

---

<b>Subject:</b>	High Intensity Focused Ultrasound (HIFU) for Oncologic Indications	<b>Publish Date:</b>	12/16/2020
<b>Guideline #:</b>	CG-MED-81	<b>Last Review Date:</b>	11/05/2020
<b>Status:</b>	Reviewed		

---

## Description

This document addresses the use of high intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) or magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound (MRgFUS) for the treatment of oncologic conditions. HIFU involves the use of a focused high-intensity convergent ultrasound beam to destroy targeted tissue.

### Note:

- See the following related document for HIFU treatment non-oncologic indications:
  - MED.00057 MRI Guided High Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation for Non-Oncologic Indications
- For information regarding other palliative treatments of metastatic bone lesions, please see the following:
  - CG-SURG-61 Cryosurgical or Radiofrequency Ablation to Treat Solid Tumors Outside the Liver

## Clinical Indications

### Medically Necessary:

The use of high intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) is considered **medically necessary** for pain palliation in individuals with localized metastatic bone pain when **all** the following criteria are met:

- A. Age 18 years or older; **and**
- B. Metastatic lesions located 1 centimeter (cm) or greater from skin and major nerve bundles; **and**
- C. Individual does not present an increased risk of fracture from the procedure (for example, a score of 7 or less on Mirel's fracture risk score); **and**
- D. Individual does not require surgical stabilization or have clinically significant comorbidities; **and**
- E. Individual is not a candidate for other therapies as evidenced by pain refractory to previous radiation therapy.

### Not Medically Necessary:

High intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) is considered **not medically necessary** when the above criteria are not met and for all other indications, including but not limited to, the treatment of prostate cancer.

## Coding

*The following codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this guideline are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider*

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

## High Intensity Focused Ultrasound (HIFU) for Oncologic Indications

reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

### Bone metastases

#### When services may be Medically Necessary when criteria are met:

##### CPT

20999 Unlisted procedure, musculoskeletal system, general [when specified as high intensity focused ultrasound for pain palliation for bone metastases]

##### HCPCS

C9734 Focused ultrasound ablation/therapeutic intervention, other than uterine leiomyomata, with magnetic resonance (MR) guidance

##### ICD-10 Diagnosis

C79.51 Secondary malignant neoplasm of bone

#### When services are Not Medically Necessary:

For the procedure and diagnosis codes listed above when criteria are not met.

### Treatment of other oncologic indications

#### When services are Not Medically Necessary:

For the following procedure codes; or when the code describes a procedure designated in the Clinical Indications section as not medically necessary.

##### CPT

19499 Unlisted procedure, breast [when specified as destruction of breast tissue by high intensity focused ultrasound]

55880 Ablation of malignant prostate tissue, transrectal, with high intensity-focused ultrasound (HIFU), including ultrasound guidance Note: code effective 01/01/2021

55899 Unlisted procedure, male genital system [for services prior to 01/01/2021 when specified as destruction of prostate tissue by high intensity focused ultrasound]

##### HCPCS

C9734 Focused ultrasound ablation/therapeutic intervention, other than uterine leiomyomata, with magnetic resonance (MR) guidance

C9747 Ablation of prostate, transrectal, high intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU), including imaging guidance [Note: code deleted 12/31/2020]

##### ICD-10 Diagnosis

C00.0-C79.49 Malignant neoplasms

C79.52-C80.2 Malignant neoplasms

D00.00-D09.9 In situ neoplasms

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

**Discussion/General Information**

Ultrasound, the use of low-intensity sound waves to produce images, is long established as a diagnostic tool. When high-intensity ultrasound waves are used in place of low-intensity, body tissue absorbs, rather than reflects the energy and produces heat and cavitation that destroys the targeted tissue. Temperatures within the targeted area increase to 60-95°C, which destroys the targeted tissue without damaging the adjacent tissue. HIFU treatment is combined with a visualization method, frequently MR guidance, to better guide treatment in real time. Ultrasound is currently being used as a therapeutic treatment in some cases, such as lithotripsy to disintegrate kidney stones. HIFU or MRgFUS has been studied as a potential treatment of various cancers. During the procedure, individuals are typically placed under conscious sedation with or without epidural anesthesia, although general anesthesia may be used. Proposed advantages of HIFU include the noninvasive nature of the procedure that spares surrounding tissue, reducing postoperative morbidity, and hastening recovery.

