

Clinical Policy: Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

Reference Number: PA.CP.MP.151

Effective Date: 09/2018

Last Review Date: 06/3/2021

[Coding Implications](#)

[Revision Log](#)

Description

Patent foramen ovale (PFO) is a congenital cardiac lesion, which is generally asymptomatic and affects up to a quarter of the population. PFO can present with an array of significant clinical complications, including cryptogenic stroke. This policy describes the medical necessity requirements for the percutaneous transcatheter closure of a patent foramen ovale with the Amplatzer™ PFO Occluder or Gore® Cardioform Septal Occluder.

Policy/Criteria

- I. It is the policy of Pennsylvania Health and Wellness® (PHW) that the percutaneous transcatheter closure of PFO an FDA-approved device (Amplatzer PFO Occluder or Gore Cardioform) is medically necessary to reduce the risk of recurrent ischemic stroke when meeting the following indications:
 - A. Age ≥ 18 and ≤ 60 ;
 - B. Both a neurologist and a cardiologist confirm all of the following:
 1. PFO with a right-to-left interatrial shunt detected by bubble study;
 2. Cryptogenic stroke caused by a presumed paradoxical embolism;
 3. Absence of other risk factors of ischemic stroke, including but not limited to, any of the following:
 - a. Atherosclerosis;
 - b. Small vessel occlusion.
 - c. Hypercoagulable state;
 - d. Atrial fibrillation;
 - e. Arterial dissection.
 4. None of the following contraindications:
 - a. Intra-cardiac mass, vegetation, tumor or thrombus at the intended site of implant, or documented evidence of venous thrombus in the vessels through which access to the PFO is gained;
 - b. Vasculature through which access to the PFO is gained is inadequate to accommodate the appropriate sheath size;
 - c. Anatomy in which the Amplatzer PFO device size required would interfere with other intracardiac or intravascular structures, such as valves or pulmonary veins;
 - d. Other source of right-to-left shunts, including an atrial septal defect and/or fenestrated septum;
 - e. Active endocarditis or other untreated infections.
- II. It is the policy of PHW® that the percutaneous transcatheter closure of PFO is **experimental/investigational** for the following:
 - A. Devices not currently FDA-approved for PFO, including any of the following:
 1. CardioSEAL STARFlex Septal Closure System;
 2. Buttoned Device;
 3. Atrial Septal Defect Occluding System;

CLINICAL POLICY

Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

4. Helex Septal Occluder;
- B. Migraine prophylaxis;
- C. Primary stroke prevention;
- D. Unexplained oxygen desaturation.

Background

The foramen ovale is a particular structure of the fetal circulation that fails to close and is present in 25% of the adult population, forming a PFO.^{1,2} The biological significance of PFOs have been widely debated in the literature for the last decade. Case control studies have established an association between an increased risk of ischemic stroke and the PFO.¹ Three initial randomized controlled trials (*e.g.* the CLOSURE I study, the PC study, and the RESPECT study), as well as a meta-analysis of 14 trials, collectively demonstrate that there is no significant advantage for surgical PFO closure to improve ischemic stroke prevention over medical therapy.⁷⁻¹⁰

However, four more recently published articles in *The New England Journal of Medicine* expand the body of work and extend analyses.²⁻⁶ Mas *et al.* for the CLOSE investigators assessed 663 patients and demonstrated reduced recurrent stroke rates after PFO closure compared to oral anticoagulation with antiplatelet medical therapy in patients with cryptogenic stroke.² This finding was also validated by S ndergaard for the Gore REDUCE investigators in their analysis of 664 patients⁴. Furthermore, Saver *et al.* for the RESPECT investigators recapitulate earlier results in a multicenter trial, noting that closure of PFO was associated with a lower rate of recurrent ischemic stroke, after having followed 980 patients for a median of 5.9 years.³ A meta-analysis of 6 RCTS demonstrated benefits of PFO closure for secondary prevention of stroke among patients with cryptogenic stroke and small increase in risk of new onset atrial fibrillation.²⁴

