HEALTH PLANS
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Medical Policy

Gastric Pacing

Policy MP-015

Origination Date: 09/27/2023

Reviewed/Revised Date: 09/18/2024

Next Review Date: 09/18/2025

Current Effective Date: 09/18/2024

Disclaimer:

1. Policies are subject to change in accordance with State and Federal notice requirements.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for U of U Health Plans Commercial, CHIP and Healthy U (Medicaid) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.
3. Services requiring prior-authorization may not be covered, if prior-authorization is not obtained.
4. This Medical Policy does not guarantee coverage or payment of the service. The service must be a benefit in the member's plan and the member must be eligible for coverage at the time of service. Additional payment guidelines may be applied that are not included in this policy.

Description:

Gastric electrical stimulation, or electrostimulation, is electrical stimulation of the muscle of the stomach wall. It has been approved for treatment of gastroparesis, a chronic gastric motility disorder characterized by nausea, vomiting, bloating, and abdominal distension. Chronic and severe gastroparesis may be associated with dehydration, poor nutritional status, and poor glycemic control in diabetics.

Gastroparesis is most commonly found as complication of diabetes. It is also found in chronic pseudo-obstruction, connective tissue disorders, Parkinson disease, and psychological pathology.

Prokinetic agents such as metoclopramide, erythromycin and antiemetic agents such as metoclopramide, granisetron, or ondansetron are used for treatment of gastroparesis. When severe the patient may require enteral or total parental nutrition.

The Enterra™ Therapy System manufactured by Medtronic is only one gastric electrical stimulator that has received approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for treatment of chronic refractory gastroparesis. The FDA has not approved any gastric pacemaker treatment of obesity.

Policy Statement and Criteria

1. Commercial Plans/CHIP

U of U Health Plans considers gastric pacing/gastric stimulation medically necessary when ALL of the following criteria are met:

A. The patient has chronic gastroparesis diagnosed by one of the following methods:
   i. Gastric scintigraphy
   ii. Breath Testing if scintigraphy is not feasible or non-diagnostic
   iii. The patient is refractory to or intolerant of medical management duration including:
      1) Dietary modification for >6 months
      2) Trial of the following agents has failed to resolve all symptoms after a trial of at least 12 weeks duration:
         a) Prokinetic agents (i.e. metoclopramide, erythromycin)
         b) Antiemetic agents (i.e. ondansetron, granisetron)
      3) Agents are contraindicated

B. Mechanical Obstruction has been excluded by endoscopy or UGI series

C. Other medications considered noncontributory AND <u>one</u> of the following:
   i. <u>≥</u>2 hospital admissions or Emergency Department visits for severe vomiting and dehydration within the last 12 months
   ii. Unable to achieve glycemic control due to gastroparesis
   iii. Patient has required enteral or total parental nutrition for poor nutritional status during the past year
   iv. Weight loss >10% in last 6 months related to gastroparesis
   v. Persistent daily nausea/vomiting for >6 months

D. Device is FDA approved

U of U Health Plans does NOT cover gastric pacing or gastric stimulation for any other indication, including for the treatment of autonomic nervous disorders, cyclic vomiting syndrome, obesity, and gastrointestinal dysmotility disorders other than gastroparesis, as they are considered experimental/investigational.

2. **Medicaid Plans**

   Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the U of U Health Plans Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website at: https://medicaid.utah.gov/utah-medicaid-official-publications/ or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

   CPT/HCPCS codes covered by Utah State Medicaid may still require further evaluation to determine medical necessity for coverage.

