

(701109)

Medical Benefit		Effective Date: 01/01/19	Next Review Date: 09/21
Preauthorization	No	Review Dates: 05/09, 05/10, 05/11, 05/12, 05/13, 05/14, 05/15, 05/16, 05/17, 05/18, 09/18, 09/19, 09/20	

This protocol considers some applications of this test or procedure investigational. If the physician feels this service is medically necessary, preauthorization is recommended.

The following protocol contains medical necessity criteria that apply for this service. The criteria are also applicable to services provided in the local Medicare Advantage operating area for those members, unless separate Medicare Advantage criteria are indicated. If the criteria are not met, reimbursement will be denied and the patient cannot be billed. Please note that payment for covered services is subject to eligibility and the limitations noted in the patient's contract at the time the services are rendered.

RELATED PROTOCOLS

Occlusion of Uterine Arteries Using Transcatheter Embolization

Radiofrequency Ablation of Miscellaneous Solid Tumors Excluding Liver Tumors

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With uterine fibroids	Interventions of interest are: • Magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound	Comparators of interest are: • Alternative nonsurgical treatment • Surgery	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Quality of life • Resource utilization • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With metastatic bone cancer who have failed or are not candidates for radiotherapy	Interventions of interest are: • Magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound	Comparators of interest are: • Supportive care	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Health status measures • Quality of life • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With other tumors (e.g., brain cancer, prostate cancer, breast cancer, desmoid, nonspinal osteoid osteoma)	Interventions of interest are: • Magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound	Comparators of interest are: • Standard care	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Health status measures • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With medication-refractory essential tremors	Interventions of interest are: • Magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound	Comparators of interest are: • Neurosurgery • Standard of care	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of Life • Treatment-related morbidity

DESCRIPTION

An integrated system providing magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound (MRgFUS) treatment is proposed as a noninvasive therapy for uterine fibroids and pain palliation of bone metastases. MRgFUS is also being investigated as a treatment of other benign and malignant tumors as well as essential tremors.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

For individuals who have uterine fibroids who receive MRgFUS, the evidence includes two small randomized controlled trials (RCTs), nonrandomized comparative studies, and case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, quality of life, resource utilization, and treatment-related morbidity. One RCT (n=20) has reported some health outcomes but its primary purpose was to determine the feasibility of a larger trial. It did not find statistically significant differences in quality of life outcomes between active and sham treatment groups but it did find lower fibroid volumes after active treatment. This trial did not have an active comparator, the clinical significance of the primary outcome was unclear, and there were no follow-up data beyond one year. The second RCT (n=49) is ongoing; preliminary results at 6 weeks posttreatment, comparing MRgFUS with uterine artery embolization have shown that the two groups are comparable in medication use and symptom improvement following treatments. Patients in the MRgFUS group reported recovering significantly faster than patients in the uterine artery embolization group, as measured by time to return to work and time to normal activities. In a separate 2013 comparative study, outcomes appeared to be better with uterine artery embolization than with MRgFUS. Long-term data on the treatment effects, recurrence rates, and impact on future fertility and pregnancy are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals with metastatic bone cancer who have failed or are not candidates for radiotherapy who receive MRgFUS, the evidence includes a sham-controlled randomized trial and several case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, health status measures, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The RCT found statistically significant improvements after MRgFUS in a composite outcome comprised of a reduction in pain and morphine use, and in pain reduction as a stand-alone outcome. A substantial proportion of patients in the treatment group experienced adverse events but most events were transient and not severe. The case series reported reductions in pain following MRgFUS treatment, consistent with the RCT. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with other tumors (e.g., breast cancer, brain cancer, prostate cancer, desmoid, non-spinal osteoid osteoma) who receive MRgFUS, the evidence includes small case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, health status measures, and treatment-related morbidity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals with medicine-refractory essential tremors who receive MRgFUS, the evidence includes two systematic reviews that identified an RCT and several observational studies. Relevant outcomes include symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The assessment did not pool study results but concluded that, overall, MRgFUS decreased tremor severity and improved quality of life. The sham-controlled randomized trial found significant improvements in the treatment group in tremor severity, functional improvement, and quality of life after three months of follow-up. The improvements in hand tremor score, function, and quality of life were maintained at the two year follow-up. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

POLICY

Magnetic resonance-guided high-intensity ultrasound ablation may be considered **medically necessary** for pain palliation in adults with metastatic bone cancer who have failed or are not candidates for radiotherapy.

