

EFFECTIVE DATE: 10|06|2009
POLICY LAST UPDATED: 12|16|2014

OVERVIEW

Radioembolization (RE), referred to as selective internal radiation therapy or “SIRT” in older literature has been developed for the treatment of unresectable primary and secondary liver cancer.

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

Prior Authorization is required for BlueCHiP for Medicare members and recommended for Commercial products.

POLICY STATEMENT

BlueCHiP for Medicare and Commercial

Radioembolization is considered medically necessary when the below criteria has been met. Radioembolization is considered not medically necessary for all other indications.

MEDICAL CRITERIA

Radioembolization may be considered **medically necessary** as a treatment for any of the following:

- Primary hepatocellular carcinoma that is unresectable and limited to the liver.
- In primary hepatocellular carcinoma as a bridge to liver transplantation.
- Hepatic metastases from neuroendocrine tumors (carcinoid and noncarcinoid) with diffuse and symptomatic disease when systemic therapy has failed to control symptoms.

Unresectable hepatic metastases from colorectal carcinoma that are both progressive and diffuse, in patients with liver-dominant disease who are refractory to chemotherapy or are not candidates for chemotherapy.

BACKGROUND

Hepatic tumors can arise either as primary liver cancer or by metastasis to the liver from other organs. Local therapy by surgical resection with tumor-free margins or liver transplantation is the only potentially curative treatment. Unfortunately, most hepatic tumors are unresectable at diagnosis, due either to their anatomic location, size, number of lesions, concurrent nonmalignant liver disease, or insufficient hepatic reserve.

Radioembolization (RE), referred to as selective internal radiation therapy (SIRT) in older literature, is the intra-arterial delivery of small beads (microspheres) impregnated with yttrium-90 via the hepatic artery. The microspheres, which become permanently embedded, are delivered to tumor preferentially to normal liver, as the hepatic circulation is uniquely organized, whereby tumors greater than 0.5 cm rely on the hepatic artery for blood supply while normal liver is primarily perfused via the portal vein.

The use of external beam radiotherapy (EBRT) and the application of more advanced radiotherapy approaches (eg, intensity-modulated radiotherapy [IMRT]) may be of limited use in patients with diffuse, multiple lesions due to the low tolerance of normal liver to radiation compared with the higher doses of radiation needed to kill the tumor.

Various nonsurgical ablative techniques have been investigated that seek to cure or palliate unresectable hepatic tumors by improving locoregional control. These techniques rely on extreme temperature changes (cryosurgery or radiofrequency ablation [RFA]), particle and wave physics (microwave or laser ablation), or arterial embolization therapy including chemoembolization, bland embolization, or RE.

RE, referred to as SIRT in older literature, is the intra-arterial delivery of small beads (microspheres) impregnated with yttrium-90 via the hepatic artery. The microspheres, which become permanently embedded, are delivered to tumor preferentially to normal liver, as the hepatic circulation is uniquely organized, whereby tumors greater than 0.5 cm rely on the hepatic artery for blood supply while normal liver is primarily perfused via the portal vein. Yttrium-90 is a pure beta-emitter with a relatively limited effective range and short half-life that helps focus the radiation and minimize its spread. Candidates for RE are initially examined by hepatic angiogram to identify and map the hepatic arterial system, and at that time, a mixture of albumin particles is delivered via the hepatic artery to simulate microspheres. After, single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) gamma imaging is used to detect possible shunting of the albumin particles into gastrointestinal or pulmonary vasculature.

Currently, two commercial forms of yttrium-90 microspheres are available: a glass sphere, TheraSphere® and a resin sphere, SIR-Spheres®. While the commercial products use the same radioisotope (yttrium-90) and have the same target dose (100 Gy), they differ in microsphere size profile, base material (i.e., resin vs. glass), and size of commercially available doses. These physical characteristics of the active and inactive ingredients affect the flow of microspheres during injection, their retention at the tumor site, spread outside the therapeutic target region, and dosimetry calculations. Note also that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) granted premarket approval of SIR-Spheres® for use in combination with 5-fluorouridine (5-FU) chemotherapy by hepatic arterial infusion (HAI) to treat unresectable hepatic metastases from colorectal cancer. In contrast, TheraSphere® was approved by humanitarian device exemption (HDE) for use as monotherapy to treat unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). In January 2007, this HDE was expanded to include patients with hepatocellular carcinoma who have partial or branch portal vein thrombosis. For these reasons, results obtained with one product do not necessarily apply to other commercial (or noncommercial) products.