The 2014 American Heart Association / American Stroke Association have not yet been updated to include recent randomized controlled trials (RCTs).¹¹ The American Heart Association published a 2018 review that stated that recent RCTs have demonstrated the superiority of PFO closure over pharmacological treatment in reducing risk of recurrent ischemic stroke in certain patients, and that governing societies should rewrite their guidelines accordingly.¹⁵

The American Academy of Neurology Practice advisory update summary on patent foramen ovale and secondary stroke prevention include the following recommendations:

- In patients being considered for PFO closure, clinicians should ensure that an appropriately thorough evaluation has been performed to rule out alternative mechanisms of stroke (level B).
- In patients with a higher risk alternative mechanism of stroke identified, clinicians should not routinely recommend PFO closure (level B).
- Clinicians should counsel patients that having a PFO is common; that it occurs in about 1 in 4 adults in the general population; that it is difficult to determine with certainty whether their PFO caused their stroke; and that PFO closure probably reduces recurrent stroke risk in select patients (level B).

In patients younger than 60 years with a PFO and embolic-appearing infarct and no other mechanism of stroke identified, clinicians may recommend closure following a discussion of potential benefits (absolute recurrent stroke risk reduction of 3.4% at 5

CLINICAL POLICY



Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

years) and risks (periprocedural complication rate of 3.9% and increased absolute rate of non-periprocedural atrial fibrillation of 0.33% per year) (level C).²⁴

Coding Implications

This clinical policy references Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®). CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association. All CPT codes and descriptions are copyrighted 2020, American Medical Association. All rights reserved. CPT codes and CPT descriptions are from the current manuals and those included herein are not intended to be all-inclusive and are included for informational purposes only. Codes referenced in this clinical policy are for informational purposes only. Inclusion or exclusion of any codes does not guarantee coverage. Providers should reference the most up-to-date sources of professional coding guidance prior to the submission of claims for reimbursement of covered services.

CPT® Codes	Description
93580	Percutaneous transcatheter closure of congenital interatrial communication (ie, Fontan fenestration, atrial septal defect) with implant

HCPCS Codes	Description
C1817	Septal defect implant system, intracardiac

ICD-10-CM Diagnosis Codes that Support Coverage Criteria

ICD-10-CM Code	Description
Q21.1	Atrial septal defect

Reviews, Revisions, and Approvals	Date	Approval Date
Policy developed	09/18	
Added “but not limited to” to criteria regarding absence of other risk factors for ischemic stroke. Added hypercoagulation, arterial dissection, and atrial fibrillation as conditions that must be ruled out. Added contraindications per instruction manual. Updated background.	12/18	01/28/18
Annual review. Added Gore Cardioform as an FDA-approved device appropriate for medically necessary closure of PFO. References reviewed and updated. Reviewed by specialist.	6/2020	
Background updated with no impact on clinical criteria. References reviewed and updated. Replaced “member” with “member/enrollee” in all instances.	7/2021	

References

1. Nakanishi, Koki, Minoru Yoshiyama, and Shunichi Homma. "Patent foramen ovale and cryptogenic stroke." *Trends in Cardiovascular Medicine* (2017).