Magnetic resonance-guided high-intensity ultrasound ablation may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of medicine-refractory essential tremors.

Magnetic resonance-guided high-intensity ultrasound ablation is considered **investigational** in all other situations including but not limited to:

- Treatment of uterine fibroids; and
- Treatment of other tumors (e.g., brain cancer, prostate cancer, breast cancer, desmoid).

BACKGROUND

UTERINE FIBROIDS

Uterine fibroids are one of the most common conditions affecting women in the reproductive years. Symptoms of uterine fibroids include menorrhagia, pelvic pressure, or pain.

Treatment

Several approaches currently available to treat symptomatic uterine fibroids include hysterectomy, abdominal myomectomy, laparoscopic and hysteroscopic myomectomy, hormone therapy, uterine artery embolization, and watchful waiting. Hysterectomy and various myomectomy procedures are considered the criterion standard treatments.

METASTATIC BONE DISEASE

Metastatic bone disease is one of the most common causes of cancer pain.

Treatment

Existing treatments include conservative measures (e.g., massage, exercise) and pharmacologic agents (e.g., analgesics, bisphosphonates, corticosteroids). For patients who do not respond to these treatments, standard care is external-beam radiotherapy. However, a substantial proportion of patients have residual pain after radiotherapy, and there is a need for alternative treatments for these patients. (One option, radiofrequency ablation, is addressed in the related Radiofrequency Ablation of Miscellaneous Solid Tumors Excluding Liver Tumors protocol).

ESSENTIAL TREMORS

ET is the most common movement disorder, with an estimated prevalence of 5% worldwide. ET most often affects the hands and arms, may affect head and voice, and rarely includes the face, legs, and trunk. ET is heterogeneous among patients, varying in frequency, amplitude, causes of exacerbation, and association with other neurologic deficits.

Treatment

The neuropathology of ET is uncertain, with some evidence suggesting that ET is localized in the brainstem and cerebellum. If patients with ET experience intermittent or persistent disability due to the tremors, initial therapy is with drugs (β -blockers or anticonvulsants). For medicine-refractory patients, surgery (deep brain stimulation or thalamotomy) may be offered, though high rates of adverse events have been observed.

MAGNETIC RESONANCE-GUIDED FOCUSED ULTRASOUND

MRgFUS is a noninvasive treatment that combines two technologies: focused ultrasound and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). The ultrasound beam penetrates through the soft tissues and, using MRI for guidance and monitoring, the beam can be focused on targeted sites. Ultrasound causes a local increase in temperature in the target tissue, resulting in coagulation necrosis while sparing the surrounding normal structures. Ultrasound

waves from each sonication are directed at a focal point that has a maximum focal volume of 20 nm in diameter and 15 nm in height/length. This causes a rapid rise in temperature (i.e., to 65°C-85°C), which is sufficient to ablate tissue at the focal point. In addition to providing guidance, the associated MRI can provide online thermometric imaging, a temperature "map", to confirm the therapeutic effect of the ablation treatment and allow for real-time adjustment of the treatment parameters.

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the ExAblate MRgFUS system (InSightec) for two indications: treatment of uterine fibroids (leiomyomata) and palliation of pain associated with tumors metastatic to bone. The ultrasound equipment is specifically designed to be compatible with magnetic resonance magnets, and it is integrated into standard clinical MRI units; it also includes a patient table, which has a cradle that houses the focused ultrasound transducer in water or a light oil bath. Some models have a detachable cradle; only certain cradle types can be used for palliation of pain associated with metastatic bone cancer. For treating pain associated with bone metastases, the aim of MRgFUS is to destroy nerves in the bone surface surrounding the tumor.

MRgFUS is also being investigated for the treatment of other tumors, including breast, prostate, brain, and desmoid tumors as well as non-spinal osteoid osteoma.

