

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

Effective Date:	5/1/2023
------------------------	-----------------

POLICY RATIONALE	PRODUCT VARIATIONS	DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND
DISCLAIMER	DEFINITIONS	BENEFIT VARIATIONS
POLICY HISTORY	CODING INFORMATION	REFERENCES
	APPENDIX	

I. POLICY

Water vapor thermal therapy

Water vapor thermal therapy (e.g. Rezūm™) may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms due to benign prostatic hyperplasia when the following is met:

- The individual is 50 years of age or older **and**
- Prostate volume of 30-80cc

Water vapor thermal therapy is considered **investigational** for all other indications. There is insufficient evidence to support a general conclusion concerning the health outcomes or benefits associated with this procedure.

Urethral Lift

Use of prostatic urethral lift in individuals 45 years of age or older with lower urinary tract symptoms due to benign prostatic hyperplasia may be considered **medically necessary** when all of the following criteria are met:

- The individual has failed a trial of satisfactory voiding with medication (alpha blocker and/or alpha-reductase inhibitor) or intolerance to medication (alpha blocker and/or 5-alpha-reductase inhibitor); **and**
- Prostate volume of 30-80cc **and**
- Prostate anatomy demonstrates normal bladder neck without an obstructive or protruding median lobe; **and**
- Individual does not have urinary retention, urinary tract infection, or recent prostatitis (within past year); **and**
- The individual has normal renal function **and**
- Individual has had appropriate testing to exclude diagnosis of prostate cancer; **and**
- The patient has no known allergy to nickel, titanium or stainless steel

The prostatic urethral lift procedure is considered **not medically necessary** for all other indications. There is insufficient evidence to support a general conclusion concerning the health outcomes or benefits associated with this procedure.

Hydrogel Rectal Spacer

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

A hydrogel rectal spacer for prostate cancer may be considered **medically necessary** when the individual meets the following:

- Preparing to undergo radiation therapy for treatment of prostate cancer; **and**
- Has no MRI or other clinical evidence of posterior tumor extension onto or into the rectum.

Hydrogel Rectal Spacer is considered **investigational** for all other indications. There is insufficient evidence to support a general conclusion concerning the health outcomes or benefits associated with this procedure.

Transurethral Waterjet Ablation (aquablation)

Transurethral waterjet ablation (aquablation) is considered **not medically necessary** for all indications. There is insufficient evidence to support a general conclusion concerning the health outcomes or benefits associated with this procedure.

High-Intensity focused ultrasound

HIFU is considered **not medically necessary** for all indications. There is insufficient evidence to support a general conclusion concerning the health outcomes or benefits associated with this procedure.

Investigational Interventions:

The following are considered **investigational**

- Temporary prostatic urethral stents/implants
- Focal laser ablation
- Prostate Artery Embolization
- Use of any other focal therapy modality not listed

There is insufficient evidence to support a general conclusion concerning the health outcomes or benefits associated with this procedure.

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) is a nonprofit alliance of cancer centers throughout the United States. NCCN develops the Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology which are recommendations aimed to help health care professionals diagnose, treat and manage patients with cancer. Guidelines evolve continuously as new treatments and diagnostics emerge and may be used by Capital Blue Cross when determining medical necessity according to this policy.

Cross-reference:

MP 5.053 Magnetic Resonance–Guided Focused Ultrasound

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

II. PRODUCT VARIATIONS

[TOP](#)

This policy is only applicable to certain programs and products administered by Capital Blue Cross. Please see additional information below, and subject to benefit variations as discussed in Section VI below.

FEP PPO - Refer to FEP Medical Policy Manual. The FEP Medical Policy manual can be found at:

<https://www.fepblue.org/benefit-plans/medical-policies-and-utilization-management-guidelines/medical-policies> .

III. DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND

[TOP](#)

Prostate cancer is the second most common cancer diagnosed among men in the U.S. According to the National Cancer Institute, nearly 268,490 new cases are estimated to be diagnosed in the U.S. in 2022 , associated with around 34,500 deaths.¹ Prostate cancer is more likely to develop in older men and in non-Hispanic Black men. About 6 in 10 cases are diagnosed in men who are ≥65 years of age, and it is rare in men <40 years of age. Autopsy studies in the pre-prostate-specific antigen (PSA) screening era identified incidental cancerous foci in 30% of men 50 years of age, with incidence reaching 75% at age 80 years.² However, the National Cancer Institute Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program data have shown that age-adjusted cancer-specific mortality rates for men with prostate cancer declined from 40 per 100,000 in 1992 to 19 per 100,000 in 2018. This decline has been attributed to a combination of earlier detection via PSA screening and improved therapies.

Diagnosis

From a clinical standpoint, different types of localized prostate cancers may appear similar during initial diagnosis.

However, the cancer often exhibits varying degrees of risk progression that may not be captured by accepted clinical risk categories (e.g., D'Amico criteria) or prognostic tools based on clinical findings (e.g., PSA titers, Gleason grade, or tumor stage). In studies of conservative management, the risk of localized disease progression based on prostate cancer–specific survival rates at ten (10) years may range from 15% to 20%, ten (10) to perhaps 27% at 20-year follow-up. Among elderly men (greater or less than 70 years) with this type of low-risk disease, comorbidities typically supervene as a cause of death; these men will die from the comorbidities with prostate cancer present rather than from the cancer itself. Other very similar appearing low-risk tumors may progress unexpectedly and rapidly, quickly disseminating and becoming incurable.

Treatments

The divergent behavior of localized prostate cancers creates uncertainty whether to treat immediately. A patient may choose definitive treatment upfront. Surgery (radical prostatectomy) or external-beam radiotherapy are frequently used to treat patients with localized prostate cancer. Complications most commonly reported with radical prostatectomy or external-beam radiotherapy and with the greatest variability are incontinence (0%-73%) and other genitourinary toxicities (irritative and obstructive symptoms); hematuria (typically less than or equal to 5%);

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

gastrointestinal and bowel toxicity, including nausea and loose stools (25%-50%); proctopathy, including rectal pain and bleeding (10%-39%); and erectile dysfunction, including impotence (50%-90%).

American Urological Association guidelines have suggested patients with low- and intermediate-risk disease have the option of entering an “active surveillance” protocol, which takes into account patient age, patient preferences, and health conditions related to urinary, sexual, and bowel function. With this approach, patients forgo immediate therapy but continue regular monitoring until signs or symptoms of disease progression are evident—at which point curative treatment is instituted.

Focal Treatments for Localized Prostate Cancer

Given significant uncertainty in predicting the behavior of individual localized prostate cancers, and the substantial adverse events associated with definitive treatments, investigators have sought a therapeutic middle ground. The latter seeks to minimize morbidity associated with radical treatment in those who may not actually require surgery while reducing tumor burden to an extent that reduces the chances for rapid progression to incurability. This approach is termed focal treatment, in that it seeks to remove using any of several ablative methods described next cancerous lesions at high risk of progression, leaving behind uninvolved glandular parenchyma. The overall goal of any focal treatment is to minimize the risk of early tumor progression and preserve erectile, urinary, and rectal functions by reducing damage to the neurovascular bundles, external sphincter, bladder neck, and rectum. Although focal treatments are offered as an alternative middle approach to manage localized prostate cancer, several key issues must be considered in choosing it. They include patient selection, lesion selection, therapy monitoring, and modalities used to ablate lesions.

