OVERVIEW
There are a wide variety of devices available for outpatient cardiac rhythm monitoring. The primary purpose of these devices is the evaluation of suspected arrhythmias that have not been detected by office or hospital-based monitoring. These devices differ in the types of monitoring leads used, the duration and continuity of monitoring, the ability to detect arrhythmias without patient intervention, and the mechanism of delivery of the information from patient to clinician. This policy addresses Mobile Cardiac Outpatient Telemetry (MCOT).

MEDICAL CRITERIA
Not applicable

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION
Not applicable

POLICY STATEMENT
BlueCHiP for Medicare
MCOT is considered medically necessary.

Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island (BCBSRI) must follow Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) guidelines, such as national coverage determinations or local coverage determinations for all BlueCHiP for Medicare policies. Therefore, BlueCHiP for Medicare policies may differ from Commercial products. In some instances, benefits for BlueCHiP for Medicare may be greater than what is allowed by the CMS.

Commercial Products
MCOT is considered not medically necessary as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

COVERAGE
Benefits may vary between groups/contracts. Please refer to the appropriate section of the Benefit Booklet, Evidence of Coverage or Subscriber Agreement for services not medically necessary.

BACKGROUND
Various devices are available for outpatient cardiac rhythm monitoring. These devices differ in the types of monitoring leads used, the duration and continuity of monitoring, the ability to detect arrhythmias without patient intervention, and the mechanism of delivering the information from patient to clinician. These devices may be used to evaluate symptoms suggestive of arrhythmias (e.g., syncope, palpitations), and may be used to detect atrial fibrillation (AF) in patients who have undergone cardiac ablation of AF or who have a history of cryptogenic stroke. This policy addresses Mobile Cardiac Outpatient Telemetry (MCOT).

Two factors must be addressed in evaluating MCOT: (1) the inherent detection capability of the monitoring devices and (2) whether the real-time transmission and interpretation of data confers an incremental health benefit. The proposed addition of real-time monitoring suggests that there may be a subset of individuals...
who require immediate intervention when an arrhythmia is detected. Because it is not clear which patients comprise that subset, or whether identification of those patients in the outpatient setting leads to improved outcomes, (e.g. reduced risks of sudden cardiac death) the evaluation of the second factor requires studies that directly assess outcomes, not just arrhythmia detection rates.

The purpose of outpatient cardiac telemetry in patients with signs or symptoms suggestive of arrhythmia is to provide an alternative method of transmitting electrical cardiac activity data to healthcare providers.

An RCT by Rothman et al (2007) compared MCOT with standard event monitors. This trial involved 305 patients randomized to the LOOP recorder or to MCOT (CardioNet) and monitored for up to 30 days. Patients were recruited from 17 centers. Investigators and patients were not blinded to randomization assignment. Patients had symptoms of syncope, presyncope, or severe palpitations occurring less frequently than once per 24 hours and a nondiagnostic 24-hour Holter or telemetry monitor within the prior 45 days. Monitor strips and diagnoses were reviewed by an electrophysiologist blinded to the monitoring device assignment. Most patients in the LOOP recorder group had a patient-triggered event monitor. Only a subset of patients (n=50) had autotrigger devices, thus precluding comparison between MCOT and autotrigger devices. Analyses were conducted on patients completing at least 25 days of monitoring. The primary endpoint was either confirmation or exclusion of arrhythmic cause of the patient’s symptoms. Arrhythmias were classified as either clinically significant or clinically insignificant. The diagnostic end point (confirmation or exclusion of arrhythmic cause of symptoms) was significantly different between the 2 groups. The difference in rates was primarily due to detection of asymptomatic (not associated with simultaneous symptoms) arrhythmias in the MCOT group, symptoms consisting of rapid AF and/or flutter (15 patients vs 1 patient), and ventricular tachycardia defined as more than 3 beats and rate greater than 100 (14 patients vs 2 patients). These differences were thought to be clinically significant rhythm disturbances and the likely causes of the patients’ symptoms. In this trial, median time to diagnosis in the total study population was 7 days in the MCOT group and 9 days in the LOOP group. (The trialists did not comment on the clinical impact (changes in management) of these findings in patients for whom the rhythm disturbance did not occur simultaneously with symptoms.

