

Medical Coverage Policy | Desensitization Treatment for Peanut Allergies



EFFECTIVE DATE: 04|01|2021

POLICY LAST REVIEWED: 10|01|2025

OVERVIEW

While peanut allergy is the most common cause of food allergy among children in the United States, deaths from accidental peanut exposure are rare. Approximately 80% of individuals who develop peanut allergy early in childhood do not outgrow their allergy and over half of them suffer from additional food allergies. Diagnosis of peanut allergy is made with an unequivocal history of an immediate allergic reaction following peanut ingestion, use of skin prick test and peanut specific IgE levels. Strict allergen avoidance is the standard of care. Peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp is a defatted, slightly roasted peanut flour with a characterized peanut allergen profile and gradually increasing doses are given orally to desensitize patients.

MEDICAL CRITERIA

Not applicable

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

Not applicable

POLICY STATEMENT

Medicare Advantage Plans

The use of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp is considered not covered as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Commercial Products

The use of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp 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 and contracts. Please refer to the appropriate Benefit Booklet, Evidence of Coverage or Subscriber Agreement for applicable not medically necessary/not covered benefits/coverage.

BACKGROUND

Peanut allergy is the most common food allergy in the United States (U.S.) with an estimated 1.6 million children and teens affected. It is also the most common allergen implicated in cases of death due to food allergy among teens. However, death from accidental peanut exposure is rare; estimated rates of fatal anaphylaxis due to accidental peanut exposure range from 0.73 to 4.25 deaths per 1,000,000 patient years, depending on community prevalence.

Allergic reactions can range from mild cutaneous symptoms to gastrointestinal symptoms such as abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, and diarrhea, and severe reactions such as anaphylaxis. Approximately 80% of individuals who develop peanut allergy early in childhood do not outgrow their food allergy in adulthood and over half suffer from additional food allergies.

Diagnosis

Double-blind, placebo-controlled, oral food challenges are the gold standard for the diagnosis of food allergy including peanut. However, food challenge tests for peanut allergy are not performed routinely in a clinical setting due to high-risk of precipitating severe symptoms including anaphylaxis. The diagnosis and management of peanut allergy in clinical practice rely on an unequivocal history of an immediate reaction

consisting of typical allergic symptoms following the isolated ingestion of a peanut. After establishing the pretest probability of the diagnosis based on positive clinical history, clinicians measure allergen sensitization with a skin prick test, allergen specific IgE, or both to establish the post-test probability of peanut allergy. The predictive power of such tests to confirm clinical history has been based on observational studies. Food challenge tests may be required if the history and IgE test results do not clearly indicate an allergy.

Current Treatment

The current standard of care for peanut allergy is strict avoidance of peanut-containing food products and timely administration of epinephrine, antihistamines, beta-blockers, and steroids in case of an allergic reaction upon accidental exposure. Up to 4 out of 10 individuals with a peanut allergy may experience an accidental exposure with an annual incidence ranging from 5% to 20%. Neuman-Sunshine et al (2012) retrospectively analyzed records of 572 individuals with peanut allergy. The median age at initial observation was 1.4 years; the median duration of follow-up was 5.3 years. The rate of post-diagnosis peanut exposure was 4.7%/year; the rate of severe reactions was 1.6%/year, and the use of epinephrine was 1.1%/year. Of the 685 exposures analyzed, 75.9% were due to ingestion, 13.6% due to contact and 4.5% were airborne. Patients and patient representatives report that strict avoidance of allergen results in an increased burden of day-to-day living, limitation on social activity and independence, missed time from work, negative impact on the quality of life and negative emotional impact. Further, affected persons and their family lifestyles are heavily impacted by fear and anxiety, and an important goal for patients is to be able to live and eat more freely.

Oral immunotherapy is practiced in the U.S. either under clinical trial protocols at tertiary centers or at unregulated private clinics. The extent of their use is not known and non-reimbursable. According to the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review in 2019, the majority of allergists do not offer oral immunotherapy. As a result, patients who pursue it often pay out of pocket, which can limit access to those who can afford it. There have been many studies of oral immunotherapy for peanut allergy using different peanut preparations, different dose escalation strategies, different maintenance doses (125 mg to 5000 mg peanut protein per day), different primary outcomes and different target populations.