Patient Selection

A proportion of men with localized prostate cancer have been reported to have (or develop) serious misgivings and psychosocial problems in accepting active surveillance, sometimes leading to inappropriately discontinuing it. Thus, appropriate patient selection is imperative for physicians who must decide whether to recommend active surveillance or focal treatment for patients who refuse radical therapy or for whom it is not recommended due to the risk/benefit balance.

Lesion Selection

Proper lesion selection is a second key consideration in choosing a focal treatment for localized prostate cancer. Although prostate cancer is a multifocal disease, clinical evidence has shown that between 10% and 40% of men who undergo radical prostatectomy for presumed multifocal disease actually have a unilaterally confined discrete lesion, which, when removed, would “cure” the patient. This view presumably has driven the use of regionally targeted focal treatment variants, such as hemiablation of half the gland containing the tumor, or subtotal prostate ablation via the “hockey stick” method. While these approaches can be curative, the more extensive the treatment, the more likely the functional adverse outcomes would approach those of radical treatments. The concept that clinically indolent lesions comprise most of the tumor burden in organ-confined prostate cancer led to development of a lesion-targeted strategy, which is referred to as “focal therapy” in this evidence review. This involves treating only the

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

largest and highest grade cancerous focus (referred to as the “index lesion”), which has been shown in pathologic studies to determine clinical progression of disease.

This concept is supported by molecular genetics evidence that suggests a single index tumor focus is usually responsible for disease progression and metastasis. The index lesion approach leaves in place small foci less than 0.5 cm³ in volume, with a Gleason score less than 7, that are considered unlikely to progress over a ten (10)- to twenty (20) year period. This also leaves available subsequent definitive therapies as needed should disease progress.

Identification of prostate cancer lesions (disease localization) particularly the index lesion, is critical to the oncologic success of focal therapy; equally important to success is the ability to guide focal ablation energy to the tumor and assess treatment effectiveness. At present, no single modality reliably meets the requirements for all 3 activities (disease localization, focal ablation energy to the tumor, assessment of treatment effectiveness). Systematic transrectal ultrasound–guided biopsy alone has been investigated; however, it has been considered insufficient for patient selection or disease localization for focal therapy. A 5-mm transperineal prostate mapping (TPM) biopsy using a brachytherapy template has been the recommended standard by the European Association of Urology, according to its 2012 guidelines. TPM can provide 3-dimensional coordinates of cancerous lesions, and has 87% to 95% accuracy rates in detecting and ruling out clinically significant cancer of all sizes. However, TPM is resource-intensive, requires general anesthesia, and has been associated with adverse events (including urinary retention [6%], prostatitis [4%], and local events such as perineal hematoma, bruising, and pain [5%]). The risk of complications of general anesthesia and the cost of processing multiple biopsy specimens limits the practicality and widespread applicability of this approach.

Multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (mpMRI), typically including T1-, T2-, diffusion-weighted imaging, and dynamic contrast-enhanced imaging, has been recognized as a promising modality to risk-stratify prostate cancer and select patients and lesions for focal therapy. Evidence has shown mpMRI can detect high-grade, large prostate cancer foci with performance similar to TPM. For example, for the primary end point definition (lesion, greater than or equal to 4 mm; Gleason score, greater than or equal to 3+4), with TPM as the reference standard, sensitivity, negative predictive value, and negative likelihood ratios with mpMRI were 58% to 73%, 84% to 89%, and 0.3 to 0.5, respectively. Specificity, positive predictive value and positive likelihood ratios were 71% to 84%, 49% to 63%, and 2.0 to 3.44, respectively. The negative predictive value of mpMRI appears sufficient to rule out clinically significant prostate cancer and may have clinical use in this setting. However, although mpMRI technology has the capability to detect and risk-stratify prostate cancer, several issues constrain its widespread use for these purposes (e.g., mpMRI requires highly specialized MRI-compatible equipment; biopsy within the MRI scanner is challenging; interpretation of prostate MRI images requires experienced urologists) and it is still necessary to histologically confirm suspicious lesions using TPM.

Therapy Monitoring

Controversy exists about the proper end points for focal therapy of prostate cancer. The primary end point of focal ablation of clinically significant disease with negative biopsies evaluated at 12 months post treatment is generally accepted according to a European consensus report. The clinical validity of MRI to analyze the presence of residual or recurrent cancer compared with

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

histologic findings is offered as a secondary end point. However, MRI findings alone are not considered sufficient in follow-up.

Finally, although investigators have indicated PSA levels should be monitored, PSA levels are not considered valid end points because the utility of PSA kinetics in tissue preservation treatments has not been established.

Modalities Used to Ablate Lesions

Five ablative methods for which clinical evidence is available are considered herein: focal laser ablation; high-intensity focused ultrasound; cryoablation; radiofrequency ablation; and photodynamic therapy. Each method requires placement of a needle probe into a tumor volume followed by delivery of some type of energy that destroys the tissue in a controlled manner. All methods except focal laser ablation currently rely on ultrasound guidance to the tumor focus of interest; focal laser ablation uses MRI to guide the probe. This evidence review does not cover focal brachytherapy.

Focal Laser Ablation

Focal laser ablation refers to the destruction of tissue using a focused beam of electromagnetic radiation emitted from a laser fiber introduced transperineal or transrectal into the cancer focus. Tissue is destroyed through thermal conversion of the focused electromagnetic energy into heat, causing coagulative necrosis. Other terms for focal laser ablation include photothermal therapy, laser interstitial therapy, and laser interstitial photocoagulation.

High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound

High-intensity focused ultrasound focuses high-energy ultrasound waves on a single location, which increases the local tissue temperature to over 80 °C. This causes a discrete locus of coagulative necrosis of approximately 3x3x10 mm. The surgeon uses a transrectal probe to plan, perform, and monitor treatment in a real-time sequence to ablate the entire gland or small discrete lesions.

Cryoablation

Cryoablation induces cell death through direct cellular toxicity from disruption of the cell membrane caused by ice-ball crystals and vascular compromise from thrombosis and ischemia secondary to freezing below -30 °C. Using a TPM template, cryoablation is performed by transperineal insertion under transrectal ultrasound guidance of a varying number of cryoprobe needles into the tumor.

Radiofrequency Ablation

Radiofrequency ablation uses energy produced by a 50-watt generator at a frequency of 460 kHz. Energy is transmitted to the tumor focus through 15 needle electrodes inserted transperineally under ultrasound guidance. Radiofrequency ablation produces an increase in tissue temperature causing coagulative necrosis.

Photodynamic Therapy

Photodynamic therapy uses an intravenous photosensitizing agent, which distributes through prostate tissue, followed by light delivered transperineally by inserted needles. The light induces

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

a photochemical reaction that produces reactive oxygen species that are highly toxic and causes functional and structural tissue damage (i.e., cell death). A major concern with photodynamic therapy is that real-time monitoring of tissue effects is not possible, and the variable optical properties of prostate tissue complicate assessment of necrosis and treatment progress.