Derkac et al (2017) retrospectively reviewed the BioTelemetry database of patients receiving ambulatory ECG monitoring, selecting patients prescribed MCOT (n=69,977) and patients prescribed AT-LER, an autotrigger looping event recorder (n=8513).[68] Patients were diagnosed with palpitations, syncope and collapse, AF, tachycardia, and/or TIA. Patients given the MCOT were monitored for an average of 20 days and patients given the AT-LER were monitored an average of 27 days. The diagnostic yield using MCOT was significantly higher than that using AT-LER for several events: 128% higher for AF, 54% higher for bradycardia, 17% higher for ventricular pause, 80% higher for SVT, and 222% higher for ventricular tachycardia. Mean time to diagnosis for each asymptomatic arrhythmia was shorter for patients monitored by MCOT than by AT-LER. There was no discussion of management changes or health outcomes based on monitoring results.

Kadish et al (2010) evaluated the frequency with which events transmitted by MCOT represented emergent arrhythmias, thereby indirectly assessing the clinical utility of real-time outpatient monitoring. Medical records from 26,438 patients who had undergone MCOT during a 9-month period from a single service provider were retrospectively examined. During a mean monitoring period of 21 days, 21% (5459) had an arrhythmic event requiring physician notification. Of these, 1% (260) had an event that could be considered potentially emergent. These potentially emergent events included 120 patients with wide-complex tachycardia, 100 patients with sinus pauses 6 seconds or longer, and 42 with sustained bradycardia at less than 30 beats per minute.

A number of uncontrolled case series have reported on arrhythmia detection rates of MCOT. One study (Joshi et al [2005]) described the outcomes of a consecutive case series of 100 patients. Included patients had the following symptoms: palpitations (47%), dizziness (24%), or syncope (19%). Patients being
evaluated for the efficacy of drug treatment (25%) were also included. Clinically significant arrhythmias were detected in 51% of patients, but half of these patients were asymptomatic. The authors commented that the automatic detection resulted in an increased diagnostic yield, but there was no discussion of its unique features (ie, the real-time analysis, transmission, and notification of arrhythmia).

In the largest study evaluating the diagnostic yield of MCOT for AF, Favilla et al (2015) evaluated a retrospective cohort of 227 patients with cryptogenic stroke or TIA who underwent 28 days of monitoring with MCOT. AF was detected in 14% (31/227) of patients, of whom 3 reported symptoms at the time of AF. Oral anticoagulation was initiated in 26 (84%) patients diagnosed with AF. Of the remaining 5 (16%) not on anticoagulation therapy, 1 had a prior history of gastrointestinal bleeding, 3 were unwilling to accept the risk of bleeding related to the use of anticoagulants, and 1 failed to follow up.

Miller et al (2013) retrospectively analyzed paroxysmal AF detection rates among 156 patients evaluated with MCOT within 6 months of a cryptogenic stroke or TIA. Over a median 21-day period of MCOT monitoring (range, 1-30 days), AF was detected in 17.3% of patients. Mean time to first occurrence of AF was 9 days (range, 1-21 days).

Tayal et al (2008) retrospectively analyzed patients with cryptogenic stroke who had not been diagnosed with AF by standard monitoring. In this study, 13 (23%) of 56 patients with cryptogenic stroke had AF detected by MCOT. Twenty-seven asymptomatic AF episodes were detected in the 13 patients; 23 of them were less than 30 seconds in duration. In contrast, Kalani et al (2015) reported a diagnostic yield for AF of 4.7% (95% CI, 1.5% to 11.9%) in a series of 85 patients with cryptogenic stroke. In this series, 82.4% of patients had completed transesophageal echocardiography, cardiac magnetic resonance imaging, or both, with negative results. Three devices were used and described as MCOT devices: 34% received LifeStar ACT ambulatory cardiac telemetry, 41% received the LifeStar AF Express autodetect looping monitor, and 25% received the Cardiomedi cardiac event monitor. While the authors reported that there was a system in place to transmit the data for review, it is unclear whether data were sent in "real-time."