*Pain palliation for localized metastatic bone pain*

Bone pain is a common complaint for individuals with metastatic cancer to the bone, with approximately 30% of all individuals with cancer developing metastatic bone lesions and 50-75% of these individuals reporting significant pain. Bone metastases are common in breast and prostate cancer (Lieberman, 2009). The current standard treatment is external beam radiation therapy (EBRT). However, EBRT has been shown to be ineffective in approximately 20-30% of cases and pain recurs in 27% of the treated population (Lieberman, 2009). In addition, there are limitations on tissue tolerance at sites previously irradiated. Those who fail, are not eligible for, or refuse radiation therapy may be pharmacologically managed, or other therapies such as surgery or percutaneous cryoablation may be attempted. These options carry their own risks and side effects.

Although the exact mechanism of analgesic action of MRgFUS in pain palliation is unknown, studies have pointed to a few explanations. As the bone cortex absorbs high ultrasound energy, periosteal denervation may ensue, resulting in pain relief. Alternatively, the reduced tumor mass caused by thermal ablation may have an analgesic effect. It is likely that both of these treatment effects contribute to pain relief.

Early prospective studies evaluating MRgFUS reported promising results. Lieberman and associates (2009) used MRgFUS to treat 31 individuals with painful bone metastases who had exhausted or refused all other pain palliation methods. The bone metastases arose from a variety of primary tumors including renal, colorectal, lung, breast and prostate. Researchers used the visual analog pain score (VAS) to measure pain levels. In those 25 participants that were able to tolerate a complete treatment, 72% (18/25) reported significant pain reduction of at least 2 points on the VAS scale, 24% (6/25) reported no reduction in pain and 4% (1/25) reported an increase in pain levels. In those individuals who reported a decrease in pain levels, 50% (9/18) reported complete relief of pain. In addition, 52% of these individuals reported significant pain relief beginning 3 days post treatment. There were no reported treatment related severe adverse events (AEs). In 2013, Napoli and colleagues treated 18 individuals with painful bone metastases with MRgFUS. Participants included those who could not undergo or refused all other available options for pain palliation. Pain severity was measured using a 10-point pain scale questionnaire. The pain severity score was significantly reduced from a baseline mean of 7.1 (SD ± 2.08) (4-10; 95% confidence interval [CI], 6.07-8.15),

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

to 2.5 (SD  $\pm$  1.4) (0-5; 95% CI, 1.81-3.2) at 1 month. This further reduced at the 3 month follow-up to 1 (SD  $\pm$  1.1) (0-3; 95% CI, 0-1.85) ( $p=0.001$ ). At 3 months, 72.2% (13/18) reported no pain without the use of pain medication, and 16.7% (3/18) reported a drop of at least 2 points on pain scale without an increase in pain medication. The remaining 11.1% (2/18) reported pain reoccurrence which required pharmacological care. There were no treatment-related AEs. In a recent, small prospective, non-randomized single arm trial, MRgFUS was used on 5 individuals with painful bone metastatic lesions with a pain rating of 4 or higher. At 2 weeks follow-up, all individuals experienced a decrease in VAS pain scores from baseline (1.5-5). A complete resolution of pain at 1 year follow-up was shown in 2 participants. While this study suggested that MRgFUS can be an effective palliative treatment, this was a small study with no comparison group (Joo, 2015).

In the first phase III study published to date, Hurwitz and colleagues (2014) conducted a randomized, placebo-controlled, single-blind, multicenter, pivotal trial which included 147 participants with bone metastases from breast, prostate, kidney, lung or other primary tumors. Eligibility included those at least 18 years old with at least a 3-month life expectancy with bone metastases which were painful despite previous radiation therapy (RT) but unsuitable for further RT. In addition, eligible participants reported a numerical rating scale (NRS) pain score of 4 or greater in spite of maximal pain medication therapy, and a score of 7 or less on the Mirel's fracture risk scale. Participants received either MRgFUS ( $n=112$ ) or placebo ( $n=35$ ) treatment. The identified primary endpoint was the improvement in self-reported pain score without an increase in pain medication utilization at 3 months. The difference in response rates between MRgFUS and placebo at 3 months was significant (64.3% versus 20.0%;  $p<0.001$ ). In addition, 21% of individuals in the MRgFUS group reduced their morphine equivalent daily dose (MEDD) intake and another 26% completely stopped their MEDD consumption. Of note, 65.7% (23/35) of individuals in the placebo group did not complete the 3-month follow-up compared to approximately 21% (26/112) of the MRgFUS group. After excluding the drop-out groups the results remained similarly statistically significant. The study also included a crossover component; 17 of the 23 individuals in the placebo group who did not complete follow-up chose to receive rescue MRgFUS after a lack of response to placebo. A statistically significant pain response was reported in 70.7% of this group. These results were not included in the primary efficacy analysis. Participants were not followed beyond 3 months. While the overall primary endpoint was met, this endpoint, a composite of the change from baseline in the worst numerical rating scale (NRS) pain score and the MEDD intake, was not comprised of entirely statistically significant components. The mean reduction in the NRS score was significant between MRgFUS and placebo ( $3.6 \pm 3.1$  versus  $0.7 \pm 2.4$ ;  $p<0.001$ ). However, the change from baseline in MEDD intake was not statistically significant, although the authors noted a trend towards a statistically significant change. The treatment group reported an AE frequency of 76.2% versus 23.8% in the sham group. The majority of events were minor and reversible. The authors noted these results compared well to the radiation therapy complication rate.