CLINICAL POLICY

Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

2. Mas, Jean-Louis, et al. "Patent Foramen Ovale Closure or Anticoagulation vs. Antiplatelets after Stroke." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 377.1. Sep. 2017: 1011-1021.
3. Saver, Jeffrey L., et al. "Long-Term Outcomes of Patent Foramen Ovale Closure or Medical Therapy after Stroke." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 377.11. Sep 2017: 1022-1032.
4. Søndergaard, Lars, et al. "Patent Foramen Ovale Closure or Antiplatelet Therapy for Cryptogenic Stroke." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 377.11. Sep 2017: 1033-1042.
5. Farb, Andrew, Nicole G. Ibrahim, and Bram D. Zuckerman. "Patent Foramen Ovale after Cryptogenic Stroke—Assessing the Evidence for Closure." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 377.11. Sep 2017: 1006-1008.
6. Ropper, Allan H. "Tipping Point for Patent Foramen Ovale Closure." (2017): 1093-1095.
7. Carroll JD, Saver JL, Thaler DE, Smalling RW, Berry S, MacDonald LA, et al. Closure of patent foramen ovale versus medical therapy after cryptogenic stroke. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 2013; 368:1092–100.
8. Meier B, Kalesan B, Mattle HP, Khattab AA, Hildick-Smith D, Dudek D, et al. Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale in cryptogenic embolism. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 2013; 368:1083–91.
9. Furlan AJ, Reisman M, Massaro J, Mauri L, Adams H, Albers GW, et al. Closure or medical therapy for cryptogenic stroke with patent foramen ovale. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 2012; 366: 991–9.
10. Wolfrum M, Froehlich GM, Knapp G, Casaubon LK, Di Nicolantonio JJ, Lansky AJ, et al. Stroke prevention by percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart* 2014; 100:389–95.
11. Kernan WN, Ovbiagele B, Black HR, Bravata DM, Chimowitz MI, Ezekowitz MD, et al. Guidelines for the prevention of stroke in patients with stroke and transient ischemic attack: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association / American Stroke Association. *Stroke* 2014 ;45:2160–236
12. Messé, Steven R., et al. "Practice advisory: Recurrent stroke with patent foramen ovale (update of practice parameter) Report of the Guideline Development, Dissemination, and Implementation Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. *Neurology* 87.8 (2016): 815-821.
13. Smer A, Salih M, Mahfood Haddad T, et al. Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials on Patent Foramen Ovale Closure Versus Medical Therapy for Secondary Prevention of Cryptogenic Stroke. *Am J Cardiol.* 2018 Jun 1;121(11):1393-1399.
14. Kuijpers T, Spencer FA, Siemieniuk RAC, et al. Patent foramen ovale closure, antiplatelet therapy or anticoagulation therapy alone for management of cryptogenic stroke? A clinical practice guideline. *BMJ.* 2018; 362: k2515. Published online 2018 Jul 25.
15. Collado FMS, Poulin MF, Murphy JJ, Jneid H, Kavinsky CJ. Patent Foramen Ovale Closure for Stroke Prevention and Other Disorders. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2018 Jun 17;7(12). pii: e007146.
16. Lee PH, Song JK, Kim JS, et al. Cryptogenic Stroke and High-Risk Patent Foramen Ovale: The DEFENSE-PFO Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2018 May 22;71(20):2335-2342.
17. St. Jude Medical Corporation. Amplatzer PFO Occluder Instructions for Use. 2018. Available at <https://manuals.sjm.com/>
18. Abbott. Amplatzer PFO Occluder. Abbott. Accessed November 8, 2019. <https://www.cardiovascular.abbott/us/en/hcp/products/structural-heart/amplatzer-pfo.html>.

CLINICAL POLICY

Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

19. Hayes. Comparative Effectiveness Review of Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale for Prevention of Recurrent Cryptogenic Stroke. Medical Technology Directory. May 31, 2018. Update September 16, 2020. Accessed 11/3/20.
20. Messe, SR, Brecker, SJD. Treatment of patent foramen ovale (PFO) for secondary stroke prevention. UpToDate. Kasner SE, Connolly HM (Eds) UpToDate, Waltham, MA. Accessed 11/3/20.
21. Hayes Health Technology Assessment: Gore Cardioform Septal Occluder (W. L. Gore & Associates Inc.) for Closure of Atrial Septal Defects. Nov 30, 2017. Annual Review Dec 12, 2019. Accessed 11/2/20.
22. W.L. Gore & Associates Inc. Cardioform Septal Occluder Instructions for Use. Flagstaff, AZ. March 2018. <https://www.goremedical.com/products/cardioform/septal-occluder>
23. Nasir UB, Qureshi WT, Jogu H et al. Updated meta-analysis of closure of patent foramen ovale versus medical therapy after cryptogenic stroke. Cardiovasc Revasc Med. 2019 Mar;20(3):187-193. doi: 10.1016/j.carrev.2018.06.001. Epub 2018 Jun 13.
24. Messe SR, Gronseth GS, Kent DM, et al. Practice advisory update summary: Patent foramen ovale and secondary stroke prevention Report of the Guideline Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology. 2020 May 19;94(20):876-885. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000009443. Epub 2020 Apr 29. Accessed 11/3/20: <https://n.neurology.org/content/neurology/94/20/876.full.pdf>