Transurethral Water Vapor Thermal Therapy and Transurethral Waterjet Ablation (Aquablation)

Transurethral water vapor thermal therapy and transurethral waterjet ablation (aquablation) have been investigated as minimally invasive alternatives to transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP), considered the traditional standard treatment for benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH). Transurethral water vapor thermal therapy uses radiofrequency-generated water vapor (~103°C) thermal energy based on the thermodynamic properties of convective versus conductive heat transfer to ablate prostate tissue. Aquablation cuts tissue by using a pressurized jet of fluid delivered to the prostatic urethra.

Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia

Benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) is a common condition in older men, affecting to some degree 40% of men in their 50s, 70% of those between ages 60 and 69, and almost 80% of those ages 70 and older.¹ Benign prostatic hyperplasia is a histologic diagnosis defined as an increase in the total number of stromal and glandular epithelial cells within the transition zone of the prostate gland. In some men, BPH results in prostate enlargement which can, in turn, lead to benign prostate obstruction and bladder outlet obstruction, which are often associated with lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) including urinary frequency, urgency, irregular flow, weak stream, straining, and waking up at night to urinate. Lower urinary tract symptoms are the most commonly presenting urological complaint and can have a significant impact on quality of life.¹

Benign prostatic hyperplasia does not necessarily require treatment. The decision on whether to treat BPH is based on an assessment of the impact of symptoms on quality of life along with the potential side effects of treatment. Options for medical treatment include alpha-1-adrenergic antagonists, 5-alpha-reductase inhibitors, anticholinergic agents, and phosphodiesterase-5 inhibitors. Medications may be used as monotherapy or in combination.²

Patients with persistent symptoms despite medical treatment may be considered for surgical treatment. The traditional standard treatment for BPH is transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP). TURP is generally considered the reference standard for comparisons of BPH procedures. Several minimally invasive prostate ablation procedures have also been developed, including transurethral microwave thermotherapy, transurethral needle ablation of the prostate, urethromicroablation phototherapy, and photoselective vaporization of the prostate. The prostatic urethral lift procedure involves the insertion of 1 or more permanent implants into the prostate, which retracts prostatic tissue and maintains an expanded urethral lumen.

Transurethral water vapor thermal therapy and aquablation have been investigated as minimally invasive alternatives to TURP. Transurethral water vapor thermal therapy uses radiofrequency-generated water vapor (~103°C) thermal energy based on the thermodynamic properties of

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

convective versus conductive heat transfer to ablate prostate tissue.³ Aquablation cuts tissue by using a pressurized jet of fluid delivered to the prostatic urethra.

Prostatic Urethral Lift

The therapy being considered is PUL. The PUL procedure involves the placement of 1 or more implants in lobes of the prostate using a transurethral delivery device. The implant device is designed to retract the prostate to allow expansion of the prostatic urethra. The implants are retained in the prostate to maintain an expanded urethral lumen. One device, the NeoTract UroLift System, has been cleared for marketing by the FDA (see Regulatory Status section). The device has 2 main components: the delivery device and the implant. Each delivery device comes preloaded with a UroLift implant.

Hydrogel Spacer

For low-or intermediate-risk prostate cancer, radiation therapy is an option. Because the rectum lies in close proximity to the prostate, the risk of rectal toxicity is high. One approach is to push the rectum away from the prostate, increasing the space and reducing the radiation dose to the rectum. A variety of biomaterials, including polyethylene glycol hydrogels (e.g., SpaceOAR System) have been evaluated as perirectal spacers.

Prostate cancer is a complex, heterogeneous disease, ranging from microscopic tumors unlikely to be life-threatening to aggressive tumors that can metastasize, leading to morbidity or death. It is the second most common cancer in men, with over 1 in 10 men diagnosed with prostate cancer over their lifetime. Cancer is typically suspected due to increased levels of prostate-specific antigen upon screening. A digital rectal exam may detect nodules, induration, or asymmetry, which is then followed by an ultrasound-guided biopsy with an evaluation of the number and grade of positive biopsy cores.

Clinical staging is based on the digital rectal exam and biopsy results. T1 lesions are not palpable while T2 lesions are palpable but appear to be confined to the prostate. T3 lesions extend through the prostatic capsule, and T4 lesions are fixed to or invade adjacent structures. The most widely used grading scheme for a prostate biopsy is the Gleason system.¹ It is an architectural grading system ranging from 1 (well-differentiated) to 5 (poorly differentiated); the score is the sum of the primary and secondary patterns. A Gleason score of 6 or less is low-grade prostate cancer that usually grows slowly; 7 is an intermediate grade; 8 to 10 is high-grade cancer that grows more quickly. A revised prostate cancer grading system has been adopted by the National Cancer Institute and the World Health Organization.² A cross-walk of these grading systems are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Prostate Cancer Grading Systems

Grade Group	Gleason Score (Primary and Secondary Pattern)	Cells
1	6 or less	Well-differentiated (low grade)
2	7 (3 + 4)	Moderately differentiated (moderate grade)
3	7 (4 + 3)	Poorly differentiated (high grade)

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

4	8	Undifferentiated (high grade)
5	9-10	Undifferentiated (high grade)

REGULATORY STATUS

Focal Laser Ablation

In 2010, the Visualase® Thermal Therapy System (Medtronic, Minneapolis, MN) and, in 2015, the TRANBERGCLS Laser fiber (Clinical Laserthermia Systems, Sweden) were cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process to necrotize or coagulate soft tissue through interstitial irradiation or thermal therapy under magnetic resonance imaging guidance for multiple indications including urology, at wavelengths from 800 to 1064 nm. FDA product code: LLZ, GEX, FRN.

High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound

In 2015, the Sonablate® 450 (SonaCare Medical, Charlotte, NC) was approved by FDA through a de novo request and classified the device as class II under the generic name “high intensity ultrasound system for prostate tissue ablation”. This device was the first of its kind to be approved in the United States. A similar device, Ablatherm® (EDAP TMS, France), was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process shortly thereafter.

Cryoablation

Some cryoablation devices cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process for cryoablation of the prostate are: Visual-ICE® (Galil Medical, St. Paul, MN), Ice Rod CX, CryoCare® (Galil Medical), IceSphere (Galil Medical), and Cryocare® Systems (Endocare®; HealthTronics, Austin, TX). FDA product code: GEH.

Radiofrequency (RF) Ablation

RF devices have been cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process for general use for soft tissue cutting and coagulation and ablation by thermal coagulation. Under this general indication, radiofrequency ablation may be used to ablate tumors. FDA product code: GEI.

Photodynamic Therapy

FDA has granted approval to several photosensitizing drugs and light applicators. Photofrin® (porfimer sodium) (Axcan Pharma) and psoralen are photosensitizer ultraviolet lamps used to treat cancer; they were cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. FDA product code: FTC.

Transurethral Convective Water Vapor Thermal Ablation

In September 2016, the Rezum™ System (NxThera, Inc., acquired by Boston Scientific in 2018) was cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process (K150786). The FDA determined that this device was substantially equivalent to existing devices (Medtronic Prostiva devices). Rezum is intended to relieve symptoms, obstructions, and reduce prostate tissue associated with benign prostatic hyperplasia. It is

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

indicated for men > 50 years of age with a prostate volume >30cm³ and <80cm³. The Rezum System is also indicated for the treatment of prostate with hyperplasia of the central zone and/or a median lobe.