While the National Comprehensive Cancer Network® (NCCN) Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPG) in Oncology for Adult Cancer Pain (V1.2020) document notes that the palliative effects of HIFU have been demonstrated in several small studies, no recommendation for or against the use of HIFU for pain palliation was given.

In 2012, the FDA approved via the Premarket Application (PMA) process the use of the ExAblate® System (InSightec, Ltd, Dallas, TX) for pain palliation in individuals 18 years and older who have metastatic bone cancer pain who have failed, are not candidates for or have refused standard radiation therapy.

---

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

### *Prostate Cancer*

Prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer in men, accounting for 19% of all new cancer cases. Prostate cancer is the second leading cause of death with approximately 39,430 deaths in 2018 (Bekelman, 2018).

HIFU has been evaluated as a minimally invasive treatment of whole gland or a focal treatment of prostate cancer, both in clinically localized prostate cancer and following recurrence. The available peer-reviewed published literature addressing the use of HIFU to treat prostate cancer consists of nonrandomized studies. There is a lack of comparative studies which evaluate the long term safety and efficacy outcomes compared to standard treatment options.

There are a number of uncontrolled case series and prospective studies which address HIFU for prostate cancer (Ahmed, 2009, 2011, 2012; Beerlage, 1999b; Blana, 2004; Chaussy, 2001; Gelet, 2000; Gelet, 2004; Guillaumier; 2018; Lawrentschuk, 2011; Muto, 2008; Napoli, 2013; Poissonnier, 2007; Shoji, 2010; Thuroff, 2003; Uchida, 2002; Uchida, 2005; Uchida, 2006a; Uchida, 2006b; Zacharakis, 2008). One of the largest of these studies was conducted by Ganzer and colleagues (2011). This study was a retrospective case series involving 804 subjects who underwent HIFU and were included in an industry-sponsored registry. The focus of this study was the use of prostate specific antigen (PSA) as a predictor of disease-free survival after HIFU, not the outcomes related to HIFU treatment. The study has several methodological flaws, including lack of a comparison group, and uncertainty regarding the percentage of subjects who completed the follow-up period.

Crouzet and colleagues (2014) conducted the largest prospective case series (n=1002) to evaluate rates of survival and morbidity over the long term in subjects treated with HIFU (Ablatherm) for localized disease. The mean follow-up period was 6.4 years (range, 0.2-13.9). Approximately 98% of subjects received 1 (60%) or 2 treatments (38%). Post-treatment biopsies were available in 77% of subjects. The overall survival (OS) rate was 80%, the progression-free survival (PFS) rate was 94%, and the disease-specific survival rate was 97%. The most commonly reported complications included “Stress 1” urinary incontinence (18.7%), followed by obstruction of the bladder outlet (16.6%), and acute urinary retention (7.6%). Late complications included occurrences of stenosis (9%) and fistula (0.4%). This prospective case series did not compare HIFU long-term survival and morbidity rates with the rates of other standard treatments.

The NCCN Prostate Cancer CPG (V2.2020) includes a recommendation for individuals with tumor recurrence following radiation therapy to include HIFU as a treatment option (2B recommendation). Previously, this recommendation was graded as a 2A. This recommendation is based upon prospective and retrospective studies (Ahmed, 2012; Baco, 2014; Crouzet, 2012; Crouzet, 2017; Kanthabalan, 2017; Palermo, 2017; Rischmann, 2017; Shah, 2016; Siddiqui, 2016; Uddin 2012). The American Urological Association (AUA) 2007 guideline on prostate cancer notes that conclusions on the outcomes of HIFU cannot be determined as there is minimal data available on this treatment. This guideline was reviewed and validated in 2011. The 2018 American Urological Association/American Society for Radiation Oncology/Society of Urologic Oncology (AUA/ASCO/SUO) notes that high intensity focused ultrasound treatment is not a standard care option for low, intermediate or high risk or localized prostate cancer.

