predictive value, and negative likelihood ratios with mp-MRI were 58% to 73%, 84% to 89%, and 0.3 to 0.5, respectively. Specificity, positive

predictive value, and positive likelihood ratios were 71% to 84%, 49% to 63%, and 2.0 to 3.44, respectively. The negative predictive value of mp-MRI appears sufficient to rule out clinically significant prostate cancer and may have clinical use in this setting. However, although mp-MRI technology has capability to detect and risk-stratify prostate cancer, several issues constrain its widespread use for these purposes (e.g., mpMRI requires highly specialized MRI-compatible equipment; biopsy within the magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scanner is challenging; interpretation of prostate MRI images requires experienced urologists) and it is still necessary to histologically confirm suspicious lesions using TPM.

Therapy Monitoring

Controversy exists as to the proper end points for focal therapy of prostate cancer. The primary end point of focal ablation of clinically significant disease with negative biopsies evaluated at 12 months posttreatment is generally accepted according to a European consensus report. The clinical validity of MRI to analyze the presence of residual or recurrent cancer compared with histologic findings is offered as a secondary end point. However, MRI findings alone are not considered sufficient in follow-up. Finally, although investigators indicate PSA levels should be monitored, they are not considered valid end points because the utility of PSA kinetics in tissue preservation treatments has not been established.

Modalities Used to Ablate Lesions

Five ablative methods for which clinical evidence is available are considered herein: focal laser ablation; high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU); cryoablation; radiofrequency ablation (RFA); and photodynamic therapy. Each method requires placement of a needle probe into a tumor volume followed by delivery of some type of energy that destroys the tissue in a controlled manner. All methods except focal laser ablation currently rely on ultrasound guidance to the tumor focus of interest; focal laser ablation uses MRI to guide the probe. This evidence review does not cover focal brachytherapy.

Focal Laser Ablation

FLA refers to the destruction of tissue using a focused beam of electromagnetic radiation emitted from a laser fiber introduced transperineal or transrectal into the cancer focus. Tissue is destroyed through thermal conversion of the focused electromagnetic energy into heat, causing coagulative necrosis. Other terms for FLA include photothermal therapy, laser interstitial therapy, and laser interstitial photocoagulation.

High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound

High-intensity focused ultrasound works by focusing high-energy ultrasound waves on a single location, which increases the local tissue temperature to over 80°C. This causes a discrete locus of coagulative necrosis of approximately 3x3x10 mm. The surgeon uses a transrectal probe to plan, carry out, and monitor treatment in a real-time sequence to ablate the entire gland or small discrete lesions.

Cryoablation

Cryoablation induces cell death through direct cellular toxicity from disruption of the cell membrane caused by ice-ball crystals and vascular compromise from thrombosis and ischemia

secondary to freezing below -30°C. It is performed by transperineal insertion under TRUS guidance of a varying number of cryoprobe needles into the tumor.

Radiofrequency Ablation

RFA uses energy produced by a 50-watt generator with a frequency of 460 kHz. The energy is transmitted to the tumor focus through 15 needle electrodes inserted transperineally under ultrasound guidance into the tissue. It produces an increase in tissue temperature causing coagulative necrosis.

Photodynamic Therapy

PDT uses an intravenous photosensitizing agent that distributes to prostate tissue, followed by delivery of light via transperineally inserted needles. The light induces a photochemical reaction that causes production of reactive oxygen species that are highly toxic and reactive with tissue causing functional and structural damage (i.e., cell death). A major concern with PDT is that real-time monitoring of tissue effects is not possible, and the variable optical properties of prostate tissue complicate assessment of necrosis and treatment progress.

KEY POINTS:

The most recent literature review was updated through July 11, 2023.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have primary localized prostate cancer who receive focal therapy using laser ablation, HIFU, cryoablation, RFA, or photodynamic therapy, the evidence includes systematic reviews, studies from a registry cohort, and numerous observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival (OS), disease-specific survival, symptoms, change in disease status, functional outcomes, quality of life (QoL), and treatment-related morbidity. The evidence is highly heterogeneous and inconsistently reports clinical outcomes. No prospective, comparative evidence was found for the majority of focal ablation techniques versus current standard treatment of localized prostate cancer, including radical prostatectomy, external-beam radiotherapy, or active surveillance. Methods have not been standardized to determine which and how many identified cancerous lesions should be treated for best outcomes. No evidence supports which, if any, of the focal techniques leads to better functional outcomes. Although high disease-specific survival rates have been reported, the short follow-up periods and small sample sizes preclude conclusions on the effect of any of these techniques on OS rates. The adverse event rates associated with focal therapies appear to be superior to those associated with radical treatments (eg, radical prostatectomy, external-beam radiotherapy); however, the evidence is limited in its quality, reporting, and scope. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