Prostatic Urethral Lift (PUL)

One implantable transprostatic tissue retractor system has been cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process. In 2013, the NeoTract UroLift® System UL400 (NeoTract) was cleared (after receiving clearance through the FDA's de novo classification process in March 2013; K130651/DEN130023). In 2016, the FDA determined that the UL500 was substantially equivalent to existing devices (UL400) for the treatment of symptoms of urinary flow obstruction secondary to BPH in individuals ages 50 years and older. In 2017, the FDA expanded the indication for the UL400 and UL500 to include lateral and median lobe hyperplasia in men 45 years or older. An additional clearance in 2019 (K193269) modified an existing contraindication for use from men with a prostate volume of >80 cc to men with a prostate volume of >100 cc. FDA product code: PEW.

Hydrogel Spacer

In October 2014, SpaceOAR® (Augmenix, a subsidiary of Boston Scientific) was cleared by the FDA through the De Novo process (DEN140030). "SpaceOAR System is intended to temporarily position the anterior rectal wall away from the prostate during radiotherapy for prostate cancer and in creating this space it is the intent of SpaceOAR System to reduce the radiation dose delivered to the anterior rectum."

DuraSeal® Exact (Integra) was approved by the FDA through the premarket approval process as a spine and cranial sealant (dura mater) and has been used off-label as a perirectal spacer.

Waterjet Ablation

In April 2017, the Aquabeam® System (Procept Robotics Corporation) was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 513(f)(2) (de novo) classification process (DEN170024). 4, The device is intended for the resection and removal of prostate tissue in males suffering from LUTS due to benign prostatic hyperplasia.

III. RATIONALE

[TOP](#)

Summary of Evidence: Focal Treatment Overview

For individuals who have primary localized prostate cancer who receive focal therapy using laser ablation, high-intensity focused ultrasound, cryoablation, radiofrequency ablation, or photodynamic therapy, the evidence includes a high-quality systematic review, studies from a registry cohort, and numerous observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, change in disease status, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The evidence is highly heterogeneous and inconsistently reports clinical outcomes. No prospective, comparative evidence was found for focal ablation techniques vs current standard treatment of localized prostate cancer, including radical prostatectomy, external-beam radiotherapy, or active surveillance. Methods have not been standardized to determine which and how many identified cancerous lesions should be treated for best outcomes. No evidence supports which, if any, of the focal techniques leads to better

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

functional outcomes. Although high disease-specific survival rates have been reported, the short follow-up periods and small sample sizes preclude conclusions on the effect of any of these techniques on overall survival rates. The adverse event rates associated with focal therapies appear to be superior to those associated with radical treatments (e.g., radical prostatectomy, external-beam radiotherapy); however, the evidence is limited in its quality, reporting, and scope. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Summary of Evidence: Transurethral Convective Water Vapor Thermal Ablation Overview

For individuals who have BPH and LUTS who receive transurethral water vapor thermal therapy, the evidence includes a single 3-month, sham-controlled, randomized trial of 197 patients with a 5-year uncontrolled follow-up phase. The outcomes of interest are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. At 3 months, LUTS improved more in the intervention group compared to the sham procedure. No adverse effects on erectile or ejaculatory function were observed, and improvements were sustained through 5 years of follow-up.

Summary of Evidence: Prostatic Urethral Lift

For individuals who have lower urinary tract obstruction symptoms due to BPH who do not have sufficient response to medical therapy or are experiencing significant side effects with medical therapy and receive a PUL, the evidence includes systematic reviews, RCTs, and noncomparative studies. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, health status measures, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. One RCT, the BPH6 study, compared the PUL procedure with TURP and reported that the PUL procedure was noninferior for the study's composite endpoint, which required concurrent fulfillment of 6 independently validated measures of symptoms, safety, and sexual health. While TURP was superior to PUL in managing lower urinary tract symptoms, PUL did provide significant symptom improvement over 2 years. Prostatic urethral lift was further superior to TURP in preserving ejaculatory function. These findings were corroborated by another RCT (the LIFT study), which compared PUL with sham control. Patients underwent washout of BPH medications before enrollment. LIFT reported that patients with the PUL procedure, compared with patients who had sham surgery and no BPH medication, had greater improvements in lower urinary tract symptoms without worsened sexual function at 3 months. After 3 months, patients were given the option to have PUL surgery; 80% of the patients with sham procedures chose that option. Publications from this trial reported these findings were preserved in a subset of patients over 3 to 5 years; however, a high number of patients were either excluded or lost to follow-up during this time. The BPH6 and LIFT RCTs included men with a prostate volume up to 80 cm³ and excluded men with median lobe obstruction. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have lower urinary tract obstruction symptoms due to BPH who have had a prior PUL procedure who are treated with a repeat PUL, the evidence includes long-term follow-up data from the LIFT study, a systematic review, and reports on care setting real world experience. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, health status measures, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. Clinical data on the occurrence of repeat PUL,

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

and consensus on clinically relevant definitions of retreatment/reintervention and subsequent outcomes are lacking. The 5 year surgical reintervention rate in the LIFT study was reported as 13.6%, while a meta-analysis concluded that the surgical reintervention rate following PUL is 6% per year. An analysis of clinical care setting real world experience reported the overall retreatment rate at 1 and 2 years to be 5.2% (95% CI, 4.2 to 6.1) and 11.9% (95% CI, 10.1 to 13.6), respectively, following an initial PUL. A retrospective healthcare system database analysis of endoscopic procedures for BPH found that patients treated with PUL were almost twice as likely to be retreated at 2-year follow-up compared to those receiving TURP (OR, 1.78; p<.01). The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Summary of Evidence: Hydrogel Spacer

For low or intermediate risk prostate cancer, radiation therapy is an option. Because the rectum lies in close proximity to the prostate, the risk of rectal toxicity is high. One approach is to push the rectum away from the prostate, increasing the space between the 2 and reducing the radiation dose to the rectum. A variety of biomaterials, including polyethylene glycol hydrogels (e.g., SpaceOAR System) have been evaluated as perirectal spacers.

For individuals who have prostate cancer and are undergoing radiation therapy who receive a hydrogel spacer, the evidence includes a pivotal RCT with a three (3)-year follow-up, observational studies, and systematic reviews of these studies. Relevant outcomes include symptoms, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The combined evidence indicates that the hydrogel spacer can reduce the radiation dose to the rectum with a statistically significant decrease in Grade I or greater late toxicity and a number needed to treat of 14.3. There were few events of greater than Grade I toxicity in either group, and the number needed to treat for a reduction in clinically significant Grade II toxicity has been reported as 68. Patient-reported declines in rectal and urinary quality of life at three (3) years were statistically lower in the spacer group and met the threshold for a clinically significant difference, although patients were not blinded to treatment at the longer-term follow-up. The number needed to treat for late improvement in rectal and urinary quality of lifewere 6.3 to 6.7, respectively. Limitations to the study include the lack of blinding and the exclusion of patients who might be at greater risk of rectal toxicity.