---

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

HIFU therapy was included in a comparative effectiveness review of clinically localized prostate cancer treatments (Dahm, 2020). Focal therapies are proposed as less invasive treatment options when compared to radical prostatectomy or radiation therapy. However, comparisons involving HIFU were limited to radical prostatectomy because of a lack of studies comparing HIFU to other therapies. There is insufficient evidence to draw conclusions about the effect of HIFU on urinary incontinence, erectile dysfunction or fecal incontinence when compared to radical prostatectomy. The authors concluded, “Although... newer modalities hold promise, we need higher quality studies to assess patient important outcomes to guide evidence-based clinical practice.”

In 2015, The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved two devices for use in prostate cancer. On October 9, the FDA granted *de novo* clearance to SonaCare Medical, LLC (Charlotte, NC) to market the Sonablate® 450 for prostate tissue ablation. Sonablate was classified as a class II device. In November, the FDA approved the use of Ablatherm® (Maple Leaf; Toronto, Canada) to treat prostate cancer in individuals who previously failed radiation therapy.

Although use of HIFU or MRgFUS for primary prostate cancer or for prostate cancer metastatic to locations other than bone has not entered the generally accepted standard care for these conditions, treatment of pain related to prostate cancer metastatic to bone may provide benefits to affected men.

### *Other Oncologic Indications*

Peek and associates (2015) conducted a systematic review of the use of HIFU in breast cancer. The authors reviewed 9 studies with a total of 167 participants. Following treatment, no residual tumor was found in 46.2% of cases. However, residual tumors of less than 10% were found in 29.4% of cases and residual tumors between 10-90% were found in 22.7% of cases. The authors noted that incomplete tumor ablation could be related to poor accuracy in determining the target area or movement during the procedure. The use of HIFU in the setting of breast cancer treatment may not allow for an adequate collection of tumor specimens to evaluate the tumor histopathology. The limited examination of small biopsies as well as the lack of a reliable means of assessing some prognostic factors, such as potential lymphovascular invasion, may not provide adequate information for the determination of adjuvant systemic therapies.

In a systematic review, Li and colleagues (2014) performed a meta-analysis on the use of HIFU in combination with radiotherapy or chemotherapy in the treatment of pancreatic cancer. A total of 23 studies comprised of 1157 individuals were included. While the analysis showed superior survival rates at 6 and 12 months in the groups which included HIFU in combination therapy, the authors noted that the overall quality of the studies was poor. A second systemic review in which HIFU was compared to other ablative therapies in the treatment of locally advanced pancreatic cancer was done by Rombouts and colleagues (2015). In addition to five HIFU trials, the review included radiofrequency ablation (RFA), irreversible electroporation (IRE), stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT), iodine-125, iodine-125-cryosurgery, photodynamic therapy and microwave ablation. Results indicated that median survival in RFA, IRE and SBRT was more favorable compared to HIFU. HIFU was comparable to the median survival in standard chemotherapy. The five HIFU trials included a total of only 136 individuals. While some trials using HIFU to treat pancreatic or liver cancer have shown some promising results, these trials have lacked a comparator group (Chen, 2015; Dupré, 2015; Shi, 2015; Sofuni, 2014). Similar to prostate

---

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

## High Intensity Focused Ultrasound (HIFU) for Oncologic Indications

cancer, there is a lack of randomized trials comparing HIFU to standard treatment options. The current evidence is insufficient to support the use of HIFU as a generally accepted oncological treatment.

### Definitions

**Bone metastasis:** When cancer cells have broken off from the primary tumor and have settled and started growing on bones.

**High intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU):** A surgical procedure that uses focused high energy sound waves to destroy target tissues in the body.

**Mirel’s scoring system:** A scoring system based upon lesion characteristics and pain levels used to classify pathologic fracture risk.

Score	Site of Lesion	Size of Lesion	Nature of Lesion	Pain
1	Upper limb	<1/3 of cortex	Blastic	Mild
2	Lower limb	1/3-2/3 of cortex	Mixed	Moderate
3	Trochanteric region	>2/3 of cortex	Lytic	Functional

\* From Jawad MU, Scully SP. In brief: classifications in brief: Mirels' classification: metastatic disease in long bones and impending pathologic fracture. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2010; 468(10):2825-2827.

