Medical Coverage Policy | Semi-Implantable and Fully Implantable Middle Ear Hearing Aids

EFFECTIVE DATE: 10|01|2015
POLICY LAST UPDATED: 09|04|2018

OVERVIEW

Moderate-to-severe sensorineural hearing loss is often treated with external acoustic hearing aids, while conductive hearing loss can be treated with acoustic or bone-conduction hearing aids when surgical or medical interventions do not correct hearing loss. Semi-implantable and fully implantable middle ear hearing aids detect sound and transduce signals directly to the ossicles in the middle ear, and have been used as an alternative to external acoustic hearing aids.

This policy does not apply to Medicare products as Medicare does not cover hearing aids.

MEDICAL CRITERIA

Not applicable

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

Not applicable

POLICY STATEMENT

Commercial Products

Semi-implantable and fully implantable middle ear hearing aids are considered not medically necessary as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Re-insertion of the device after removal is considered not medically necessary.

COVERAGE

Benefits may vary between groups/contracts. Please refer to the appropriate Benefit Booklet, Evidence of Coverage, or Subscriber Agreement for limitations of benefits/coverage when services are not medically necessary.

BACKGROUND

HEARING LOSS

Hearing loss is described as conductive, sensorineural, or mixed, and can be unilateral or bilateral. Normal hearing is the detection of sound at or below 20 decibels (dB). The American Speech Language-Hearing Association has defined the degree of hearing loss based on pure-tone average (PTA) detection thresholds as mild (20-40 dB), moderate (40-60 dB), severe (60-80 dB), and profound (≥80 dB).

Treatment

Sound amplification through the use of an air-conduction hearing aid can provide benefit to patients with sensorineural, conductive, or mixed hearing loss. Contralateral routing of signal is a system in which a microphone on the affected side transmits a signal to an air-conduction hearing aid on the normal or less affected side.

Patients with moderate to severe sensorineural hearing loss are typically fitted with external acoustic hearing aids. Conductive hearing loss may be treated with acoustic or bone conduction hearing aids when surgical or medical interventions are unable to correct hearing loss. However, these hearing aids may not be acceptable

to patients, either due to issues related to anatomic fit, sound quality, or personal preference. In some cases, external acoustic hearing aids cannot be used due to external ear pathologies (eg, otitis externa). Semi-implantable and fully implantable middle ear hearing aids have been developed as an alternative to external acoustic hearing aids.

Semi- and Fully Implantable Middle Ear Hearing Aids

Two semi-implantable devices have Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval: the Vibrant Soundbridge (MED-EL Corp.) and the Maxum System (Ototronix). The devices consist of 3 components: a magnetic component that is implanted onto the ossicles of the middle ear, a receiver, and a sound processor. The Soundbridge device is implanted subcutaneously behind the ear while the processor is worn externally on the scalp over the receiver unit and held in place by a magnet. The Maxum System device is placed in the user's ear canal while the processor rests over the external ear. In general, the sound processor receives and amplifies the sound vibrations and transforms the sound pressure into electrical signals that are received by the receiver unit. The receiver unit then transduces these electrical signals into electromagnetic energy and creates an alternating electromagnetic field with the magnetic component (floating mass transducer) implanted on the ossicles of the middle ear. This electromagnetic field results in attractive and repulsive forces on the magnetic implant, causing vibration of the bones of the middle ear similar to normal hearing.

One fully implantable middle ear hearing aid has FDA approval: the Esteem Implantable Hearing System (Envoy Medical). Similar to the semi-implantable devices, the fully implantable device consists of a sensor, a sound processor, and a driver connected to the ossicles. The sensor detects vibrations of the tympanic membrane and transforms the vibrations into electrical signals that are processed by the sound processor. The processor transduces these signals via piezoelectric transduction, as opposed to the electromagnetic transduction used in the semi-implantable devices. A piezoelectric transducer (the sensor) is placed at the head of the incus and converts mechanical vibrations detected from the tympanic membrane into electrical signals that are delivered to the stapes by another piezoelectric transducer (the driver).