In a study by Hamstra *et al*, SpaceOAR, a hydrogel intended to create a rectal prostate space, was evaluated in a single-blind phase III trial of image guided intensity modulated radiation therapy. A total of 222 men were randomized 2:1 to the spacer or control group and received 79.2 Gy in 1.8-Gy fractions to the prostate with or without the seminal vesicles. There was a median follow-up period of three (3) years. Cumulative toxicity, quality of life (QOL), and changes in the Expanded Prostate Cancer Index Composite (EPIC), were tested. The proportions of men with minimally important differences (MIDs) in each domain were tested using repeated measures logistic models with prespecified thresholds. The 3-year incidence of grade I (9.2% vs 2.0%; PZ.028) and grade 2 (5.7% vs 0%; PZ.012) rectal toxicity favored the spacer arm. Grade 1 urinary incontinence was also lower in the spacer arm (15% vs 4%; PZ.046), with no difference in grade2 urinary toxicity (7% vs 7%; PZ0.7). From 6 months onward, bowel QOL consistently favored the spacer group (PZ.002), with the difference at three

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

(3) years (5.8 points; P less than .05) meeting the threshold for a MID. The control group had a 3.9-point greater decline in urinary QOL compared with the spacer group at three (3) years (P less than .05), but the difference did not meet the MID threshold. At three (3) years, more men in the control group than in the spacer group had experienced a MID decline in bowel QOL (41% vs 14%; PZ.002) and urinary QOL (30% vs 17%; PZ.04). Furthermore, the control group were also more likely to have experienced large declines (twice the MID) in bowel QOL (21% vs 5%; PZ.02) and urinary QOL (23% vs 8%; PZ.02). It is also notable that the use of this hydrogel spacer provided a clinically meaningful improvement even in the best current standard of care for conventionally fractionated dose-escalated RT, with Patient Reported Outcomes surveys (PROs) identifying significant improvements in both urinary and bowel QOL. (Hamstra, Daniel A; Mariados, Neil; Sylvester, John; and et al, "Continued benefit to rectal separation for prostate radiation therapy: Final results of a phase III trial." International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics.97, 5. 976-985. (2017).

The SpaceOAR System (Augmenix, Inc., Bedford, MA) is an FDA approved absorbable hydrogel that can be introduced between the prostate and rectum to decrease rectal toxicity and minimize changes in bowel QOL. Prior analyses of the pivotal phase 3 trial noted lower penile bulb radiation dose with spacer, but there was no difference in average sexual QOL between arms; however, because nearly 60% of men who had moderate to severe sexual dysfunction at baseline, it is possible that an impact of the spacer on sexual function was masked. A post hoc analysis by Hamstra *et al* identified the subgroup of men with adequate baseline sexual QOL (41% of respondents) and found a correlation between reduced RT dose to penile bulb and better sexual QOL as well as quality of erections when comparing the spacer arm with control.

Over a two-year period, hydrogel spacer use during radiation treatment in men with prostate cancer reduced GI, GU, and SD complications and yielded QALY gains at moderately increased costs meeting generally accepted definitions of cost effectiveness. (Brooks *et al*; 2020). Studies have shown that placement of the device between the prostate and rectum can optimize radiation therapies for patients with localized prostate cancer, and potentially minimize radiation-induced rectal toxicity and complications (Mariados 2015, Uhl 2014, Susil 2010). Those studies include a phase 3 trial that demonstrated a statistically significant reduction in late rectal toxicity (adverse events affecting the rectum, i.e., rectal bleeding) with the use of the spacer compared with rectal toxicity without spacer use (Mariados, et al, 2015).

Spacer application was rated as "easy" or "very easy" 98.7% of the time, with a 99% hydrogel placement success rate. Perirectal spaces were 12.6 ± 3.9 mm and 1.6 ± 2.0 mm in the spacer and control groups, respectively. There were no device-related adverse events, rectal perforations, serious bleeding, or infections within either group. Pre-to postspacer plans had a significant reduction in mean rectal V70 (12.4% to 3.3%, P less than .0001). Overall acute rectal adverse event rates were similar between groups, with fewer spacer patients experiencing rectal pain (P=.02). A significant reduction in late (3-15 months) rectal toxicity severity in the spacer group was observed (P=.04), with a 2.0% and 7.0% late rectal toxicity incidence in the spacer and control groups, respectively. There was no late rectal toxicity greater than grade I in the spacer group. At 15 months 11.6% and 21.4% of spacer and control patients, respectively, experienced 10-point declines in bowel quality of life. MRI scans at 12 months verified spacer

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

absorption. Spacer application was well tolerated. Increased perirectal space reduced rectal irradiation, reduced rectal toxicity severity, and decreased rates of patients experiencing declines in bowel quality of life. The spacer appears to be an effective tool, potentially enabling advanced prostate RT protocols. (Mariados, et al, 2015).

Summary of Evidence: Aquablation

For individuals who have benign prostatic hyperplasia and lower urinary tract symptoms who receive aquablation, the evidence includes one noninferiority RCT of aquablation compared to TURP in 187 patients with 3 years of followup. The outcomes of interest are symptoms, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The primary efficacy endpoint was the difference between groups in the change in International Prostate Symptom Score (IPSS) at 6 months, and the primary safety end point was the development of Clavien-Dindo persistent grade 1, or 2 or higher operative complications at 3 months. At 6 months, mean I-PSS decreased from baseline by 16.9 points for aquablation and 15.1 points for TURP (mean difference 1.8 points; p <.0001 for noninferiority and p =.1347 for superiority). The primary safety endpoint rate was lower in the aquablation group compared to the TURP group (26% vs 42%, p =.0149). The rate of grade 2 and greater events was similar in the 2 groups (20% for aquablation and 23% for TURP; p =.3038). Over 3 years, improvements remained similar between groups. Confidence in these conclusions is reduced due to imprecision of estimates and a lack of additional supportive trials, especially with regard to comparative adverse events. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Summary of Evidence: Prostate Artery Embolization (PAE)

PAE is not recommended by AUA. Current data does not support this and the benefit over risk is unclear. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

National Comprehensive Cancer Network on focal therapy including high-intensity focused ultrasound

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines for prostate cancer (v.1.2023) recommend At this time, the panel recommends only cryosurgery and high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU; category 2B) as local therapy options for RT recurrence in the absence of metastatic disease

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence on focal therapy including high-intensity focused ultrasound

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2019; updated in 2021) issued guidance on the use of cryoablation for localized prostate cancer. Cryoablation and high-intensity ultrasound are not recommended for the treatment of localized prostate cancer because there is a lack of evidence on quality of life benefits and long-term survival.

American Urological Association on focal therapy

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

The American Urological Association, in collaboration with the American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) with additional representation from the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), and Society of Urologic Oncology (SUO) published updated guidelines on the management of clinically localized prostate cancer in 2022.¹⁷ The guidelines included the following recommendation on focal treatments:

- "Clinicians should inform patients with intermediate-risk prostate cancer considering whole gland or focal ablation that there are a lack of high-quality data comparing ablation outcomes to radiation therapy, surgery, and active surveillance. (Expert Opinion)"
- "Clinicians should not recommend whole gland or focal ablation for patients with high-risk prostate cancer outside of a clinical trial. (Expert Opinion)"

National Cancer Institute on focal therapy including high-intensity focused ultrasound

The National Cancer Institute (NCI; 2021) updated its information on prostate cancer treatments. The NCI indicated that cryoablation, photodynamic therapy, and HIFU were new treatment options currently being studied in national trials. The NCI offered no recommendation for or against these treatments.