**Palliative treatment:** Treatment given for relief of symptoms and pain rather than attempting to cure.

### References

#### Peer Reviewed Publications:

- Ahmed HU, Cathcart P, McCartan N, et al. Focal salvage therapy for localized prostate cancer recurrence after external beam radiotherapy: a pilot study. *Cancer*. 2012; 118(17):4148-4155.
- Ahmed HU, Freeman A, Kirkham A, et al. Focal therapy for localized prostate cancer: a phase I/II trial. *J Urol*. 2011; 185(4):1246-1254.
- Ahmed HU, Hindley RG, Dickinson L, et al. Focal therapy for localised unifocal and multifocal prostate cancer: a prospective development study. *Lancet Oncol*. 2012; 13(6):622-632.
- Ahmed HU, Zacharakis E, Dudderidge T, et al. High-intensity focused ultrasound in the treatment of primary prostate cancer: the first UK series. *Br J Cancer*. 2009; 101(1):19-26.
- Albisinni S, Aoun F, Bellucci S, et al. Comparing high-intensity focal ultrasound hemiablation to robotic radical prostatectomy in the management of unilateral prostate cancer: a matched-pair analysis. *J Endourol*. 2017; 31(1):14-19
- Baco E, Gelet A, Crouzet S, et al. Hemi salvage high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) in unilateral radiorecurrent prostate cancer: a prospective two-centre study. *BJU Int*. 2014; 114(4):532-540.
- Beerlage HP, Thuroff S, Debruyne FM, et al. Transrectal high-intensity focused ultrasound using the Ablatherm device in the treatment of localized prostate carcinoma. *Urology*. 1999a; 54(2):273-277.

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

8. Beerlage HP, van Leenders GJ, Oosterhof GO, et al. High-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) followed after one to two weeks by radical retropubic prostatectomy: results of a prospective study. *Prostate*. 1999b; 39(1):41-46.
9. Bertrand AS, Iannessi A, Natale R, et al. Focused ultrasound for the treatment of bone metastases: effectiveness and feasibility. *J Ther Ultrasound*. 2018; 6:8
10. Blana A, Murat FJ, Walter B, et al. First analysis of the long-term results with transrectal HIFU in patients with localised prostate cancer. *Eur Urol*. 2008; 53(6):1194-1201.
11. Blana A, Walter B, Rogenhofer S, Wieland WF. High-intensity focused ultrasound for the treatment of localized prostate cancer: 5-year experience. *Urology*. 2004; 63(2):297-300.
12. Boccon-Gibod L, Djavan WB, Hammerer P, et al. Management of prostate-specific antigen relapse in prostate cancer: a European Consensus. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2004; 58(4):382-390.
13. Chaussy C, Thuroff S, Rebillard X, Gelet A. Technology insight: High-intensity focused ultrasound for urologic cancers. *Nat Clin Pract Urol*. 2005; 2(4):191-198.
14. Chaussy C, Thuroff S. Results and side effects of high-intensity focused ultrasound in localized prostate cancer. *J Endourol*. 2001; 15(4):437-440.
15. Chaussy C, Thuroff S. The status of high-intensity focused ultrasound in the treatment of localized prostate cancer and the impact of a combined resection. *Curr Urol Rep*. 2003; 4(3):248-252.
16. Chen L, Wang K, Chen Z, et al. High intensity focused ultrasound ablation for patients with inoperable liver cancer. *Hepatogastroenterology*. 2015; 62(137):140-143.
17. Colombel M, Gelet A. Principles and results of high-intensity focused ultrasound for localized prostate cancer. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis*. 2004; 7(4):289-294.
18. Crouzet S, Blana A, Murat FJ, et al. Salvage high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) for locally recurrent prostate cancer after failed radiation therapy: Multi-institutional analysis of 418 patients. *BJU Int*. 2017; 119(6):896-904.
19. Crouzet S, Chapelon JY, Rouvière O, et al. Whole-gland ablation of localized prostate cancer with high-intensity focused ultrasound: oncologic outcomes and morbidity in 1002 patients. *Eur Urol*. 2014; 65(5):907-914.
20. Crouzet S, Murat FJ, Pommier P, et al. Locally recurrent prostate cancer after initial radiation therapy: early salvage high-intensity focused ultrasound improves oncologic outcomes. *Radiother Oncol*. 2012; 105(2):198-202.
21. Dupré A, Melodelima D, Pérol D, et al. First clinical experience of intra-operative high intensity focused ultrasound in patients with colorectal liver metastases: a phase I-IIa study. *PLoS One*. 2015; 10(2):e0118212.
22. Errico A. Surgery: MRgFUS-non invasive treatment for patients with painful bone metastasis. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. 2014; 11(6):303.
23. Ganzer R, Robertson CN, Ward JF, et al. Correlation of prostate-specific antigen nadir and biochemical failure after high-intensity focused ultrasound of localized prostate cancer based on the Stuttgart failure criteria - analysis from the @-Registry. *BJU Int*. 2011; 108(8 Pt 2):E196-E201.
24. Gardner TA, Koch MO. Prostate cancer therapy with high-intensity focused ultrasound. *Clin Genitourin Cancer*. 2005; 4(3):187-192.
25. 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*. 2014; 96(9):743-751.