Unresectable primary HCC

Most patients with HCC present with unresectable disease, and treatment options are limited secondary to the chemoresistance of HCC and the intolerance of normal liver parenchyma to tumoricidal radiation doses. Results of 2 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have shown a survival benefit using transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) therapy versus supportive care in patients with unresectable HCC.(1,2) In 1 study, patients were randomly assigned to TACE, TAE, or supportive care. One-year survival rates for TACE, TAE, and supportive care were 82%, 75%, and 63%, respectively, and 2-year survival rates were 63%, 50%, and 27%, respectively. A recent multicenter, randomized, double-blind placebo controlled Phase III trial that enrolled 602 patients with advanced HCC randomly assigned patients to receive sorafenib versus placebo.(3) Overall survival (OS) was significantly longer in the sorafenib group compared with placebo (10.7 vs 7.9 months, respectively; hazard ratio [HR] for sorafenib, 0.69; p<0.001

Unresectable intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma

Cholangiocarcinomas are tumors that arise from the epithelium of the bile duct and are separated into intrahepatic and extrahepatic types. Intrahepatic cholangiocarcinomas appear in the hepatic parenchyma and are also known as peripheral cholangiocarcinomas. Resection is the only treatment with the potential for cure, and 5-year survival rates have been in the range of 20% to 43%.(4) Patients with unresectable disease may select among fluoropyrimidine-based or gemcitabine-based chemotherapy, fluoropyrimidine chemoradiation or best supportive care.

Unresectable metastatic CRC

Fifty to sixty percent of patients with CRC will develop metastases, either synchronously or metachronously. Select patients with liver-only metastases that are surgically resectable can be cured, with some reports showing 5-year survival rates exceeding 50%. Emphasis on treating these patients with potentially curable disease is on complete removal of all tumor with negative surgical margins. Most patients diagnosed with metastatic colorectal disease are initially classified as having unresectable disease. In patients with metastatic disease limited to the liver, preoperative chemotherapy is sometimes used in an attempt to downsize the metastases to convert the metastatic lesions to a resectable status (conversion chemotherapy).

In patients with unresectable disease that cannot be converted to resectable disease, the primary treatment goal is palliative, with survival benefit shown with both second- and third-line systemic chemotherapy. (5) Recent advances in chemotherapy, including oxaliplatin, irinotecan and targeted antibodies like cetuximab, have doubled the median survival in this population from less than 1 year to more than 2 years.(5) Palliative chemotherapy by combined systemic and HAI may increase disease-free (DF) intervals for patients with unresectable hepatic metastases from colorectal cancer.

RFA has been shown to be inferior to resection in local recurrence rates and 5-year OS and is generally reserved for patients with potentially resectable disease that cannot be completely resected due to patient comorbidities, location of metastases (ie, adjacent to a major vessel), or an estimate of inadequate liver reserve following resection. RFA is generally recommended to be used with the goal of complete resection with curative intent.(6) The role of local (liver-directed) therapy (including RE, chemoembolization, and conformal radiation therapy) in debulking unresectable metastatic disease remains controversial.(6)

Unresectable metastatic neuroendocrine tumors

Neuroendocrine tumors are an uncommon, heterogeneous group of mostly slow-growing, hormone-secreting malignancies, with an average patient age of 60 years. Primary neuroendocrine tumors vary in location, but most are either carcinoids (which most commonly arise in the midgut) or pancreatic islet cells. Carcinoid tumors, particularly if they metastasize to the liver, can result in excessive vasoactive amine secretion including serotonin and are commonly associated with the carcinoid syndrome (diarrhea, flush, bronchoconstriction, right valvular heart failure).

Although they are considered to be indolent tumors, at the time of diagnosis, up to 75% of patients have liver metastases, and with metastases to the liver, 5-year survival rates are less than 20%. Surgical resection of the metastases is considered the only curative option; however, less than 10% of patients are eligible for resection, as most patients have diffuse, multiple lesions.