National Comprehensive Cancer Network on Hydrogel Spacer

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network guideline for prostate cancer (v1.2023) provides the following recommendation in principles of radiation therapy, " Overall, the panel believes that biocompatible and biodegradable perirectal spacer materials may be implanted between the prostate and rectum in patients undergoing external radiotherapy with organ-confined prostate cancer in order to displace the rectum from high radiation dose regions. Patients with obvious rectal invasion or visible T3 and posterior extension should not undergo perirectal spacer implantation."

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence on Hydrogel Spacer

Biodegradable spacer insertion to reduce rectal toxicity during radiotherapy for prostate cancer

- NICE (2017) recommends " Current evidence on the safety and efficacy of insertion of a biodegradable spacer to reduce rectal toxicity during radiotherapy for prostate cancer is adequate to support the use of this procedure provided that standard arrangements are in place for clinical governance, consent and audit. The procedure should only be done by clinicians with training in, and experience of, transperineal interventional procedures."

American Society of Clinical Oncology, the American Urological Association, and the American Society for Radiation Oncology on Hydrogel Spacer

In 2018, the American Society of Clinical Oncology, the American Urological Association, and the American Society for Radiation Oncology published a joint guideline on hypofractionated radiation therapy for localized prostate cancer. The guideline recommends that men be counseled about the small increased risk of acute gastrointestinal toxicity with hypofractionation. "Moderately fractionated EBRT has a similar risk of acute and late genitourinary and late GI toxicity compared with conventionally fractionated EBRT. However, physicians should discuss the limited follow-up beyond 5 years for most existing RCTs [randomized controlled trials]

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

evaluating moderate hypofractionation." This was a strong recommendation based on high-quality evidence and 100% consensus.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) on Transurethral Water Thermal Therapy and Transurethral Water Jet Ablation for BPH

Transurethral water vapour ablation for lower urinary tract symptoms caused by benign prostatic hyperplasia

- NICE (2018) recommends "Current evidence on the safety and efficacy of transurethral water vapour ablation for urinary tract symptoms caused by benign prostatic hyperplasia is adequate to support the use of this procedure provided that standard arrangements are in place for clinical governance, consent and audit. This procedure should only be done by a urologist with specific training in the procedure, who should carry out their initial procedures with an experienced mentor."

Rezum for treating lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia

- NICE (2020) recommends "Evidence supports the case for adopting Rezum for treating lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) caused by benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) in the NHS. Rezum relieves LUTS and improves quality of life. Rezum is a minimally invasive procedure. It should be considered as a treatment option for people with: moderate to severe LUTS (International Prostate Symptoms Score [IPSS] typically 13 or over) and a moderately enlarged prostate (typically between 30 cm³ and 80 cm³)."

Transurethral water jet ablation for lower urinary tract symptoms caused by benign prostatic hyperplasia

- NICE (2018) recommended "The evidence on transurethral water jet ablation for lower urinary tract symptoms caused by benign prostatic hyperplasia raises no major safety concerns. The evidence on efficacy is limited in quantity. Therefore, this procedure should only be used with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent, and audit or research. "

American Urological Association on Water Vapor Thermal Therapy and Robotic Waterjet Treatment for BPH

The American Urological Association (2018, amended 2019, 2020, 2021) issued clinical practice guidelines on benign prostatic hyperplasia (amended 2021) and made the following relevant recommendations:

- Water vapor thermal therapy should be considered as a treatment option for patients with LUTS/BPH provided prostate volume 30-80cc. (Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)
- Water vapor thermal therapy may be offered to eligible patients who desire preservation of erectile and ejaculatory function. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)
- Robotic waterjet treatment (RWT) may be offered as a treatment option to patients with LUTS/BPH provided prostate volume 30-80cc. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence on Prostatic Urethral Lifts

In 2014, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence published guidance on urethral lift implants to treat lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH). The guidance stated:

"Current evidence on the efficacy and safety of insertion of prostatic urethral lift implants to treat lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia is adequate to support the use of this procedure."

In 2021 the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence published updated guidance on the use of UroLift for treating LUTS of BPH. The guidance stated: "the UroLift system relieves lower urinary tract symptoms, avoids risk to sexual function, and improves quality of life " and "the UroLift system should be considered as an alternative to transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) and holmium laser enucleation of the prostate (HoLEP). It can be done as a day-case or outpatient procedures for people aged 50 and older with a prostate volume between 30 and 80 mL

American Urological Association on Prostatic Urethral Lifts

In 2021, the American Urological Association published guidelines on Management of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia/ Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms. The guidelines made the following recommendations and statements regarding prostatic urethral lift (PUL).

- PUL should be considered as a treatment option for patients with LUTS/BPH provided prostate volume 30-80cc and verified absence of an obstructive middle lobe. (Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)
- "PUL may be offered to eligible patients who desire preservation of erectile and ejaculatory function."

American Urological Association on Prostate Artery Embolization (PAE)

- In 2021, recommended "PAE for the routine treatment of LUTS/BPH is not supported by current data, and benefit over risk remains unclear; therefore, PAE is not recommended outside the context of clinical trials. (Expert Opinion)"

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence on Prostatic Urethral Temporary Implant

In 2022, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) issued an interventional procedures guidance on prostatic urethral temporary implant insertion for lower urinary tract symptoms caused by BPH. The recommendation noted that the evidence on the use of these devices is limited in quantity and quality. Therefore, the procedure should only be used with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent, and audit or research.

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

IV. DEFINITIONS

[TOP](#)

IMRT refers to Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy.

QALY refers to Quality Adjusted Life Year.

QoL refers to Quality of Life.

V. BENEFIT VARIATIONS

[TOP](#)

The existence of this medical policy does not mean that this service is a covered benefit under the member's health benefit plan. Benefit determinations should be based in all cases on the applicable health benefit plan language. Medical policies do not constitute a description of benefits. A member's health benefit plan governs which services are covered, which are excluded, which are subject to benefit limits and which require preauthorization. There are different benefit plan designs in each product administered by Capital Blue Cross. Members and providers should consult the member's health benefit plan for information or contact Capital Blue Cross for benefit information.

VI. DISCLAIMER

[TOP](#)

Capital Blue Cross's medical policies are developed to assist in administering a member's benefits, do not constitute medical advice, and are subject to change. Treating providers are solely responsible for medical advice and treatment of members. Members should discuss any medical policy related to their coverage or condition with their provider and consult their benefit information to determine if the service is covered. If there is a discrepancy between this medical policy and a member's benefit information, the benefit information will govern. If a provider or a member has a question concerning the application of this medical policy to a specific member's plan of benefits, please contact Capital Blue Cross' Provider Services or Member Services. Capital Blue Cross considers the information contained in this medical policy to be proprietary and it may only be disseminated as permitted by law.

VII. CODING INFORMATION

[TOP](#)

Note: This list of codes may not be all-inclusive, and codes are subject to change at any time. The identification of a code in this section does not denote coverage as coverage is determined by the terms of member benefit information. In addition, not all covered services are eligible for separate reimbursement.