Clinical Rationale

In 2015, Lal et al., conducted a systematic review of GES using the Enterra System. The final review consisted of 21 out of 53 potentially relevant studies published since 2003; eighteen were prospective cohort studies and 3 were crossover studies. The overall risk of bias was considered medium to high in the majority of studies. The main reason was the frequency of nonrandomized trials which tend to have a higher risk of bias. There was a variation in the methods used to assess the improvement in symptoms in the patients with GES implants. The most commonly used measures were: Total Symptom Score (TSS), Gastroparesis Cardinal Symptom Index (GCSI), Monthly and Weekly Vomiting Frequency, Monthly and Weekly Nausea Frequency, and Gastrointestinal Symptoms Rating Scale (GSRS). All studies investigating gastric emptying used a 2-hour and 4-hour Gastric Emptying Test (GET) after a low-fat meal. The studies in this systematic review included a variety of outcome measures and variety of preoperative assessments, making it difficult to combine data and offer firm conclusions. The evidence base for the use of GES in gastroparesis is limited with a total of just five months of blinded, randomized study including only 83 patients. However, accepting the limitations of the evidence base, the majority of studies reported an improvement in symptomology and quality of life with GES. An improvement in gastric emptying was seen in most studies, with only two failing to demonstrate an improvement. However, with the exception of one study, improved gastric emptying did not correlate with the improved symptomology. In conclusion, the authors found that while current evidence has shown a degree of efficacy in these patients, further high-quality, large clinical trials are needed to establish the efficacy of this therapy and to identify the patients for whom this therapy is inappropriate.

In 2017, Levinthal and Bielefeldt published a systematic review and meta-analysis to demonstrate if GES is effective in reducing symptoms in patients with gastroparesis. Five studies randomly allocated patients to periods with or without GES. Total symptom severity (TSS) scores did not differ between these periods (0.17 [95% confidence interval: -0.06 to 0.4]; $p = 0.15$). However, sixteen open label studies of GES showed a significant TSS decrease (2.68 [2.04-3.32]; $q = 39.0$; $p < 0.001$). Other treatment modalities similarly improved TSS by 1.97 [1.5-2.44] for medical therapy (MED), by 1.52 [0.9-2.15] for placebo arms (PLA), and by 2.32 [1.56-3.06] for botulinum toxin (BTx). There were significant differences in baseline TSS ratings among these studies (GES: 6.28 [6.28-7.42]; MED: 4.76 [4.09-5.42]; PLA: 4.59 [3.77-5.42]; BTx: 6.02 [5.3-6.74]; $q = 35.1$; $p < 0.001$). Meta-regression analysis showed these baseline differences to significantly impact TSS ratings during treatment ($q = 71.8$; $p < 0.001$). The authors concluded that independent of the treatment modality, baseline symptom severity impacts treatment results in gastroparesis and considering the skewed population with refractory symptoms, regression to the mean likely contributes to the substantial discrepancies between the reported results of controlled and open label GES studies.

In a 2021 systematic review of the therapeutic role of gastric pacemakers in adults with gastroparesis, Rajamanuri et al., assessed 12 studies which included data on adults with medically refractory gastroparesis that required gastric electrical stimulation therapy, and found that the studies showed varying effects of GES on gastroparesis symptoms like nausea, vomiting, and abdominal bloating. The review determined that there was significant weight gain noted based on the evidence in the studies they reviewed and that, while most of the studies suggested a significant improvement in the quality of life and the Gastroparesis Cardinal Symptom Index (GCSI) scores, the evidence supporting no difference in the quality of life seemed stronger, as shown by the meta-analysis and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) vs. open-label trials that showed positive results for quality of life with gastric pacing. Other beneficial effects of GES were found, including reductions in inflammatory indicators, improved metabolic hormone levels and improved mucosal electrogram frequencies over baseline that were sustained for over six months. The authors noted that their review was limited due to the inclusion of open-labeled studies. Therefore, further RCTs were recommended to analyze the impact of gastric pacemakers in the improvement of symptoms in patients with gastroparesis, studies that evaluate the efficacy for the different causes of gastroparesis, such as diabetes, idiopathic and post-surgical, and future studies that include the pediatric population.

In a 2016 single center cohort case series, Heckert et al., evaluated the effectiveness of GES with Enterra® for treatment for refractory symptoms of gastroparesis, the improvement in specific symptoms of gastroparesis, and clinical factors impacting on outcome of 151 patients with refractory gastroparesis. Gastroparesis patients (n = 151; (120 females) with refractory gastroparesis (72 diabetic, 73 idiopathic, 6 other) underwent GES with Enterra® (Medtronic). Patients filled out a symptom severity questionnaire (PAGI-SYM) prior to insertion. At each follow-up visit, the patient filled out PAGI-SYM and assessed their therapeutic response using the Clinical Patient Grading Assessment Scale (CPGAS). The authors concluded that GES improved symptoms in 75% of patients with 43% being at least moderately improved. Response in diabetics was better than in nondiabetic patients. Nausea, loss of appetite, and early satiety responded the best. However, the unknown length of study follow-up did not allow for assessment of intermediate and long-term outcomes and the lack of comparison group limits the conclusions that can be derived from this study.