For individuals who are peanut-allergic children and adolescents ages 4 to 17 who receive peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp, the evidence includes 2 pivotal double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trials (PALISADE and ARTEMIS, RAMSES, and POSEIDON), and an open-label extension study of the PALISADE trial. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, quality of life, hospitalizations, medication use, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. In the PALISADE trial, 555 patients aged 4 to 55 years were randomized to peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp (n=416) or placebo (n=139). A subset of 499 patients aged 4 to 17 years old were used for the primary analysis. The primary outcome was the difference in the proportion of participants who could ingest 600 mg or more of peanut protein without dose-limiting symptoms in a food challenge after approximately 1-year follow-up between the treatment and placebo arm. The percentage of patients who met the primary endpoint at exit food challenge test was 67.2% versus 4.0% (difference 63.2%, 95% CI: 53.0 to 73.3, p<.001) in the treatment arm versus placebo, respectively. Adverse events occurred with greater frequency and severity in peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp treated individuals versus placebo: serious adverse events (2.2% vs. 0.8%), systemic allergic reactions (14.2% vs. 3.2%), use of epinephrine outside of the food challenge test (14.0% vs. 6.5%), withdrawal due to adverse events (11.6% vs. 2.4%), and overall withdrawal rate (21.0% vs. 7.3%). In the ARTEMIS trial, similar results revealed that peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp significantly increased the percentage of patients who could tolerate an even higher dose of peanut protein of 1000 mg as compared to placebo (58% vs. 2%, p<.0001). Additionally, 99% of patients in the peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp group and 98% of patients in the placebo group experienced 1 or more treatment-emergent adverse events, with the majority of events being mild or moderate in severity. Gastrointestinal disorders occurred more frequently among the peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp participants as compared to placebo (91% vs. 77%). Additionally, certain subjects in the peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp group reported quality of life improvements that exceeded the minimum clinically important difference between the 2 groups across various domains. Notable study relevance limitations included the intended use for the population was unclear, key health outcomes were not addressed, insufficient assessment of harms, and the existence of an insufficient duration for the evaluation of benefits and harms. Key limitations in study design and conduct

included the potential for partial unblinding due to adverse events (outcome assessed by treating physician). The RAMSES phase 3 trial was designed to evaluate the safety and tolerability of peanut allergen powder-dnfp in patients who had not undergone a screening food challenge in order to demonstrate a more "real world" setting than the ARTEMIS and PALISADE trials that required a positive screening food challenge for inclusion. The RAMSES trial found safety results similar to the ARTEMIS and PALISADE trials; however, the follow-up period is limited and long-term safety and efficacy results are lacking. There is need for more data to demonstrate that desensitization leads to reduced reactions to accidental exposure to peanuts and improved quality of life. Lastly, the POSEIDON phase 3 trial was designed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp in preschool-aged children who were 1 to <4 years of age and experienced dose-limiting symptoms from 300 mg or less of peanut protein during a screening double-blind, placebo-controlled food challenge. Efficacy and safety results in POSEIDON were similar to those seen in the PALISADE, ARTEMIS, and RAMSES trials. Notably, the percentage of children who met the primary endpoint (ingestion of 600 mg or more of peanut protein without dose-limiting symptoms in a food challenge after approximately 1-year follow-up) was 73.5% versus 6.3% (difference, 67.2%; 95% CI, 50.0 to 67.2; p<.001) in the treatment arm versus placebo, respectively. There is a need for more data to demonstrate that desensitization leads to reduced reactions to accidental exposure to peanuts and improved quality of life. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Regulatory Status

On January 31, 2020, Palforzia® [Peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) Allergen Powder-dnfp] was approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for the mitigation of allergic reactions, including anaphylaxis, that may occur with accidental exposure to peanut. Palforzia is approved for use in patients with a confirmed diagnosis of peanut allergy. Initial dose escalation may be administered to patients aged 4 through 17 years. Up-dosing and maintenance may be continued in patients 4 years of age and older. Palforzia is to be used in conjunction with a peanut-avoidant diet. Palforzia is to be used in conjunction with a peanut-avoidant diet. On July 26, 2024, FDA approved Palforzia to include initiation of treatment, up-dosing, and maintenance in individuals ages 1 through 3 years with a confirmed diagnosis of peanut allergy to mitigate allergic reactions, including anaphylaxis, that may occur with accidental exposure to peanuts.²⁷