Conventional therapy is largely considered to be palliative supportive care, to control, eradicate, or debulk hepatic metastases, often to palliate carcinoid syndrome or local pain from liver capsular stretching. Therapies for unresectable metastatic neuroendocrine tumors include medical (somatostatin analogs like octreotide), systemic chemotherapy, ablation (radiofrequency or cryotherapy), TAE or TACE, or radiation. Although patients often achieve symptom relief with octreotide, the disease eventually becomes refractory, with a median duration of symptom relief of approximately 13 months, with no known effect on survival. Systemic chemotherapy for these tumors has shown modest response rates of limited duration, is better for pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors compared with carcinoids, and is frequently associated with significant toxicity.(7) Chemoembolization has shown response rates of nearly 80%, but the effect is of short duration and a survival benefit has not been demonstrated.(7)

Miscellaneous metastatic tumors

Small case reports have been published on the use of RE in many other types of cancer with hepatic metastases, including breast, melanoma, head, and neck (including parotid gland), pancreaticobiliary, anal, thymic, thyroid, endometrial, lung, kidney, gastric, small bowel, esophageal, ovarian, cervical, prostatic, bladder, and for sarcoma and lymphoma.(8)

COVERAGE

Benefits vary between groups/contracts. Please refer to the appropriate Evidence of Coverage or Subscriber Agreement for applicable radiology benefits/coverage.

CODING

BlueCHiP for Medicare and Commercial:

There are no specific CPT codes describing radioembolization therapy. Providers should file using the unlisted code:

77399

RELATED POLICIES

None

PUBLISHED

Provider Update	Feb 2015
Provider Update	Jan 2014
Provider Update	Dec 2012
Provider Update	Mar 2011

REFERENCES

1. Llovet JM, Real MI, Montana X et al. Arterial embolisation or chemoembolisation versus symptomatic treatment in patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a randomized controlled trial. *Lancet* 2002; 359(9319):1734-9.
2. Lo CM, Ngan H, Tso WK et al. Randomized controlled trial of transarterial lipiodol chemoembolization for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology* 2002; 35(5):1164-71.
3. Llovet J, Ricci S, Mazzaferro V et al. Sorafenib improves survival in advanced Hepatocellular Carcinoma (HCC): Results of a Phase III randomized placebo-controlled trial (SHARP trial). *J Clin Oncol* 2007; 25(18S):LBA1.
4. National Cancer Comprehensive Cancer Network Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Hepatobiliary Cancers (V.2.2012). 2012. http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/PDF/hepatobiliary.pdf. Accessed February 2014.
5. Tice J. Selective internal radiation therapy or radioembolization for inoperable liver metastases from colorectal cancer California Technology Assessment Forum 2010. Available online at: <http://www.ctaf.org/assessments/selective-internal-radiation-therapy-or-radioembolization-inoperable-liver-metastases>. Last accessed February, 2014.
6. National Cancer Comprehensive Cancer Network Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Colon Cancer (V.3.2012). 2012. http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/PDF/colon.pdf.
7. King J, Quinn R, Glenn DM et al. Radioembolization with selective internal radiation microspheres for neuroendocrine liver metastases. *Cancer* 2008; 113(5):921-9.
8. Kennedy AS, Salem R. Radioembolization (yttrium-90 microspheres) for primary and metastatic hepatic malignancies. *Cancer J* 2010; 16(2):163-75.

9. Salem R, Lewandowski RJ, Mulcahy MF et al. Radioembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma using yttrium-90 microspheres: a comprehensive report of long-term outcomes. *Gastroenterology* 2010; 138(1):52-64.
10. Carr BI, Kondragunta V, Buch SC et al. Therapeutic equivalence in survival for hepatic arterial chemoembolization and yttrium 90 microsphere treatments in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a two-cohort study. *Cancer* 2010; 116(5):1305-14.
11. Vente MA, Wondergem M, van der Tweel I et al. Yttrium-90 microsphere radioembolization for the treatment of liver malignancies: a structured meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol* 2009; 19(4):951-9.
12. Lewandowski RJ, Kulik LM, Riaz A et al. A comparative analysis of transarterial downstaging for hepatocellular carcinoma: chemoembolization versus radioembolization. *Am J Transplant* 2009; 9(8):1920-8.
13. Kulik LM, Carr BI, Mulcahy MF et al. Safety and efficacy of 90Y radiotherapy for hepatocellular carcinoma with and without portal vein thrombosis. *Hepatology* 2008; 47(1-Jan):71-81.
14. Salem R, Thurston KG, Carr BI et al. Yttrium-90 microspheres: radiation therapy for unresectable liver cancer. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2002; 13(9 pt 2):S223-9.
15. Hoffmann RT, Paprottka PM, Schon A et al. Transarterial hepatic yttrium-90 radioembolization in patients with unresectable intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: factors associated with prolonged survival. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2012; 35(1):105-16.

[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.