In 2020, Ducrotte et al., completed a multicenter, double-blind RCT with crossover analyzing the efficacy of GES in patients with refractory vomiting, with or without gastroparesis. Patients included in the study (n=172) had chronic vomiting and/or nausea > 12 months that was related to type 1 or 2 diabetes mellitus, related to a surgical procedure (partial gastric resection surgery and/or vagotomy), or was idiopathic. Participants had normal or delayed gastric emptying with symptoms that were refractory to treatment and severe enough to affect the general condition of the patient and didn't have evidence of a mechanical obstruction within the digestive tract or a neurologic disease. Patients were randomized to either the ON/OFF group (n=79) with four months of active stimulation followed by four months of sham stimulation or the OFF/ON group (n=93) with four months of sham stimulation followed by four months with active stimulation. They were assessed at the end of each four month period (at five and nine months after implantation). Primary endpoints measured were vomiting score, ranging from 0 (daily vomiting) to 4 (no vomiting), and the quality of life, assessed by the Gastrointestinal Quality of Life Index scoring system. Secondary endpoints were changes in other digestive symptoms, nutritional status, gastric emptying, and control of diabetes. Final analysis in the intention to treat (ITT) population was carried out in 66 patients in the ON/OFF group and in 83 patients in the OFF/ON group. During both phases of the crossover study, vomiting scores were significantly higher in the group with the device on than the control group ($p<0.001$), in diabetic and nondiabetic patients. Vomiting scores increased significantly when the device was ON in patients with delayed ($p<0.01$) or normal gastric emptying ($p=0.05$). Gastric emptying was not accelerated during the ON period compared with the OFF period.

Having the GES turned on was not associated with increased quality of life. A total of 101 adverse events were reported in the study, with 45 therapy or device -related events: abdominal wall pain at the implantation site (n=28), infections at the abdominal pouch level (n=16), hematoma (n=1). In three cases, the device-related adverse events were serious enough to prompt device removal. The authors found that GES is effective in reducing the frequency of refractory vomiting and nausea in a subset of patients with chronic vomiting. However, further more robust studies are needed to determine predictive factors of favorable response.

In 2018, Hayes (updated 2022) published a Health Technology Assessment (HTA) on the safety and efficacy of GES for gastroparesis following their review of 12 studies, including 3 randomized crossover trials (RCTs), six pretreatment/post-treatment studies, one non-randomized comparative study, one comparative cohort study and one compilation of case series. The Hayes HTA stated that the effectiveness of GES for treating chronic gastroparesis remains uncertain, as findings have not provided consistent evidence. They also noted that the available randomized studies provide little confirmation of the apparent benefit that was seen in unblinded studies. The report stated that GES appears safe in most patients, but serious complications can occur, including the movement of the stimulator and/or the electrical leads following implantation. The device removal rates in the studies reviewed were between 7% -12%. The overall quality of the evidence for the treatment of gastroparesis with GES was low due to the individual study limitations and inconsistency in the findings. The authors concluded that additional randomized and placebo-controlled studies are needed to determine whether GES is a reliable therapy for gastroparesis and whether the benefits of GES treatment outweigh the potential risks.

Several specialty societies have weighed in on gastric pacing. The American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) issued updated guidelines in 2022 stating “GES may be considered for control of gastroparesis (GP) symptoms as a humanitarian use device (HUD). Documented clinical usefulness in both idiopathic gastroparesis (IG) and diabetic gastroparesis (DG) suggests there is a role for GES in accordance with its HUD approval” as defined by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). However, this conditional recommendation was based on a low quality body of evidence (Camilleri, 2013, updated 2022).