Investigational when used to describe Focal Treatments for Prostate Cancer

Procedure Codes							
0582T	0655T	C9769	55899				

Not Medically Necessary when used for aquablation

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

Procedure Codes							
0421T	C2596						

Not Medically Necessary for high intensity-focused ultrasound (HIFU)

Procedure Codes							
55880	55899						

Covered when Medically Necessary when used for Radiofrequency water vapor (steam) thermal therapy

Procedure Codes							
53854							

ICD-10-CM Diagnosis Code	Description
D29.1	Benign Neoplasm of Prostate
N13.8	Other Obstruction and Reflux Uropathy
N32.0	Bladder Neck Obstruction
N40.1	Enlarged Prostate with lower urinary tract symptoms
N40.3	Nodular Prostate with lower urinary tract symptoms
R33.8	Other Retention of Urine
R39.15	Urgency of Urination
R39.16	Straining to Void

Covered when Medically Necessary for Prostatic Urethral Lift

Procedure Codes							
52441	52442	C9739	C9740				

ICD-10-CM Diagnosis Code	Description
D29.1	Benign Neoplasm of Prostate
N40.1	Enlarged Prostate with lower urinary tract symptoms
N40.3	Nodular Prostate with lower urinary tract symptoms

Covered when Medically Necessary for Hydrogel Therapy

Procedure Codes							
55874							

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

ICD-10-CM Diagnosis Code	Description
C61	Malignant Neoplasm of Prostate
C79.82	Secondary malignant neoplasm of genital organs
D07.5	Carcinoma in situ of prostate
D40.0	Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of prostate
D49.59	Neoplasm of unspecified behavior of other genitourinary organs

VIII. REFERENCES

[TOP](#)

Focal Treatments and other treatments (including HIFU, PAE, Temporary implants)

1. American Cancer Society. *Key statistics for prostate cancer*. January 12, 2022.
2. Dall'Era MA, Cooperberg MR, Chan JM, et al. Active surveillance for early-stage prostate cancer: review of the current literature. *Cancer*. Apr 15 2008; 112(8): 1650-9. PMID 18306379
3. Bangma CH, Roemeling S, Schroder FH. Overdiagnosis and overtreatment of early detected prostate cancer. *World J Urol*. Mar 2007; 25(1): 3-9. PMID 17364211
4. Johansson JE, Andren O, Andersson SO, et al. Natural history of early, localized prostate cancer. *JAMA*. Jun 09 2004; 291(22): 2713-9. PMID 15187052
5. Ploussard G, Epstein JI, Montironi R, et al. The contemporary concept of significant versus insignificant prostate cancer. *Eur Urol*. Aug 2011; 60(2): 291-303. PMID 21601982
6. Harnden P, Naylor B, Shelley MD, et al. The clinical management of patients with a small volume of prostatic cancer on biopsy: what are the risks of progression? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cancer*. Mar 01 2008; 112(5): 971-81. PMID 18186496
7. Brimo F, Montironi R, Egevad L, et al. Contemporary grading for prostate cancer: implications for patient care. *Eur Urol*. May 2013; 63(5): 892-901. PMID 23092544
8. Eylert MF, Persad R. Management of prostate cancer. *Br J Hosp Med (Lond)*. Feb 2012; 73(2): 95-9. PMID 22504752
9. Eastham JA, Kattan MW, Fearn P, et al. Local progression among men with conservatively treated localized prostate cancer: results from the Transatlantic Prostate Group. *Eur Urol*. Feb 2008; 53(2): 347-54. PMID 17544572
10. Bill-Axelsson A, Holmberg L, Ruutu M, et al. Radical prostatectomy versus watchful waiting in early prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med*. May 12 2005; 352(19): 1977-84. PMID 15888698
11. Thompson IM, Goodman PJ, Tangen CM, et al. Long-term survival of participants in the prostate cancer prevention trial. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 15 2013; 369(7): 603-10. PMID 23944298
12. Albertsen PC, Hanley JA, Fine J. 20-year outcomes following conservative management of clinically localized prostate cancer. *JAMA*. May 04 2005; 293(17): 2095-101. PMID 15870412
13. Borley N, Feneley MR. Prostate cancer: diagnosis and staging. *Asian J Androl*. Jan 2009; 11(1): 74-80. PMID 19050692
14. Freedland SJ. Screening, risk assessment, and the approach to therapy in patients with prostate cancer. *Cancer*. Mar 15 2011; 117(6): 1123-35. PMID 20960523

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

15. Ip S, Dahabreh IJ, Chung M, et al. An evidence review of active surveillance in men with localized prostate cancer. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment no. 204 (AHRQ Publication No. 12-E003-EF). Rockville, MD: Agency for Research and Quality; 2011.
16. American Urological Association. Guideline for management of clinically localized prostate cancer: 2007 update. Linthicum, MD: American Urological Association Education and Research; 2007.
17. Eastham JA, Aufferberg GB, Barocas DA, et al. Clinically Localized Prostate Cancer: AUA/ASTRO Guideline. 2022; <https://www.auanet.org/guidelines/guidelines/clinically-localized-prostate-cancer-uaa/astro-guideline-2022>. Accessed August 1, 2022.
18. Whitson JM, Carroll PR. Active surveillance for early-stage prostate cancer: defining the triggers for intervention. *J Clin Oncol*. Jun 10 2010; 28(17): 2807-9. PMID 20439633
19. Albertsen PC. Treatment of localized prostate cancer: when is active surveillance appropriate?. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. Jul 2010; 7(7): 394-400. PMID 20440282
20. Jacome-Pita F, Sanchez-Salas R, Barret E, et al. Focal therapy in prostate cancer: the current situation. *Ecancermedicalscience*. 2014; 8: 435. PMID 24944577
21. Nguyen CT, Jones JS. Focal therapy in the management of localized prostate cancer. *BJU Int*. May 2011; 107(9): 1362-8. PMID 21223478
22. Lindner U, Lawrentschuk N, Schatloff O, et al. Evolution from active surveillance to focal therapy in the management of prostate cancer. *Future Oncol*. Jun 2011; 7(6): 775-87. PMID 21675840
23. Iberti CT, Mohamed N, Palese MA. A review of focal therapy techniques in prostate cancer: clinical results for high-intensity focused ultrasound and focal cryoablation. *Rev Urol*. 2011; 13(4): e196-202. PMID 22232569
24. Lecornet E, Ahmed HU, Moore CM, et al. Conceptual basis for focal therapy in prostate cancer. *J Endourol*. May 2010; 24(5): 811-8. PMID 20443699
25. Tay KJ, Mendez M, Moul JW, et al. Active surveillance for prostate cancer: can we modernize contemporary protocols to improve patient selection and outcomes in the focal therapy era?. *Curr Opin Urol*. May 2015; 25(3): 185-90. PMID 25768694
26. Passoni NM, Polascik TJ. How to select the right patients for focal therapy of prostate cancer?. *Curr Opin Urol*. May 2014; 24(3): 203-8. PMID 24625428
27. Scales CD, Presti JC, Kane CJ, et al. Predicting unilateral prostate cancer based on biopsy features: implications for focal ablative therapy--results from the SEARCH database. *J Urol*. Oct 2007; 178(4 Pt 1): 1249-52. PMID 17698131
28. Mouraviev V, Mayes JM, Sun L, et al. Prostate cancer laterality as a rationale of focal ablative therapy for the treatment of clinically localized prostate cancer. *Cancer*. Aug 15 2007; 110(4): 906-10. PMID 17587207
29. Mouraviev V, Mayes JM, Madden JF, et al. Analysis of laterality and percentage of tumor involvement in 1386 prostatectomized specimens for selection of unilateral focal cryotherapy. *Technol Cancer Res Treat*. Apr 2007; 6(2): 91-5. PMID 17375971
30. 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*. Mar 2008; 38(3): 192-9. PMID 18281309
31. Kasivisvanathan V, Emberton M, Ahmed HU. Focal therapy for prostate cancer: rationale and treatment opportunities. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. Aug 2013; 25(8): 461-73. PMID 23759249