---

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.



26. Gelet A, Chapelon JY, Bouvier R, et al. Transrectal high-intensity focused ultrasound: minimally invasive therapy of localized prostate cancer. *J Endourol*. 2000; 14(6):519-528.
  27. Gelet A, Chapelon JY, Poissonnier L, et al. Local recurrence of prostate cancer after external beam radiotherapy: early experience of salvage therapy using high-intensity focused ultrasonography. *Urology*. 2004; 63(4):625-629.
  28. Guillaumier S, Peters M, Arya M, et al. A multicentre study of 5-year outcomes following focal therapy in treating clinically significant nonmetastatic prostate cancer. *Eur Urol*. 2018; 74(4):422-429.
  29. Harding D, Giles SL, Brown MRD, et al. Evaluation of quality of life outcomes following palliative treatment of bone metastases with magnetic resonance-guided high intensity focused ultrasound: an international multicentre study. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. 2018; 30(4):233-242.
  30. 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*. 2014; 106(5).
  31. Jawad MU, Scully SP. In brief: classifications in brief: Mirels' classification: metastatic disease in long bones and impending pathologic fracture. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2010; 468(10):2825-2827.
  32. Joo B, Park MS, Lee SH, et al. Pain palliation in patients with bone metastases using magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound with conformal bone system: a preliminary report. *Yonsei Med J*. 2015; 56(2):503-509.
  33. Kanthabalan A, Peters M, Van Vulpen M, et al. Focal salvage high-intensity focused ultrasound in radiorecurrent prostate cancer. *BJU Int*. 2017; 120(2):246-256.
  34. Lawrentschuk N, Finelli A, Van der Kwast TH, et al. Salvage radical prostatectomy following primary high intensity focused ultrasound for treatment of prostate cancer. *J Urol*. 2011; 185(3):862-868.
  35. Li CC, Wang YQ, Li YP, Li XL. High-intensity focused ultrasound for treatment of pancreatic cancer: a systematic review. *J Evid Based Med*. 2014; 7(4):270-281.
  36. 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*. 2009; 16(1):140-146.
  37. Limani K, Aoun F, Holz S, et al. Single high intensity focused ultrasound session as a whole gland primary treatment for clinically localized prostate cancer: 10-year outcomes. *Prostate Cancer*. 2014; 2014:186782.
  38. Muto S, Yoshii T, Saito K, et al. Focal therapy with high-intensity-focused ultrasound in the treatment of localized prostate cancer. *Jpn J Clin Oncol*. 2008; 38(3):192-199.
  39. 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*. 2013; 63(2):395-398.
  40. Napoli A, Anzidei M, Marincola BC, et al. Primary pain palliation and local tumor control in bone metastases treated with magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound. *Invest Radiol*. 2013; 48(6):351-358.
  41. Palermo G, Totaro A, Sacco E, et al. High intensity focused ultrasound as first line salvage therapy in prostate cancer local relapse after radical prostatectomy: 4-year follow-up outcomes. *Minerva Urol Nefrol*. 2017; 69(1):93-100.
  42. Peek MC, Ahmed M, Napoli A, et al. Systematic review of high-intensity focused ultrasound ablation in the treatment of breast cancer. *Br J Surg*. 2015; 102(8):873-882.
  43. Pickles T, Goldenberg L, Steinhoff G. Technology review: high-intensity focused ultrasound for prostate cancer. *Can J Urol*. 2005; 12(2):2593-2597.
  44. Poissonnier L, Chapelon JY, Rouviere O, et al. Control of prostate cancer by transrectal HIFU in 227 patients. *Eur Urology*. 2007; 51(2):381-387.
- 

