

# Clinical Policy: Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

Reference Number: PA.CP.MP.151

Effective Date: 09/2018

Date of Last Review: 07/28/2022

[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. Currently, two devices have been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for percutaneous PFO closure; the Amplatzer™ PFO Occluder and the Gore® Cardioform Septal Occluder.

## Policy/Criteria

- I. It is the policy of Pennsylvania Health and Wellness® (PHW) that the percutaneous transcatheter closure of PFO is **medically necessary** to reduce the risk of recurrent ischemic stroke, when used according to FDA labeled indications, contraindications, warnings and precautions and meet the following indications:
  - A. Age  $\geq 18$  and  $\leq 60$ ;
  - 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.
- 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;
    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.<sup>1,2</sup> The biological significance of PFOs has 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.<sup>1</sup> Three initial randomized

## CLINICAL POLICY

### Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

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.<sup>7-10</sup>

However, four additional published articles in *The New England Journal of Medicine* expand the body of work and extend analyses.<sup>2-6</sup> In the CLOSE study, 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.<sup>2</sup> This finding was also validated by the Gore REDUCE investigators in their analysis of 664 patients.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, 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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup>

Mounting evidence suggests that PFO device closure is more effective than medical therapy alone for select patients aged  $\leq 60$  years with a PFO-associated stroke (i.e., a nonlacunar ischemic stroke in the setting of a PFO with a right-to-left interatrial shunt and no other source of stroke despite a comprehensive evaluation).<sup>20</sup>

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.<sup>15</sup>

2021 guidelines from the American Heart Association/ American Stroke Association considers it reasonable to percutaneously close PFO in patients who meet each of the following criteria: age 18–60 years, nonlacunar stroke, no other identified cause, and high risk patent foramen ovale features.<sup>24</sup>

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 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).

## CLINICAL POLICY

### Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

- In patients who opt to receive medical therapy alone without PFO closure, clinicians may recommend an antiplatelet medication such as aspirin or anticoagulation (level C)<sup>23</sup>

### 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	Review 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/

Reviews, Revisions, and Approvals	Review Date	Approval Date
		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	
Annual review. Reworded policy statement, adding “when used according to FDA labeled indications, contraindications, warnings and precautions. Removed contraindications (I.B.4) since they are specific to the Amplatzer PFO device. Updated background with 2021 AHA/ASA recommendations. Added AAN recommendation for patients who opt to receive medical therapy alone without PFO closure. “Changed “review date” in the header to “date of last revision” and “date” in the revision log header to “revision date.” References reviewed, updated, and reformatted. Reviewed by specialist.	7/28/2022	

## References

1. Nakanishi K, Yoshiyama M, Homma S. Patent foramen ovale and cryptogenic stroke. *Trends Cardiovasc Med*. 2017;27(8):575-581. doi:10.1016/j.tcm.2017.06.016
2. Mas JL, Derumeaux G, Guillon B, et al. Patent Foramen Ovale Closure or Anticoagulation vs. Antiplatelets after Stroke. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377(11):1011-1021. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1705915
3. Saver JL, Carroll JD, Thaler DE, et al. Long-Term Outcomes of Patent Foramen Ovale Closure or Medical Therapy after Stroke. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(11):1022-1032. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1610057
4. Søndergaard L, Krasner SE, Rhodes JF, et al. Patent Foramen Ovale Closure or Antiplatelet Therapy for Cryptogenic Stroke. [published correction appears in *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Mar 5;382(10):978] *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(11):1033-1042. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1707404
5. Farb A, Ibrahim NG, Zuckerman BD. Patent Foramen Ovale after Cryptogenic Stroke- Assessing the Evidence for Closure. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(11):1006-1008. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1700218

## CLINICAL POLICY

### Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

6. Ropper AH. Tipping Point for Patent Foramen Ovale Closure. *N Engl J Med.* (2017);377(11): 1093-1095. doi:10.1056/NEJMe1709637
7. Carroll JD, Saver JL, Thaler DE, et al. Closure of patent foramen ovale versus medical therapy after cryptogenic stroke. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;368(12):1092–1100 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1301440.
8. Meier B, Kalesan B, Mattle HP, et al. Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale in cryptogenic embolism. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;368(12):1083–1091. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1211716
9. Furlan AJ, Reisman M, Massaro J, et al. Closure or medical therapy for cryptogenic stroke with patent foramen ovale. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366(11): 991–999. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1009639
10. Wolfrum M, Froehlich GM, Knapp G, Casaubon LK, Di Nicolantonio JJ, Lansky AJ, et al. *Heart* 2014;100(5):389–395. doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2013-304394
11. Kernan WN, Ovbiagele B, Black HR, 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. [published correction appears in *Stroke*. 2015 Feb;46(2):e54]. *Stroke* 2014;45(7):2160–2236. doi:10.1161/STR.0000000000000024
12. Messé SR, Gronseth G, Kent DM, 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* 2016;(87): 815-821. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000002961
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;121(11):1393-1399. doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2018.02.021
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 2018 Jul 25. doi:10.1136/bmj.k2515
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 7(12). e007146. Published 2018 Jun 17. doi:10.1161/JAHA.117.007146
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;71(20):2335-2342. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2018.02.046
17. St. Jude Medical Corporation. Amplatzer PFO Occluder Instructions for Use. 2018. Available at <https://www.fda.gov/media/97980/download>
18. Abbott. Amplatzer PFO Occluder. Abbott. Accessed October 18, 2021.. <https://www.cardiovascular.abbott/us/en/hcp/products/structural-heart/amplatzer-pfo.html>.
19. Comparative Effectiveness Review of Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale for Prevention of Recurrent Cryptogenic Stroke. Hayes. [www.hayesinc.com](http://www.hayesinc.com). Published May 31, 2018 (annual review September 16, 2020.) Accessed October 18, 2021.
20. Messe SR, Brecker SJD. Treatment of patent foramen ovale (PFO) for secondary stroke prevention. UpToDate. [www.uptodate.com](http://www.uptodate.com). Published May 07, 2021. Accessed October 19, 2021.

## CLINICAL POLICY

### Transcatheter Closure of Patent Foramen Ovale

21. W.L. Gore & Associates Inc. Cardioform Septal Occluder Instructions for Use. Flagstaff, AZ. March 2018. <https://www.goremedical.com/products/cardioform/septal-occluder>
22. 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;20(3):187-193. doi: 10.1016/j.carrev.2018.06.001.
23. 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.
24. Kleindorfer DO, Towfighi A, Chaturvedi S, et al. 2021 Guideline for the Prevention of Stroke in Patients With Stroke and Transient Ischemic Attack: A Guideline From the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association [published correction appears in *Stroke*. 2021 Jul;52(7):e483-e484]. *Stroke*. 2021;52(7):e364-e467. doi:10.1161/STR.0000000000000375