Narasimha et al (2018) published results of a study in which 33 patients wore both an ELR and a Kardia monitor to screen for AF during a period of 14 to 30 days.[49] Patients were 18 years or older, had palpitations less often than daily but more frequently than several times per month, and prior nondiagnostic ECGs. Exclusion criteria included myocardial infarction within the last 3 months, history of ventricular tachycardia/fibrillation, unstable angina, and syncope. Study personnel viewed the Kardia monitor recordings once daily and a physician was contacted if a serious or sustained arrhythmia was detected. Patients were also monitored by the ELR company, which notified a physician on call when necessary. All 33 patients had a diagnosis using the Kardia monitor and 24 patients received a diagnosis using the ELR (p=0.001).

Dorr et al (2019) compared the diagnostic accuracy of a smartwatch system with cardiologists’ interpretation of an ECG in the diagnostic accuracy to detect AF. The smartwatch system uses an algorithm to enable rhythm analysis of the photoplethysmographic (PPG) signals. The population consisted of 508 hospitalized patients who had interpretable ECG and PPG recordings. The PPG algorithm compared with the cardiologists’ diagnoses had a sensitivity of 94% and a specificity of 98%. A limitation of the study was that many of the recordings were excluded due to insufficient signal quality (148 of 672). The investigators concluded that detection of AF is feasible with a smartwatch, though signal quality issues need to be resolved and a broader population needs to be tested.

The available evidence suggests that MCOT is likely at least as good at detecting arrhythmias as ambulatory event monitoring. Compared with ambulatory event monitoring, MCOT is associated with the theoretical advantage of real-time monitoring, allowing for emergent intervention for potentially life-threatening arrhythmias. One study reported that 1% of arrhythmic events detected on MCOT over a 9-month period could be considered potentially emergent. However, no studies were identified that addressed whether the use of MCOT is associated with differences in the management of or outcomes after these potentially emergent events.
events. The addition of real-time monitoring to outpatient ambulatory monitoring is considered an enhancement to existing technology. Currently, the evidence does not demonstrate a clinically significant incremental benefit for MCOT. Therefore, this service is considered not medically necessary for Commercial products.

**CODING**

**BlueCHIP for Medicare and Commercial Products**
The following codes are covered for BlueCHIP for Medicare only and not medically necessary for Commercial products:

93228  Wearable mobile cardiovascular telemetry with electrocardiographic recording, concurrent computerized real time data analysis and greater than 24 hours of accessible ECG data storage (retrievable with query) with ECG triggered and patient selected events transmitted to a remote attended surveillance center for up to 30 days; physician review and interpretation with report

93229  Wearable mobile cardiovascular telemetry with electrocardiographic recording, concurrent computerized real time data analysis and greater than 24 hours of accessible ECG data storage (retrievable with query) with ECG triggered and patient selected events transmitted to a remote attended surveillance center for up to 30 days; technical support for connection and patient instructions for use, attended surveillance, analysis and physician prescribed transmission of daily and emergent data reports

**RELATED POLICIES**
Not applicable

**PUBLISHED**
Provider Update, August 2020
Provider Update, August 2019
Provider Update, July 2018
Provider Update, August 2017
Provider Update, January 2017
Provider Update, October 2015
Provider Update, January 2014
Provider Update, January 2013
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This medical policy is made available to you for informational purposes only. It is not a guarantee of payment or a substitute for your medical judgment in the treatment of your patients. Benefits and eligibility are determined by the member’s subscriber agreement or member certificate and/or the employer agreement, and those documents will supersede the provisions of this medical policy. For information on member-specific benefits, call the provider call center. If you provide services to a member which are determined to not be medically necessary (or in some cases medically necessary services which are non-covered benefits), you may not charge the member for the services unless you have informed the member and they have agreed in writing in advance to continue with the treatment at their own expense. Please refer to your participation agreement(s) for the applicable provisions. This policy is current at the time of publication; however, medical practices, technology, and knowledge are constantly changing. BCBSRI reserves the right to review and revise this policy for any reason and at any time, with or without notice. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.