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

45. Rebillard X, Gelet A, Davin JL, et al. Transrectal high-intensity focused ultrasound in the treatment of localized prostate cancer. *J Endourol.* 2005; 19(6):693-701.
46. Rischmann P, Gelet A, Riche B, et al. Focal high intensity focused ultrasound of unilateral localized prostate cancer: a prospective multicentric hemiablation study of 111 patients. *Eur Urol.* 2017; 71(2):267-273.
47. Rombouts SJ, Vogel JA, van Santvoort HC, et al. Systematic review of innovative ablative therapies for the treatment of locally advanced pancreatic cancer. *Br J Surg.* 2015; 102(3):182-193.
48. Shah TT, Peters M, Kanthabalan A, et al. PSA nadir as a predictive factor for biochemical disease-free survival and overall survival following whole-gland salvage HIFU following radiotherapy failure. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis.* 2016; 19(3):311-316.
49. Schatzl G, Madersbacher S, Djavan B, et al. Two-year results of transurethral resection of the prostate versus four 'less invasive' treatment options. *Eur Urol.* 2000; 37(6):695-701.
50. Shi Y, Ying X, Hu X, et al. Influence of high intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) treatment to the pancreatic function in pancreatic cancer patients. *Pak J Pharm Sci.* 2015; 28(3 Suppl):1097-1100.
51. Shoji S, Nakano M, Nagata Y, et al. Quality of life following high-intensity focused ultrasound for the treatment of localized prostate cancer: a prospective study. *Int J Urol.* 2010; 17(8):715-719.
52. Siddiqui KM, Billia M, Arifin A, et al. Pathological, oncologic and functional outcomes of a prospective registry of salvage high intensity focused ultrasound ablation for radiorecurrent prostate cancer. *J Urol.* 2017; 197(1):97-102.
53. Sofuni A, Moriyasu F, Sano T, et al. Safety trial of high-intensity focused ultrasound therapy for pancreatic cancer. *World J Gastroenterol.* 2014; 20(28):9570-9577.
54. Taneja SS. Re: Salvage high-intensity focused ultrasound for patients with recurrent prostate cancer after brachytherapy. *J Urol.* 2015; 194(1):114.
55. Thuroff S, Chaussy C, Vallancien G, et al. High-intensity focused ultrasound and localized prostate cancer: efficacy results from the European multicentric study. *J Endourol.* 2003; 17(8):673-677.
56. Thuroff S, Chaussy C. High-intensity focused ultrasound: complications and adverse events. *Mol Urol.* 2000; 4(3):183-187.
57. Uchida T, Baba S, Irie A, et al. Transrectal high-intensity focused ultrasound in the treatment of localized prostate cancer: a multicenter study. *Hinyokika Kyo.* 2005; 51(10):651-658.
58. Uchida T, Ohkusa H, Nagata Y, et al. Treatment of localized prostate cancer using high-intensity focused ultrasound. *BJU Int.* 2006b; 97(1):56-61.
59. Uchida T, Ohkusa H, Yamashita H, et al. Five years' experience of transrectal high-intensity focused ultrasound using the Sonablate device in the treatment of localized prostate cancer. *Int J Urol.* 2006a; 13(3):228-233.
60. Uchida T, Sanghvi NT, Gardner TA, et al. Transrectal high-intensity focused ultrasound for treatment of patients with stage T1b-2n0m0 localized prostate cancer: a preliminary report. *Urology.* 2002; 59(3):394-398.
61. Uchida T, Tomonaga T, Kim H, et al. Improved outcomes with advancements in high intensity focused ultrasound devices for the treatment of localized prostate cancer. *J Urol.* 2015; 193(1):103-110.
62. Uddin Ahmed H, Cathcart P, Chalasani V, et al. Whole-gland salvage high-intensity focused ultrasound therapy for localized prostate cancer recurrence after external beam radiation therapy. *Cancer.* 2012; 118(12):3071-3078.
63. Yutkin V, Ahmed HU, Donaldson I, et al. Salvage high-intensity focused ultrasound for patients with recurrent prostate cancer after brachytherapy. *Urology.* 2014; 84(5):1157-1162.

---

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

## High Intensity Focused Ultrasound (HIFU) for Oncologic Indications

64. Zacharakis E, Ahmed HU, Ishaq A, et al. The feasibility and safety of high-intensity focused ultrasound as salvage therapy for recurrent prostate cancer following external beam radiotherapy. *BJU Int.* 2008; 102(7):786-792.
65. Zhang M, Liu L, Wang J, et al. Effects of high-intensity focused ultrasound for treatment of abdominal lymph node metastasis from gastric cancer. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2015 Mar;34(3):435-440.