Two semi-implantable devices were approved by the FDA through the premarket approval process: the Vibrant® Soundbridge™ (MED-EL Corp.) in 2000 and the Direct System™ (Soundtec) in 2001. The Soundtec system was discontinued by the manufacturer Ototronix in 2004 due to performance issues; it was re-released in 2009 under the name Maxum™ System. Approved FDA labeling for both states that the devices are "…intended for use in adults, 18 years of age or older, who have a moderate to severe sensorineural hearing loss and desire an alternative to an acoustic hearing aid."

In 2010, the Esteem® Implantable Hearing System (Envoy Medical, St. Paul, MN), a fully implantable middle ear hearing aid, was approved by FDA through the premarket approval process. FDA-approved labeling for the Esteem® hearing implant indicates it is "intended to alleviate hearing loss ... in adults 18 years of age or older with stable bilateral sensorineural hearing loss."

Another fully implantable middle ear hearing aid, the Carina® Fully Implantable Hearing Device, is in development (Otologics, now Cochlear), but does not have FDA approval. Phase 1 and 2 trials have been conducted in the United States under investigational device exemptions.

The evidence for semi-implantable and fully implantable middle ear hearing aids in individuals who have hearing loss is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes. Therefore, semi- and fully implantable middle ear hearing aids are considered not medically necessary.

CODING

Commercial Products

The following codes are not medically necessary:

S2230 Implantation of magnetic component of semi-implantable hearing device on ossicles in middle ear

V5095 Semi-implantable middle ear hearing prosthesis

RELATED POLICIES

Cochlear Implants
Hearing Aid Mandate

PUBLISHED

Provider Update, November 2018
Provider Update, February 2018
Provider Update, January 2017
Provider Update, August 2015
Provider Update, July 2015

REFERENCES

1. Uhler K, Anderson MC, Jenkins HA. Long-term outcome data in patients following one year's use of a fully implantable active middle ear implant. *Audiol Neurootol.* 2016;21(2):105-112. PMID 27031589
2. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness: Vibrant Soundbridge. 2000; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf/P990052B.pdf. Accessed January 24, 2018.
3. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data: Soundtec Direct System. 2001; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf/P010023b.pdf. Accessed January 24, 2018.
4. Luetje CM, Brackman D, Balkany TJ, et al. Phase III clinical trial results with the Vibrant Soundbridge implantable middle ear hearing device: a prospective controlled multicenter study. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Feb 2002;126(2):97-107. PMID 11870337
5. Sterkers O, Boucarra D, Labassi S, et al. A middle ear implant, the Symphonix Vibrant Soundbridge: retrospective study of the first 125 patients implanted in France. *Otol Neurotol.* May 2003;24(3):427-436. PMID 12806295
6. Ernst A, Todt I, Wagner J. Safety and effectiveness of the Vibrant Soundbridge in treating conductive and mixed hearing loss: A systematic review. *Laryngoscope.* Jun 2016;126(6):1451-1457. PMID 26468033
7. Bruchhage KL, Leichtle A, Schonweiler R, et al. Systematic review to evaluate the safety, efficacy and economical outcomes of the Vibrant Soundbridge for the treatment of sensorineural hearing loss. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* Apr 2017;274(4):1797-1806. PMID 27796557
8. Butler CL, Thavaneswaran P, Lee IH. Efficacy of the active middle-ear implant in patients with sensorineural hearing loss. *J Laryngol Otol.* Jul 2013;127 Suppl 2:S8-16. PMID 23790515
9. Kahue CN, Carlson ML, Daugherty JA, et al. Middle ear implants for rehabilitation of sensorineural hearing loss: a systematic review of FDA approved devices. *Otol Neurotol.* Aug 2014;35(7):1228-1237. PMID 24643033
10. Zwartenkot JW, Hashemi J, Cremers CW, et al. Active middle ear implantation for patients with sensorineural hearing loss and external otitis: long-term outcome in patient satisfaction. *Otol Neurotol.* Jul 2013;34(5):855-861. PMID 23739560
11. Hough JV, Matthews P, Wood MW, et al. Middle ear electromagnetic semi-implantable hearing device: results of the phase II SOUNDTEC direct system clinical trial. *Otol Neurotol.* Nov 2002;23(6):895-903. PMID 12438853
12. Silverstein H, Atkins J, Thompson JH, Jr., et al. Experience with the SOUNDTEC implantable hearing aid. *Otol Neurotol.* Mar 2005;26(2):211-217. PMID 15793407
13. Frenzel H, Sprinzl G, Streitberger C, et al. The Vibrant Soundbridge in children and adolescents: preliminary European multicenter results. *Otol Neurotol.* Aug 2015;36(7):1216-1222. PMID 26107139
14. Marino R, Linton N, Eikelboom RH, et al. A comparative study of hearing aids and round window application of the vibrant sound bridge (VSB) for patients with mixed or conductive hearing loss. *Int J Audiol.* Apr 2013;52(4):209-218. PMID 23527900