National Comprehensive Cancer Network

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines for prostate cancer (v.1.2023) recommend only cryosurgery and high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) as local therapy options for radiotherapy recurrence in the absence of metastatic disease (category 2B). Cryotherapy or other local therapies are not recommended as routine primary therapy for

localized prostate cancer due to lack of long-term data comparing these treatments to radiation or radical prostatectomy.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2019; updated in 2021) issued guidance on the use of cryoablation for localized prostate cancer. Cryoablation and high-intensity ultrasound are not recommended for the treatment of localized prostate cancer because there is a lack of evidence on quality of life benefits and long-term survival.

American Urological Association et al

The American Urological Association, in collaboration with the American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) with additional representation from the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), and Society of Urologic Oncology (SUO) published updated guidelines on the management of clinically localized prostate cancer in 2022. The guidelines included the following recommendation on focal treatments:

- "Clinicians should inform patients with intermediate-risk prostate cancer considering whole gland or focal ablation that there are a lack of high-quality data comparing ablation outcomes to radiation therapy, surgery, and active surveillance. (Expert Opinion)"
- "Clinicians should not recommend whole gland or focal ablation for patients with high-risk prostate cancer outside of a clinical trial. (Expert Opinion)"

National Cancer Institute

The National Cancer Institute (NCI; 2021) updated its information on prostate cancer treatments. The NCI indicated that cryoablation, photodynamic therapy, and HIFU were new treatment options currently being studied in national trials. The NCI offered no recommendation for or against these treatments.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force published recommendations for prostate cancer screening. However, there are no recommendations for focal treatment of prostate cancer.

KEY WORDS:

Focal Laser Ablation, FLA, High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound, HIFU, Cryoablation, Radiofrequency Thermal Ablation, Radiofrequency ablation, RFA, Photodynamic Therapy, PDT, prostate cancer, localized prostate cancer, Visualase[®] Thermal Therapy System, Ablatherm[®], Visual-ICE[®], Ice Rod CX, CryoCare[®], IceSphere, Photofrin[®], psoralen, porfimer sodium, ultraviolet lamps, Tranberg Thermal Therapy System, NanoTherm[®], NanoActivator[®], Magnetic Nanoparticles.

APPROVED BY GOVERNING BODIES:

Focal Laser Ablation

In 2010, the Visualase[®] Thermal Therapy System (Medtronic) and in 2015 the TRANBERG Laser fiber (Clinical Laserthermia Systems) were cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and

Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process for use to necrotize or coagulate soft tissue through interstitial irradiation or thermal therapy under magnetic resonance imaging guidance in cardiothoracic surgery, dermatology, otolaryngology, gastroenterology, general surgery, gynecology, head and neck surgery, neurosurgery, plastic surgery, orthopedics, pulmonology, radiology, and urology, for wavelengths 800 to 1064 nm. In 2021, the FDA granted a breakthrough device designation to a novel artificial intelligence (AI)-enabled focal therapy system for the treatment of localized prostate cancer. The Avenda[®] Health Focal Therapy System combines an AI-based margin prediction software algorithm with focal laser ablation to deliver treatment directly to the prostate tumor. FDA product code: LLZ, GEX, FRN.

High-Intensity Focused US

In October 2015, the Sonablate[®] 450 (SonaCare Medical) was cleared for marketing through the 510(k) process after approval of a de novo request and classified the device as class II under the generic name “high intensity ultrasound system for prostate tissue ablation”. This device was the first of its kind to be approved in the United States. In November 2015, Ablatherm[®]-HIFU (EDAP TMS) was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. In June 2018, EDAP received 510(k) clearance for its Focal-One[®] HIFU device designed for prostate tissue ablation procedures. This device fuses magnetic resonance and 3D biopsy data with real-time ultrasound imaging, allowing urologists to view detailed images of the prostate on a large monitor and direct high-intensity ultrasound waves to ablate the targeted area.