REGULATORY STATUS

In October 2004, the ExAblate® 2000 System (InSightec) was approved by the FDA through the premarket approval process for "ablation of uterine fibroid tissue in pre- or perimenopausal women with symptomatic uterine fibroids who desire a uterine sparing procedure." Treatment is indicated for women with a uterine gestational size of fewer than 24 weeks who have completed childbearing.

In October 2012, the ExAblate® System, Model 2000/2100/2100 VI, was approved by the FDA through the premarket approval process for pain palliation in adults with metastatic bone cancer who have failed or are not candidates for radiotherapy. The device was evaluated through an expedited review process. The FDA required a postapproval study with 70 patients to evaluate the effectiveness of the system under actual clinical conditions.

In July 2016, the FDA approved the use of the ExAblate® Neuro System for the treatment of ET in patients who have not responded to medication (b-blockers or anticonvulsant drugs) through the premarket approval process.

FDA product codes: NRZ, POH.

Services that are the subject of a clinical trial do not meet our Technology Assessment and Medically Necessary Services Protocol criteria and are considered investigational. *For explanation of experimental and investigational, please refer to the Technology Assessment and Medically Necessary Services Protocol.*

It is expected that only appropriate and medically necessary services will be rendered. We reserve the right to conduct prepayment and postpayment reviews to assess the medical appropriateness of the above-referenced procedures. **Some of this protocol may not pertain to the patients you provide care to, as it may relate to products that are not available in your geographic area.**

REFERENCES

We are not responsible for the continuing viability of web site addresses that may be listed in any references below.

1. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound therapy for symptomatic uterine fibroids. TEC Assessments. 2005;Volume 20:Tab 10.
2. Barnard EP, AbdElmagied AM, Vaughan LE, et al. Periprocedural outcomes comparing fibroid embolization and focused ultrasound: a randomized controlled trial and comprehensive cohort analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. May 2017; 216(5): 500.e1-500.e11. PMID 28063909
3. Jacoby VL, Kohi MP, Poder L, et al. PROMISE trial: a pilot, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of magnetic resonance guided focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids. *Fertil Steril*. Mar 2016; 105(3): 773-780. PMID 26658133
4. Gizzo S, Saccardi C, Patrelli TS, et al. Magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound myomectomy: safety, efficacy, subsequent fertility and quality-of-life improvements, a systematic review. *Reprod Sci*. Apr 2014; 21(4): 465-76. PMID 23868442
5. Chen R, Keserci B, Bi H, et al. The safety and effectiveness of volumetric magnetic resonance-guided high-intensity focused ultrasound treatment of symptomatic uterine fibroids: early clinical experience in China. *J Ther Ultrasound*. 2016; 4: 27. PMID 27822376
6. Froeling V, Meckelburg K, Schreiter NF, et al. Outcome of uterine artery embolization versus MR-guided high-intensity focused ultrasound treatment for uterine fibroids: long-term results. *Eur J Radiol*. Dec 2013; 82(12): 2265-9. PMID 24075785
7. Rabinovici J, David M, Fukunishi H, et al. Pregnancy outcome after magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery (MRgFUS) for conservative treatment of uterine fibroids. *Fertil Steril*. Jan 2010; 93(1): 199-209. PMID 19013566
8. Hurwitz MD, Ghanouni P, Kanaev SV, et al. Magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound for patients with painful bone metastases: phase III trial results. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. Apr 23 2014; 106(5). PMID 24760791
9. Liberman B, Gianfelice D, Inbar Y, et al. Pain palliation in patients with bone metastases using MR-guided focused ultrasound surgery: a multicenter study. *Ann Surg Oncol*. Jan 2009; 16(1): 140-6. PMID 19002530
10. Arrigoni F, Barile A, Zugaro L, et al. Intra-articular benign bone lesions treated with Magnetic Resonance-guided Focused Ultrasound (MRgFUS): imaging follow-up and clinical results. *Med Oncol*. Apr 2017; 34(4): 55. PMID 28244018
11. Zippel DB, Papa MZ. The use of MR imaging guided focused ultrasound in breast cancer patients; a preliminary phase one study and review. *Breast Cancer*. 2005; 12(1): 32-8. PMID 15657521
12. Hynynen K, Pomeroy O, Smith DN, et al. MR imaging-guided focused ultrasound surgery of fibroadenomas in the breast: a feasibility study. *Radiology*. Apr 2001; 219(1): 176-85. PMID 11274554
13. Gianfelice D, Khat A, Amara M, et al. MR imaging-guided focused US ablation of breast cancer: histopathologic assessment of effectiveness-- initial experience. *Radiology*. Jun 2003; 227(3): 849-55. PMID 12714680
14. Gianfelice D, Khat A, Amara M, et al. MR imaging-guided focused ultrasound surgery of breast cancer: correlation of dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI with histopathologic findings. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Nov 2003; 82(2): 93-101. PMID 14692653
15. Merckel LG, Knuttel FM, Deckers R, et al. First clinical experience with a dedicated MRI-guided high-intensity focused ultrasound system for breast cancer ablation. *Eur Radiol*. Nov 2016; 26(11): 4037-4046. PMID 26852219
16. McDannold N, Clement GT, Black P, et al. Transcranial magnetic resonance imaging-guided focused ultrasound surgery of brain tumors: initial findings in 3 patients. *Neurosurgery*. Feb 2010; 66(2): 323-32; discussion 332. PMID 20087132
17. Napoli A, Anzidei M, De Nunzio C, et al. Real-time magnetic resonance-guided high-intensity focused ultrasound focal therapy for localised prostate cancer: preliminary experience. *Eur Urol*. Feb 2013; 63(2): 395-8. PMID 23159454
18. Geiger D, Napoli A, Conchiglia A, et al. MR-guided focused ultrasound (MRgFUS) ablation for the treatment of nonspinal osteoid osteoma: a prospective multicenter evaluation. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. May 07 2014; 96(9): 743-51. PMID 24806011