**Government Agency, Medical Society, and Other Authoritative Publications:**

1. American College of Radiology (ACR). ACR Appropriateness Criteria®. Locally advanced (high-risk) prostate cancer. 2016. Available at: <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/69397/Narrative>. Accessed on October 5, 2020.
2. American Urological Association (AUA) / American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) / Society of Urologic Oncology (SUO). Clinically Localized Prostate Cancer: AUA/ASTRO/SUO Guideline. 2017. Available at: [https://www.astro.org/uploadedFiles/MAIN\\_SITE/Patient\\_Care/Clinical\\_Practice\\_Statements/Content\\_Pieces/ClinicallyLocalizedProstateCancer.pdf](https://www.astro.org/uploadedFiles/MAIN_SITE/Patient_Care/Clinical_Practice_Statements/Content_Pieces/ClinicallyLocalizedProstateCancer.pdf). Accessed on October 5, 2020.
3. Dahm P, Brasure M, Ester E, et al. Therapies for clinically localized prostate cancer [Internet]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2020 Sep. Report No.: 20-EHC022.
4. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology®. © 2020 National Comprehensive Cancer Network, Inc. For additional information visit the NCCN website: <http://www.nccn.org/index.asp>. Accessed on October 5, 2020.
  - Adult Cancer Pain (V1.2020). Revised April 8, 2020.
  - Prostate Cancer (V2.2020). Revised May 21, 2020.
5. Thompson I, Thrasher JB, Aus G, et al.; AUA Prostate Cancer Clinical Guideline Update Panel. Guideline for the management of clinically localized prostate cancer: 2007 update. *J Urol.* 2007; 177(6):2106-2131. Reviewed and validity confirmed 2011.
6. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). 510K Premarket notification. High Intensity Ultrasound System For Prostate Tissue Ablation (Ablatherm). November 6, 2015. Available at: [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf15/k153023.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf15/k153023.pdf). Accessed on October 5, 2020.
7. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). 510K Premarket notification. High Intensity Ultrasound System For Prostate Tissue Ablation (Focal One). June 7, 2018. Available at: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpmn/pmn.cfm?ID=K172721>. Accessed on October 5, 2020.
8. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Premarket Notification Database. Magnetic Resonance guided Focused Ultrasound Surgery System (MRgFUS) ExAblate Model 2000/2100. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data (SSED). No. P110039. Available at: [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf11/p110039b.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf11/p110039b.pdf). Accessed on October 5, 2020.

**Websites for Additional Information**

1. American Cancer Society. Bone Metastases. Last Revised September 10, 2020. Available at: <http://www.cancer.org/treatment/understandingyourdiagnosis/bonemetastasis/bone-metastasis-treating-problems-caused>. Accessed on October 5, 2020.

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.

## High Intensity Focused Ultrasound (HIFU) for Oncologic Indications

2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC): How is Prostate Cancer Treated? Last Reviewed: August 18, 2020. Available at: [http://www.cdc.gov/cancer/prostate/basic\\_info/treatment.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/cancer/prostate/basic_info/treatment.htm). Accessed on October 5, 2020.
3. U.S. National Library of Medicine. Medical Encyclopedia. Prostate Cancer. Update date: October 5, 2020. Available at: <https://medlineplus.gov/prostatecancer.html>. Accessed on October 5, 2020.
4. U.S. National Library of Medicine. MedlinePlus. Palliative Care. Available at: <https://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/palliativecare.html>. Accessed on October 4, 2020.

### Index

Ablatherm®  
 Sonablate 450  
 ExAblate

**The use of specific product names is illustrative only. It is not intended to be a recommendation of one product over another, and is not intended to represent a complete listing of all products available.**

### History

Status	Date	Action
Reviewed	11/05/2020	Medical Policy & Technology Assessment Committee (MPTAC) review. Updated Description, Discussion, References and Websites for Additional Information sections. Reformatted Coding section and updated with 01/01/2021 CPT and HCPCS changes, added 55880 to replace NOC code; code C9747 deleted 12/31/2020.
Reviewed	11/07/2019	MPTAC review. Updated Description, Discussion, References and Websites for Additional Information sections.
New	03/21/2019	MPTAC review.
New	03/20/2019	Hematology/Oncology Subcommittee review. Moved content of MED.00119 High Intensity Focused Ultrasound (HIFU) for Oncologic Indications to new clinical utilization management guideline document with the same title.

Federal and State law, as well as contract language including definitions and specific coverage provisions/exclusions, and Medical Policy take precedence over Clinical UM Guidelines and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. The member's contract benefits in effect on the date that services are rendered must be used. Clinical UM Guidelines, which address medical efficacy, should be considered before utilizing medical opinion in adjudication. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Clinical UM Guidelines periodically. Clinical UM guidelines are used when the plan performs utilization review for the subject. Due to variances in utilization patterns, each plan may choose whether or not to adopt a particular Clinical UM Guideline. To determine if review is required for this Clinical UM Guideline, please contact the customer service number on the back of the member's card.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from the health plan.