Cryotherapy

Some cryotherapy devices cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process for cryoablation of the prostate are: Visual-ICE[®] (Galil Medical), Ice Rod CX, CryoCare[®] (Galil Medical), and IceSphere (Galil Medical), and Cryocare[®] Systems (Endocare[®]). FDA product code: GEH.

Radiofrequency Ablation

Radiofrequency ablation devices have been cleared through the 510(k) process by FDA for the general use of soft tissue cutting and coagulation and ablation by thermal coagulation. Under this general indication, RFA may be used as a method to ablate tumors. FDA product code: GEI.

Photodynamic Therapy

FDA has granted approvals to several photosensitizing drugs and light applicators. Photofrin[®] (porfimer sodium) (Axcan Pharma) and psoralen are photosensitizers, ultraviolet lamps used in the treatment of cancer, were cleared from marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. FDA product code: FTC.

In 2020, an FDA advisory committee voted against recommending approval of padeliporfin di-potassium (Tookad[®]; Steba Biotech), a minimally invasive photodynamic therapy for localized prostate cancer, citing concerns that men with very low-risk disease would potentially choose this therapy instead of active surveillance, despite the unproven long-term benefits and harms of treatment.

Magnetic Nanoparticles

MagForce® USA, Inc. is conducting a clinical study evaluating NanoTherm® under an FDA Investigational Device Exemption(IDE) (NCT05010759). NanoTherm uses magnetic nanoparticles and an alternating magnetic field to create heat and local ablation in the ablation of prostate cancer.

BENEFIT APPLICATION:

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

CURRENT CODING:**CPT Codes:**

53899	unlisted procedure, urinary system
55880	Ablation of malignant prostate tissue, transrectal, with high intensity-focused ultrasound (HIFU), including ultrasound guidance (Effective 01/01/2021)
55899	unlisted procedure, male genital system
0655T	Transperineal focal laser ablation of malignant prostate tissue, including transrectal imaging guidance, with MR-fused images or other enhanced ultrasound imaging (Effective 07/01/21)
0738T	Treatment planning for magnetic field induction ablation of malignant prostate tissue, using data from previously performed magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) examination (Effective 01/01/2023)
0739T	Ablation of malignant prostate tissue by magnetic field induction, including all intraprocedural, transperineal needle/catheter placement for nanoparticle installation and intraprocedural temperature monitoring, thermal dosimetry, bladder irrigation, and magnetic field nanoparticle activation (Effective 01/01/2023)

REFERENCES:

1. Albisinni S, Melot C, Aoun F et al. Focal treatment for unilateral prostate cancer using high-intensity focal ultrasound: A comprehensive study of pooled data. J Endourol. 2018 Sept 12;32 (9):797-804.
2. American Cancer Society. Key statistics for prostate cancer. January 12, 2022. www.cancer.org/cancer/prostate-cancer/about/key-statistics.html.