19. Avedian RS, Bitton R, Gold G, et al. Is MR-guided High-intensity Focused Ultrasound a Feasible Treatment Modality for Desmoid Tumors?. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. Mar 2016; 474(3): 697-704. PMID 26040967
20. Bucknor MD, Rieke V. MRgFUS for desmoid tumors within the thigh: early clinical experiences. *J Ther Ultrasound*. 2017; 5: 4. PMID 28174660
21. Ghanouni P, Dobrotwir A, Bazzocchi A, et al. Magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound treatment of extra-abdominal desmoid tumors: a retrospective multicenter study. *Eur Radiol*. Feb 2017; 27(2): 732-740. PMID 27147222
22. Schaink A, Li C, Gajic-Veljanoski O, et al. Magnetic Resonance-Guided Focused Ultrasound Neurosurgery for Essential Tremor: A Health Technology Assessment. *Ont Health Technol Assess Ser*. 2018; 18(4): 1-141. PMID 29805721
23. Mohammed N, Patra D, Nanda A. A meta-analysis of outcomes and complications of magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound in the treatment of essential tremor. *Neurosurg Focus*. Feb 2018; 44(2): E4. PMID 29385917
24. Elias WJ, Lipsman N, Ondo WG, et al. A Randomized Trial of Focused Ultrasound Thalamotomy for Essential Tremor. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 25 2016; 375(8): 730-9. PMID 27557301
25. Chang JW, Park CK, Lipsman N, et al. A prospective trial of magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound thalamotomy for essential tremor: Results at the 2-year follow-up. *Ann Neurol*. Jan 2018; 83(1): 107-114. PMID 29265546
26. Lutz S, Balboni T, Jones J, et al. Palliative radiation therapy for bone metastases: Update of an ASTRO Evidence-Based Guideline. *Pract Radiat Oncol*. Jan 2017; 7(1): 4-12. PMID 27663933
27. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Bone Cancer. Version 1.2020. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/bone.pdf. Accessed May 19, 2020.
28. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Breast Cancer. Version 4.2020. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/breast.pdf. Accessed May 19, 2020.
29. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Central Nervous System Cancers. Version 2.2020. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/cns.pdf. Accessed May 19, 2020.
30. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Prostate Cancer. Version 1.2020. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate.pdf. Accessed May 19, 2020.