CODING

Medicare Advantage Plans and Commercial Products

There is no specific CPT code for treatment using Palforzia (Peanut [*Arachis hypogaea*] Allergen Powder-dnfp). Claims should be filed using the unlisted HCPCS code:

J8499 Prescription drug, oral, non-chemotherapeutic, NOS

RELATED POLICIES

None

PUBLISHED

Provider Update, December 2025

Provider Update, August 2024

Provider Update, September 2023

Provider Update, October 2022

Provider Update, April 2021

REFERENCES:

1. Gupta RS, Warren CM, Smith BM, et al. The Public Health Impact of Parent-Reported Childhood Food Allergies in the United States. *Pediatrics*. 2018;142(6):e20181235. *Pediatrics*. Mar 2019; 143(3). PMID 30819972
2. Bock SA, Muñoz-Furlong A, Sampson HA. Further fatalities caused by anaphylactic reactions to food, 2001-2006. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. Apr 2007; 119(4): 1016-8. PMID 17306354

3. Umasunthar T, Leonardi-Bee J, Hodes M, et al. Incidence of fatal food anaphylaxis in people with food allergy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Exp Allergy*. Dec 2013; 43(12): 1333-41. PMID 24118190
4. Boyce JA, Assa'ad A, Burks AW, et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of food allergy in the United States: report of the NIAID-sponsored expert panel. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. Dec 2010; 126(6 Suppl): S1-58. PMID 21134576
5. Sampson HA, Aceves S, Bock SA, et al. Food allergy: a practice parameter update-2014. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. Nov 2014; 134(5): 1016-25.e43. PMID 25174862
6. Gupta RS, Lau CH, Sita EE, et al. Factors associated with reported food allergy tolerance among US children. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*. Sep 2013; 111(3): 194-198.e4. PMID 23987195
7. Sicherer SH, Burks AW, Sampson HA. Clinical features of acute allergic reactions to peanut and tree nuts in children. *Pediatrics*. Jul 1998; 102(1): e6. PMID 9651458
8. Sicherer SH, Wood RA. Advances in diagnosing peanut allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. Jan 2013; 1(1): 1-13; quiz 14. PMID 24229816
9. Roberts G, Lack G. Diagnosing peanut allergy with skin prick and specific IgE testing. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. Jun 2005; 115(6): 1291-6. PMID 15940149
10. Gupta RS, Springston EE, Warrier MR, et al. The prevalence, severity, and distribution of childhood food allergy in the United States. *Pediatrics*. Jul 2011; 128(1): e9-17. PMID 21690110
11. Neuman-Sunshine DL, Eckman JA, Keet CA, et al. The natural history of persistent peanut allergy. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*. May 2012; 108(5): 326-331.e3. PMID 22541403
12. Gupta RS, Warren CM, Smith BM, et al. The Public Health Impact of Parent-Reported Childhood Food Allergies in the United States. *Pediatrics*. Dec 2018; 142(6). PMID 30455345
13. Varshney P, Jones SM, Scurlock AM, et al. A randomized controlled study of peanut oral immunotherapy: clinical desensitization and modulation of the allergic response. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. Mar 2011; 127(3): 654-60. PMID 21377034
14. Blumchen K, Ulbricht H, Staden U, et al. Oral peanut immunotherapy in children with peanut anaphylaxis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. Jul 2010; 126(1): 83-91.e1. PMID 20542324
15. Anagnostou K, Clark A, King Y, et al. Efficacy and safety of high-dose peanut oral immunotherapy with factors predicting outcome. *Clin Exp Allergy*. Sep 2011; 41(9): 1273-81. PMID 21414048
16. Jones SM, Scurlock AM, Pons L, et al. Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled (DBPC) Trial of Oral Immunotherapy (OIT) in Peanut Allergic Children. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*. 2009;123(2):S211.
17. Anagnostou K, Islam S, King Y, et al. Assessing the efficacy of oral immunotherapy for the desensitisation of peanut allergy in children (STOP II): a phase 2 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. Apr 12 2014; 383(9925): 1297-1304. PMID 24485709
18. Narisety SD, Frischmeyer-Guerrero PA, Keet CA, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled pilot study of sublingual versus oral immunotherapy for the treatment of peanut allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. May 2015; 135(5): 1275-82.e1-6. PMID 25528358
19. Chu DK, Wood RA, French S, et al. Oral immunotherapy for peanut allergy (PACE): a systematic review and meta-analysis of efficacy and safety. *Lancet*. Jun 01 2019; 393(10187): 2222-2232. PMID 31030987
20. Tang ML, Ponsonby AL, Orsini F, et al. Administration of a probiotic with peanut oral immunotherapy: A randomized trial. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. Mar 2015; 135(3): 737-44.e8. PMID 25592987