3. American Urological Association (AUA). Guideline for the management of clinically localized prostate cancer. 2011; www.auanet.org/education/guidelines/prostate-cancer.cfm. Accessed June 2016.
4. Arumainayagam N, Ahmed HU, Moore CM, et al. Multiparametric MR imaging for detection of clinically significant prostate cancer: a validation cohort study with transperineal template prostate mapping as the reference standard. *Radiology*. Sep 2013; 268(3):761-769.
5. Azzouzi AR, Vincendeau S, Barret E, et al. Padeliporfin vascular-targeted photodynamic therapy versus active surveillance in men with low-risk prostate cancer (CLIN1001 PCM301): an open-label, phase 3, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol*. Feb 2017; 18(2): 181-191.
6. Bahn D, de Castro Abreu AL, Gill IS et al. Focal cryotherapy for clinically unilateral, low-intermediate risk prostate cancer in 73 men with a median follow-up of 3.7 years. *Eur Urol* 2012; 62(1):55-63.
7. Bates AS, Ayers J, Kostakopoulos N, et al. A Systematic Review of Focal Ablative Therapy for Clinically Localised Prostate Cancer in Comparison with Standard Management Options: Limitations of the Available Evidence and Recommendations for Clinical Practice and Further Research. *Eur Urol Oncol*. Jun 2021; 4(3): 405-423.
8. Briganti A, Tutolo M, Suardi N, et al. There is no way to identify patients who will harbor small volume, unilateral prostate cancer at final pathology. Implications for focal therapies. *Prostate*. Jun 1 2012; 72(8):925-930.
9. Brimo F, Montironi R, Egevad L, et al. Contemporary grading for prostate cancer: implications for patient care. *Eur Urol*. May 2013; 63(5):892-901.
10. Chao B, Lepor H. 5-Year Outcomes Following Focal Laser Ablation of Prostate Cancer. *Urology*. Sep 2021; 155: 124-129.
11. Crawford ED, Rove KO, Barqawi AB, et al. Clinical-pathologic correlation between transperineal mapping biopsies of the prostate and three-dimensional reconstruction of prostatectomy specimens. *Prostate*. May 2013; 73(7):778-787.
12. Dickinson L, Ahmed HU, Allen C, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging for the detection, localisation, and characterisation of prostate cancer: recommendations from a European consensus meeting. *Eur Urol*. Apr 2011; 59(4):477-494.
13. Duwe G, Boehm K, Haack M, et al. Single-center, prospective phase 2 trial of high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) in patients with unilateral localized prostate cancer: good functional results but oncologically not as safe as expected. *World J Urol*. May 2023; 41(5): 1293-1299.
14. Eastham JA, Aufferberg GB, Barocas DA, et al. Clinically Localized Prostate Cancer: AUA/ASTRO Guideline. 2022; www.auanet.org/guidelines/guidelines/clinically-localized-prostate-cancer-uaa/astro-guideline-2022.
15. Emberton M. TOOKAD (Padeliporfin) vascular-targeted photodynamic therapy versus active surveillance in men with low risk prostate cancer. A randomized phase 3 clinical trial. Paper presented at: European Association of Urology 2016; Munich, Germany.
16. Eylert MF, Persad R. Management of prostate cancer. *Br J Hosp Med (Lond)*. Feb 2012; 73(2):95-99.

17. Freedland SJ. Screening, risk assessment, and the approach to therapy in patients with prostate cancer. *Cancer*. Mar 15 2011; 117(6):1123-1135.
18. Gallina A, Maccagnano C, Suardi N, et al. Unilateral positive biopsies in low risk prostate cancer patients diagnosed with extended transrectal ultrasound-guided biopsy schemes do not predict unilateral prostate cancer at radical prostatectomy. *BJU Int*. Jul 2012; 110(2 Pt 2):E64-68.
19. Gill IS, Azzouzi AR, Emberton M, et al. Randomized trial of partial gland ablation with vascular targeted phototherapy versus active surveillance for low risk prostate cancer: extended followup and analyses of effectiveness. *J Urol*. Jun 2 2018.
20. Guillaumier A, Peters M, Rya M, et al. A multicentre study of 5-year outcomes following focal therapy in treating clinically significant nonmetastatic prostate cancer. *Eur Urol*. 2018 Oct;74(4):422-429.
21. Guo CC, Wang Y, Xiao L, et al. The relationship of TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion between primary and metastatic prostate cancers. *Hum Pathol*. May 2012; 43(5):644-649.
22. Hand L. FDA Panel Pans HIFU for Prostate Cancer. Jul 31, 2014. Medscape Medical News 2014, WebMD, LLC www.medscape.com/viewarticle/829179.
23. Heidenreich A, Bastian, PJ, Bellmunt, J, et al. European Association of Urology 2012 guidelines on prostate cancer (available at: www.uroweb.org/guidelines/online-guidelines/).
24. Hopstaken JS, Bomers JGR, Sedelaar MJP, et al. An Updated Systematic Review on Focal Therapy in Localized Prostate Cancer: What Has Changed over the Past 5 Years?. *Eur Urol*. Jan 2022; 81(1): 5-33.
25. Hu Y, Ahmed HU, Carter T, et al. A biopsy simulation study to assess the accuracy of several transrectal ultrasonography (TRUS)-biopsy strategies compared with template prostate mapping biopsies in patients who have undergone radical prostatectomy. *BJU Int*. Sep 2012; 110(6):812-820.
26. Iberti CT, Mohamed N, Palese MA. A review of focal therapy techniques in prostate cancer: clinical results for high-intensity focused ultrasound and focal cryoablation. *Rev Urol*. 2011; 13(4):e196-202.
27. IOM (Institute of Medicine). 2011. Clinical Practice Guidelines We Can Trust. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
28. Ip S, IJ D, Chung M ea. An evidence review of active surveillance in men with localized prostate cancer. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment no. 204 (Prepared by Tufts Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. HHSA 290-2007-10055-I). 2011; AHRQ Publication No. 12-E003-EF, Rockville, MD: Agency for Research and Quality. (Available at: www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/reports/final.cfm).
29. Jacome-Pita F, Sanchez-Salas R, Barret E, et al. Focal therapy in prostate cancer: the current situation. *Ecancermedicalscience*. 2014; 8:435.
30. Kasivisvanathan V, Emberton M, Ahmed HU. Focal therapy for prostate cancer: rationale and treatment opportunities. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. Aug 2013; 25(8):461-473.
31. Lee T, Mendhiratta N, Sperling D, et al. Focal laser ablation for localized prostate cancer: principles, clinical trials, and our initial experience. *Rev Urol*. 2014; 16(2):55-66.