15. Colletti L, Mandala M, Colletti V. Long-term outcome of round window Vibrant SoundBridge implantation in extensive ossicular chain defects. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Jul 2013;149(1):134-141. PMID 23585147
16. Vyskocil E, Riss D, Honeder C, et al. Vibroplasty in mixed and conductive hearing loss: comparison of different coupling methods. *Laryngoscope.* Jun 2014;124(6):1436-1443. PMID 24338550
17. Atas A, Tutar H, Gunduz B, et al. Vibrant SoundBridge application to middle ear windows versus conventional hearing aids: a comparative study based on international outcome inventory for hearing aids. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* Jan 2014;271(1):35-40. PMID 23400404
18. Skarzynski H, Olszewski L, Skarzynski PH, et al. Direct round window stimulation with the Med-El Vibrant Soundbridge: 5 years of experience using a technique without interposed fascia. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* Mar 2014;271(3):477-482. PMID 23512431
19. de Abajo J, Sanhueza I, Giron L, et al. Experience with the active middle ear implant in patients with moderateto-severe mixed hearing loss: indications and results. *Otol Neurotol.* Oct 2013;34(8):1373-1379. PMID 24005166
20. Dillon MT, Tubbs RS, Adunka MC, et al. Round window stimulation for conductive and mixed hearing loss. *Otol Neurotol.* Oct 2014;35(9):1601-1608. PMID 25111522
21. Beltrame AM, Martini A, Prosser S, et al. Coupling the Vibrant Soundbridge to cochlea round window: auditory results in patients with mixed hearing loss. *Otol Neurotol.* Feb 2009;30(2):194-201. PMID 19180678
22. Bernardeschi D, Hoffman C, Benchaa T, et al. Functional results of Vibrant Soundbridge middle ear implants in conductive and mixed hearing losses. *Audiol Neurootol.* Jan 2011;16(6):381-387. PMID 21228566
23. Colletti L, Carner M, Mandala M, et al. The floating mass transducer for external auditory canal and middle ear malformations. *Otol Neurotol.* Jan 2011;32(1):108-115. PMID 21131892
24. Gunduz B, Atas A, Bayazit YA, et al. Functional outcomes of Vibrant Soundbridge applied on the middle ear windows in comparison with conventional hearing aids. *Acta Otolaryngol.* Dec 2012;132(12):1306-1310. PMID 23039370
25. Mandala M, Colletti L, Colletti V. Treatment of the atretic ear with round window vibrant soundbridge implantation in infants and children: electrocochleography and audiologic outcomes. *Otol Neurotol.* Oct 2011;32(8):1250- 1255. PMID 21897320