21. Hsiao KC, Ponsonby AL, Axelrad C, et al. Long-term clinical and immunological effects of probiotic and peanut oral immunotherapy after treatment cessation: 4-year follow-up of a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. Oct 2017; 1(2): 97-105. PMID 30169215
22. Dunn Galvin A, McMahon S, Ponsonby AL, et al. The longitudinal impact of probiotic and peanut oral immunotherapy on health-related quality of life. *Allergy*. Mar 2018; 73(3): 560-568. PMID 29052245
23. Blumchen K, Trendelenburg V, Ahrens F, et al. Efficacy, Safety, and Quality of Life in a Multicenter, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial of Low-Dose Peanut Oral Immunotherapy in Children with Peanut Allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. Feb 2019; 7(2): 479-491.e10. PMID 30423449
24. Fauquert JL, Michaud E, Pereira B, et al. Peanut gastrointestinal delivery oral immunotherapy in adolescents: Results of the build-up phase of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial (PITA study). *Clin Exp Allergy*. Jul 2018; 48(7): 862-874. PMID 29665158
25. Reier-Nilsen T, Michelsen MM, Lødrup Carlsen KC, et al. Feasibility of desensitizing children highly allergic to peanut by high-dose oral immunotherapy. *Allergy*. Feb 2019; 74(2): 337-348. PMID 30225844
26. Prescribing Label: PALFORZIA [Peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) Allergen Powder-dnfp] Powder for oral administration. https://www.palforzia.com/static/pi_palforzia.pdf
27. FDA Supplemental BLA Approval - Palforzia, July 26, 2024.
28. Bird JA, Spergel JM, Jones SM, et al. Efficacy and Safety of AR101 in Oral Immunotherapy for Peanut Allergy: Results of ARC001, a Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Phase 2 Clinical Trial. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2018; 6(2): 476-485.e3. PMID 29092786
29. Nilsson C, Scurlock AM, Dellon ES, et al. Onset of eosinophilic esophagitis during a clinical trial program of oral immunotherapy for peanut allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. Dec 2021; 9(12): 4496-4501. PMID 34389504
30. Vickery BP, Vereda A, Casale TB, et al. AR101 Oral Immunotherapy for Peanut Allergy. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 22 2018; 379(21): 1991-2001. PMID 30449234
31. Vickery BP, Vereda A, Nilsson C, et al. Continuous and Daily Oral Immunotherapy for Peanut Allergy: Results from a 2-Year Open-Label Follow-On Study. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. May 2021; 9(5): 1879-1889.e13. PMID 33359589
32. Brown KR, Baker J, Vereda A, et al. Safety of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) allergen powder-dnfp in children and teenagers with peanut allergy: Pooled summary of phase 3 and extension trials. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. Jun 2022; 149(6): 2043-2052.e9. PMID 34971646
33. Ciaccio C, Goldsobel AB, Anagnostou A, et al. Participant characteristics and safety outcomes of peanut oral immunotherapy in the RAMSES and ARC011 trials. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*. Dec 2022; 129(6): 758-768.e4. PMID 35973655
34. O'B Hourihane J, Beyer K, Abbas A, et al. Efficacy and safety of oral immunotherapy with AR101 in European children with a peanut allergy (ARTEMIS): a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. Oct 2020; 4(10): 728-739. PMID 32702315
35. Du Toit G, Brown KR, Vereda A, et al. Oral Immunotherapy for Peanut Allergy in Children 1 to Less Than 4 Years of Age. *NEJM Evid*. Nov 2023; 2(11): EVIDoa2300145. PMID 38320526
36. Sampson HA, Gerth van Wijk R, Bindslev-Jensen C, et al. Standardizing double-blind, placebo-controlled oral food challenges: American Academy of Allergy, Asthma Immunology-European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology PRACTALL consensus report. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. Dec 2012; 130(6): 1260-74. PMID 23195525