Additionally, the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK): The NIDDK states that gastric electrical stimulation is only used to treat people with gastroparesis due to diabetes or unknown causes and may be effective for those people whose nausea and vomiting do not improve with dietary changes or medications (NIDDK, 2018).

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) issued a statement in 2014 supporting the use of GES for gastroparesis. They stated that current evidence on the safety and efficacy of GES is adequate to support its use as an option for treating chronic, intractable nausea and vomiting secondary to gastroparesis, with normal arrangements for clinical governance, consent and audit. Observing that further publications providing data about the effects of the procedure on symptoms in the long term and on device durability would be useful.

The Enterra™ Therapy System (Medtronic Inc., Minneapolis, MN) is a GES which received U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) marketing approval as a Class III medical device under the Humanitarian Device Exemption (HDE) on March 31, 2000. It is indicated for the treatment of chronic, intractable (drug refractory) nausea and vomiting secondary to gastroparesis of diabetic or idiopathic etiology. This system has not been evaluated for patients under age 18 or over age 70 (FDA, 2000b). According to the FDA, HUD is a device that is intended to benefit patients by treating or diagnosing a disease or condition that affects fewer than 4000 individuals in the United States per year. An HDE application is not required to contain the results of scientifically valid clinical investigations demonstrating that the device is

effective for its intended purpose. However, the application, must contain sufficient information for the FDA to determine that the device does not pose an unreasonable or significant risk of illness or injury, and that the probable benefit to health outweighs the risk of injury or illness from its use, taking into account the probable risks and benefits of currently available devices or alternative forms of treatment. Additionally, the applicant must demonstrate that there are no comparable devices available to treat or diagnose the disease or condition, and that they could not otherwise bring the device to market (FDA, 2018).

Applicable Coding

CPT Codes

Possibly Covered Codes

43647	Laparoscopy, surgical; implantation or replacement of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum
43648	Laparoscopy, surgical; revision or removal of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum
43881	Implantation or replacement of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum, open
43882	Revision or removal of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum, open
64590	Insertion or replacement of peripheral or gastric neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver, direct or inductive coupling
64595	Revision or removal of peripheral or gastric neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver

Non-Covered Codes

43647	Laparoscopy, surgical; implantation or replacement of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum
43648	Laparoscopy, surgical; revision or removal of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum
43881	Implantation or replacement of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum, open
43882	Revision or removal of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum, open
C1820	Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), with rechargeable battery and charging system
C1822	Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), high frequency, with rechargeable battery and charging system
E0765	FDA approved nerve stimulator, with replaceable batteries, for treatment of nausea and vomiting
L8679	Implantable neurostimulator, pulse generator, any type

References:

1. Abell T, McCallum R, Hocking M, et al. Gastric electrical stimulation for medically refractory gastroparesis. Gastroenterology 2003; 125:421.
2. Camilleri M, Kuo B, Nguyen L, et al. ACG Clinical Guideline: Gastroparesis. Am J Gastroenterol. 2022 Aug 1;117(8):11971220.Cappabianca S, Reginelli A, Lacobellis F, et al. Dynamic MRI defecography vs. entero-colpo-cysto-defecography in the evaluation of midline pelvic floor hernias in female pelvic floor disorders. Int J Colorectal Dis. 2011 Sep;26(9):1191-6.
3. Chu H, Lin Z, Zhong L, et al. Treatment of high-frequency gastric electrical stimulation for gastroparesis. J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2012 Jun;27(6):1017-26.
4. Ducrotte P, Coffin B, Bonaz B, et. al. Gastric electrical stimulation reduces refractory vomiting in a randomized crossover trial. Gastroenterology. 2020 Feb;158(3):506-514.e2.
5. Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Assessment. (20108). "Gastric electrical stimulation for gastroparesis". October 26, 2018. Updated December 7, 2022. Accessed: September 26, 2023. Available at: https://evidence.hayesinc.com/report/dir.gast0001
6. Heckert J, Sankineni A, Hughes WB, et al. Gastric Electric Stimulation for Refractory Gastroparesis: A Prospective Analysis of 151 Patients at a Single Center. Dig Dis Sci 2016; 61:168.
7. Heckert J, Sankineni A, Hughes WB, et al. Gastric electric stimulation for refractory gastroparesis: a prospective analysis of 151 patients at a single center. Dig Dis Sci. 2016 Jan; 61(1):168-75.
8. Jayanthi N, Dexter S, Sarela A, et al. Gastric electrical stimulation for treatment of clinical severe gastroparesis. J Minim Access Surg. 2013 Oct;9(4).
9. Keller DS, Parkman HP, Boucek DO, et al. Surgical outcomes after gastric electric stimulator placement for refractory gastroparesis. J Gastrointest Surg. 2013;17(4):620-626.
10. Klinge MW, Rask P, Mortensen LS, et al. Early assessment of cost-effectiveness of gastric electrical stimulation for diabetic nausea and vomiting. J Neurogastroenterol Motil. 2017;23(4):541-549.
11. Lal N, Livermore, S, Declan D, et al. Gastric electric stimulation with the Enterra System: a systemic review. Gastroenterol Res Pract. 2015; 2015:762972.
12. Levinthal DJ, Bielefeldt K. Systematic review and meta-analysis: Gastric electrical stimulation for gastroparesis. Auton Neurosci. 2017 Jan;202:45-55.
13. Lin Z, McElhinney C, Sarosiek I, et al. Chronic gastric electrical stimulation for gastroparesis reduces the use of prokinetic and/or antiemetic medications and the need for hospitalizations. Dig Dis Sci 2005; 50:1328.
14. McCallum RW, Lin Z, Forster J, et al. Gastric electrical stimulation improves outcomes of patients with gastroparesis for up to 10 years. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2011; 9:314.
15. Michael Camilleri , MD 1 , Henry P. Parkman , MD2 , Mehnaz A. Shafi , MD3 , Th omas L. Abell , MD4 and Lauren Gerson , MD, MSc; Clinical Guideline: Management of Gastroparesis; Am J Gastroenterol 2013; 108:18–37; doi: 10.1038/ajg.2012.373; published online 13 November 2012.
16. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). NICE interventional procedure guidance IPG489. Gastroelectrical stimulation for gastroparesis. London (UK): 2014 May.
17. National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK). Gastroparesis. Last reviewed: Jan 2018. Accessed: September 25, 2023. Available at URL address: https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/digestive-diseases/gastroparesis/treatment
18. Pasricha PJ, Camilleri M, Hasler WL, et al. White paper AGA: gastroparesis: clinical and regulatory insights for clinical trials. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2017 Aug;15(8):1184-1190.
19. Paulus GF, van Avesaat M, van Rijn S, Alleleyn AME, Swain JM, Abell TL. Multicenter, Phase 1, Open Prospective Trial of Gastric Electrical Stimulation for the Treatment of Obesity: First-in-Human Results with a Novel Implantable System. Obes Surg. 2020 May;30(5):1952-1960.
20. Rajamanuri, M., et al. (2021). "A Systematic Review of the Therapeutic Role of Gastric Pacemakers in Adults With Gastroparesis." Cureus 13(9): e18152.
21. Shada A, Nielsen A, Marowski S, et al. Wisconsin's Enterra Therapy Experience: A multi-institutional review of gastric electrical stimulation for medically refractory gastroparesis. Surgery 2018; 164:760.
22. Shada A, Nielsen A, Marowski S, et al. Wisconsin's Enterra Therapy Experience: A multi-institutional review of gastric electrical stimulation for medically refractory gastroparesis. Surgery. 2018 Oct;164(4):760-765.
23. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Approval Order. Enterra Therapy System-H990014. Mar 31, 2000a. Accessed: September 26, 2023. Available at URL address: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfhde/hde.cfm?id=375491
24. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Enterra Therapy System- H990014. Summary of Safety and Probable Benefit. Mar 31, 2000b. Accessed: September 26, 2023. Available at URL address: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf/h990014b.pdf

25. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Enterra Therapy System- H990014. Executive Summary: Pediatric Advisory Committee meeting. Fall 2022. Accessed: September 26, 2023. https://www.fda.gov/media/161026/download