32. Lepor H, Llukani E, Sperling D, et al. Complications, recovery, and early functional outcomes and oncologic control following in-bore focal laser ablation of prostate cancer. *Eur Urol*. Dec 2015; 68(6):924-926.
33. Lian H, Zhuang J, Yang R, et al. Focal cryoablation for unilateral low-intermediate-risk prostate cancer: 63-month mean follow-up results of 41 patients. *Int Urol Nephrol*. Jan 2016; 48(1):85-90.
34. Lindner U, Lawrentschuk N, Schatloff O, et al. Evolution from active surveillance to focal therapy in the management of prostate cancer. *Future Oncol*. Jun 2011; 7(6):775-787.
35. Mayes JM, Mouraviev V, Sun L, et al. Can the conventional sextant prostate biopsy accurately predict unilateral prostate cancer in low-risk, localized, prostate cancer? *Urol Oncol*. Mar-Apr 2011; 29(2):166-170.
36. Mehravand S, George AK, Hoang AN, et al. MRI-guided focal laser ablation of prostate cancer: a prospective single-arm, single-center trial with 3 years of follow-up. *Diagn Interv Radiol*. May 2021; 27(3): 394-400.
37. Mendez MH, Passoni NM, Pow-Sang J, et al. Comparison of outcomes between preoperatively potent men treated with focal versus whole gland cryotherapy in a matched population. *J Endourol*. 2015 Oct; 29(10):1193-8.
38. Mouraviev V, Villers A, Bostwick DG, et al. Understanding the pathological features of focality, grade and tumour volume of early-stage prostate cancer as a foundation for parenchyma-sparing prostate cancer therapies: active surveillance and focal targeted therapy. *BJU Int*. Oct 2011; 108(7):1074-1085.
39. Nahar B, Bhat A, Reis IM, et al. Prospective Evaluation of Focal High Intensity Focused Ultrasound for Localized Prostate Cancer. *J Urol*. Sep 2020; 204(3): 483-489.
40. Natarajan S, Raman S, Priester AM, et al. Focal laser ablation of prostate cancer: phase I clinical trial. *J Urol*. Jul 2016; 196(1):68-75.
41. National Cancer Institute. Prostate Cancer Treatment (PDQ) Patient Version: Treatment Option Overview. 2021. www.cancer.gov/types/prostate/patient/prostate-treatment-pdq#link/_142.
42. National Cancer Institute. Prostate Cancer Treatment, Treatment Option Overview. 2014; www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/pdq/treatment/prostate/Patient/page4#_172.
43. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: prostate cancer. Version 4.2022. www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate.pdf.
44. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Focal Therapy Using Cryoablation for Localised Prostate Cancer (IPG423). 2012; www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg423/chapter/1-guidance.
45. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Focal Therapy Using High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound for Localized Prostate Cancer (IPG424). 2012; www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg424.
46. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Prostate cancer: diagnosis and management (CG175). 2014; www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg175/resources/prostate-cancer-diagnosis-and-management-35109753913285.

47. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Prostate cancer: diagnosis and management. [NG131]. 2019;
www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng131/chapter/Recommendations.
48. Nguyen CT, Jones JS. Focal therapy in the management of localized prostate cancer. *BJU Int*. May 2011; 107(9):1362-1368.
49. Passoni NM, Polascik TJ. How to select the right patients for focal therapy of prostate cancer? *Curr Opin Urol*. May 2014; 24(3):203-208.
50. Ploussard G, Epstein JI, Montironi R, et al. The contemporary concept of significant versus insignificant prostate cancer. *Eur Urol*. Aug 2011; 60(2): 291-303.
51. Reddy D, Peters M, Shah TT, et al. Cancer Control Outcomes Following Focal Therapy Using High-intensity Focused Ultrasound in 1379 Men with Nonmetastatic Prostate Cancer: A Multi-institute 15-year Experience. *Eur Urol*. Apr 2022;81(4): 407-413.
52. Sanda MG, Chen RC, Crispino T, et al. Clinically Localized Prostate Cancer: AUA/ASTRO/SUO Guideline. 2017; [www.auanet.org/guidelines/clinically-localized-prostate-cancer-new-\(aua/astro/suo-guideline-2017\)](http://www.auanet.org/guidelines/clinically-localized-prostate-cancer-new-(aua/astro/suo-guideline-2017)).
53. Sinnott M, Falzarano SM, Hernandez AV, et al. Discrepancy in prostate cancer localization between biopsy and prostatectomy specimens in patients with unilateral positive biopsy: implications for focal therapy. *Prostate*. Aug 1 2012; 72(11):1179-1186.
54. Taneja SS, Bennett J, Coleman J, et al. Final results of a phase I/II multicenter trial of wst11 vascular targeted photodynamic therapy for hemi-ablation of the prostate in men with unilateral low risk prostate cancer performed in the United States. *J Urol*. 2016 Oct; 196(4):1096-104.
55. Tay KJ, Mendez M, Moul JW, et al. Active surveillance for prostate cancer: can we modernize contemporary protocols to improve patient selection and outcomes in the focal therapy era? *Curr Opin Urol*. 2015 May; 25(3):185-90.
56. Thompson IM, Jr., Goodman PJ, Tangen CM, et al. Long-term survival of participants in the prostate cancer prevention trial. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 15 2013; 369(7):603-610.
57. Tsivian M, Abern MR, Qi P, et al. Short-term functional outcomes and complications associated with transperineal template prostate mapping biopsy. *Urology*. Jul 2013; 82(1):166-170.
58. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Final Recommendation Statement: Prostate Cancer: Screening. 2018;
www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/Page/Document/RecommendationStatementFinal/prostatecancer-screening1.
59. Valerio M, Ahmed HU, Emberton M, et al. The role of focal therapy in the management of localised prostate cancer: a systematic review. *Eur Urol*. Oct 2014; 66(4):732-751.
60. van den Bos W, Muller BG, Ahmed H, et al. Focal therapy in prostate cancer: international multidisciplinary consensus on trial design. *Eur Urol*. Jun 2014; 65(6):1078-1083.
61. Ward JF, Jones JS. Focal cryotherapy for localized prostate cancer: a report from the national Cryo On-Line Database (COLD) Registry. *BJU Int*. Jun 2012; 109(11):1648-1654.

62. Wolff RF, Ryder S, Bossi A, et al. A systematic review of randomized controlled trials of radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer. Eur J Cancer. Nov 2015; 51(16):2345-2367.

POLICY HISTORY:

Adopted for Blue Advantage, April 2015

Available for comment May 2 through June 15, 2015

Medical Policy Group, September 2015

Medical Policy Group, June 2016

Medical Policy Group, September 2016

Medical Policy Group, September 2017

Medical Policy Group, October 2018 **(4)**: Updates to Description, Key Points, Governing Bodies and References. No change to policy statement.

Medical Policy Group, September 2019

Medical Policy Group, September 2020

Medical Policy Group, November 2020: 2021 Annual Coding Update. Added CPT 55880 to the Current Coding section.

Medical Policy Group, June 2021: Quarterly coding update. Added code 0655T to Current Coding. Added key word: Tranberg Thermal Therapy System.

Medical Policy Group, September 2021

Medical Policy Group, September 2022

Medical Policy Group, September 2023

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.