37. Plaut M, Sawyer RT, Fenton MJ. Summary of the 2008 National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases-US Food and Drug Administration Workshop on Food Allergy Clinical Trial Design. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* Oct 2009; 124(4): 671-8.e1. PMID 19560803
38. Pettersson ME, Koppelman GH, Flokstra-de Blok BMJ, et al. Prediction of the severity of allergic reactions to foods. *Allergy.* Jul 2018; 73(7): 1532-1540. PMID 29380392
39. Vander Leek TK, Liu AH, Stefanski K, et al. The natural history of peanut allergy in young children and its association with serum peanut-specific IgE. *J Pediatr.* Dec 2000; 137(6): 749-55. PMID 11113829
40. Hourihane JO, Grimshaw KE, Lewis SA, et al. Does severity of low-dose, double-blind, placebo-controlled food challenges reflect severity of allergic reactions to peanut in the community?. *Clin Exp Allergy.* Sep 2005; 35(9): 1227-33. PMID 16164452
41. Canonica GW, Baena-Cagnani CE, Bousquet J, et al. Recommendations for standardization of clinical trials with Allergen Specific Immunotherapy for respiratory allergy. A statement of a World Allergy Organization (WAO) taskforce. *Allergy.* Mar 2007; 62(3): 317-24. PMID 17298350
42. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schünemann HJ, et al. GRADE guidelines: a new series of articles in the *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology.* *J Clin Epidemiol.* Apr 2011; 64(4): 380-2. PMID 21185693
43. Mantelli F, Lambiase A, Bonini S, et al. Clinical trials in allergic conjunctivitis: a systematic review. *Allergy.* Jul 2011; 66(7): 919-24. PMID 21261658
44. Allen KJ, Remington BC, Baumert JL, et al. Allergen reference doses for precautionary labeling (VITAL 2.0): clinical implications. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* Jan 2014; 133(1): 156-64. PMID 23987796
45. Fernandez-Rivas M, Vereda A, Vickery BP, et al. Open-label follow-on study evaluating the efficacy, safety, and quality of life with extended daily oral immunotherapy in children with peanut allergy. *Allergy.* Mar 2022; 77(3): 991-1003. PMID 34320250
46. Jara M, Walker E, Tilles S, et al. Real-world safety experience with Peanut (Arachis hypogaea) Allergen Powder-dnfp in 2500 children with peanut allergy. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol.* Jun 2024; 132(6): 778-780. PMID 38479712
47. Sampson HA, Muñoz-Furlong A, Campbell RL, et al. Second symposium on the definition and management of anaphylaxis: summary report--Second National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease/Food Allergy and Anaphylaxis Network symposium. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* Feb 2006; 117(2): 391-7. PMID 16461139
48. Roberts G, Angier E. Peanut oral immunotherapy: balancing benefits and risks for individuals. *Lancet.* Jun 01 2019; 393(10187): 2180-2181. PMID 31036338
49. American Academy of Allergy Asthma and Immunology (AAAAI). The current state of oral immunotherapy. Accessed April 25, 2025. <https://www.aaaai.org/tools-for-the-public/conditions-library/allergies/the-current-state-of-oral-immunotherapy>
50. Institute for Clinical and Economic Review (ICER) Final Evidence Report: Oral Immunotherapy and Viaskin Peanut for Peanut Allergy: Effectiveness and Value. July 10, 2019. Accessed at https://icer.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/ICER_PeanutAllergy_Final_Report_071019.pdf. Accessed April 9, 2025.

CLICK THE ENVELOPE ICON BELOW TO SUBMIT COMMENTS

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.