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

32. Mouraviev V, Villers A, Bostwick DG, et al. Understanding the pathological features of focality, grade and tumour volume of early-stage prostate cancer as a foundation for parenchyma-sparing prostate cancer therapies: active surveillance and focal targeted therapy. *BJU Int.* Oct 2011; 108(7): 1074-85. PMID 21489116
33. Mouraviev V, Mayes JM, Polascik TJ. Pathologic basis of focal therapy for early-stage prostate cancer. *Nat Rev Urol.* Apr 2009; 6(4): 205-15. PMID 19352395
34. Liu W, Laitinen S, Khan S, et al. Copy number analysis indicates monoclonal origin of lethal metastatic prostate cancer. *Nat Med.* May 2009; 15(5): 559-65. PMID 19363497
35. Guo CC, Wang Y, Xiao L, et al. The relationship of TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion between primary and metastatic prostate cancers. *Hum Pathol.* May 2012; 43(5): 644-9. PMID 21937078
36. Ahmed HU, Emberton M. Active surveillance and radical therapy in prostate cancer: can focal therapy offer the middle way?. *World J Urol.* Oct 2008; 26(5): 457-67. PMID 18704441
37. Stamey TA, Freiha FS, McNeal JE, et al. Localized prostate cancer. Relationship of tumor volume to clinical significance for treatment of prostate cancer. *Cancer.* Feb 01 1993; 71(3 Suppl): 933-8. PMID 7679045
38. Nelson BA, Shappell SB, Chang SS, et al. Tumour volume is an independent predictor of prostate-specific antigen recurrence in patients undergoing radical prostatectomy for clinically localized prostate cancer. *BJU Int.* Jun 2006; 97(6): 1169-72. PMID 16686706
39. van den Bos W, Muller BG, Ahmed H, et al. Focal therapy in prostate cancer: international multidisciplinary consensus on trial design. *Eur Urol.* Jun 2014; 65(6): 1078-83. PMID 24444476
40. Mayes JM, Mouraviev V, Sun L, et al. Can the conventional sextant prostate biopsy accurately predict unilateral prostate cancer in low-risk, localized, prostate cancer?. *Urol Oncol.* Mar-Apr 2011; 29(2): 166-70. PMID 19451000
41. Sinnott M, Falzarano SM, Hernandez AV, et al. Discrepancy in prostate cancer localization between biopsy and prostatectomy specimens in patients with unilateral positive biopsy: implications for focal therapy. *Prostate.* Aug 01 2012; 72(11): 1179-86. PMID 22161896
42. Gallina A, Maccagnano C, Suardi N, et al. Unilateral positive biopsies in low risk prostate cancer patients diagnosed with extended transrectal ultrasound-guided biopsy schemes do not predict unilateral prostate cancer at radical prostatectomy. *BJU Int.* Jul 2012; 110(2 Pt 2): E64-8. PMID 22093108
43. Briganti A, Tutolo M, Suardi N, et al. There is no way to identify patients who will harbor small volume, unilateral prostate cancer at final pathology. implications for focal therapies. *Prostate.* Jun 01 2012; 72(8): 925-30. PMID 21965006
44. Arumainayagam N, Ahmed HU, Moore CM, et al. Multiparametric MR imaging for detection of clinically significant prostate cancer: a validation cohort study with transperineal template prostate mapping as the reference standard. *Radiology.* Sep 2013; 268(3): 761-9. PMID 23564713
45. Dickinson L, Ahmed HU, Allen C, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging for the detection, localisation, and characterisation of prostate cancer: recommendations from a European consensus meeting. *Eur Urol.* Apr 2011; 59(4): 477-94. PMID 21195536
46. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Prostate cancer: diagnosis and management. [NG131]. 2019;

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

47. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). *Focal Therapy Using High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound for Localized Prostate Cancer [IPG424]*. 2012;
48. Lee T, Mendhiratta N, Sperling D, et al. *Focal laser ablation for localized prostate cancer: principles, clinical trials, and our initial experience*. *Rev Urol*. 2014; 16(2): 55-66. PMID 25009445
49. Azzouzi AR, Vincendeau S, Barret E, et al. *Padeliporfin vascular-targeted photodynamic therapy versus active surveillance in men with low-risk prostate cancer (CLIN1001 PCM301): an open-label, phase 3, randomised controlled trial*. *Lancet Oncol*. Feb 2017; 18(2): 181-191. PMID 28007457
50. Valerio M, Ahmed HU, Emberton M, et al. *The role of focal therapy in the management of localised prostate cancer: a systematic review*. *Eur Urol*. Oct 2014; 66(4): 732-51. PMID 23769825
51. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. *The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration*. *J Clin Epidemiol*. Oct 2009; 62(10): e1-34. PMID 19631507
52. Roach M, Hanks G, Thames H, et al. *Defining biochemical failure following radiotherapy with or without hormonal therapy in men with clinically localized prostate cancer: recommendations of the RTOG-ASTRO Phoenix Consensus Conference*. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. Jul 15 2006; 65(4): 965-74. PMID 16798415
53. Wolff RF, Ryder S, Bossi A, et al. *A systematic review of randomised controlled trials of radiotherapy for localised prostate cancer*. *Eur J Cancer*. Nov 2015; 51(16): 2345-67. PMID 26254809
54. Bates AS, Ayers J, Kostakopoulos N, et al. *A Systematic Review of Focal Ablative Therapy for Clinically Localised Prostate Cancer in Comparison with Standard Management Options: Limitations of the Available Evidence and Recommendations for Clinical Practice and Further Research*. *Eur Urol Oncol*. Jun 2021; 4(3): 405-423. PMID 33423943
55. Hopstaken JS, Bomers JGR, Sedelaar MJP, et al. *An Updated Systematic Review on Focal Therapy in Localized Prostate Cancer: What Has Changed over the Past 5 Years?*. *Eur Urol*. Jan 2022; 81(1): 5-33. PMID 34489140
56. Lepor H, Llukani E, Sperling D, et al. *Complications, Recovery, and Early Functional Outcomes and Oncologic Control Following In-bore Focal Laser Ablation of Prostate Cancer*. *Eur Urol*. Dec 2015; 68(6): 924-6. PMID 25979568
57. Natarajan S, Raman S, Priester AM, et al. *Focal Laser Ablation of Prostate Cancer: Phase I Clinical Trial*. *J Urol*. Jul 2016; 196(1): 68-75. PMID 26748164
58. Mehralivand S, George AK, Hoang AN, et al. *MRI-guided focal laser ablation of prostate cancer: a prospective single-arm, single-center trial with 3 years of follow-up*. *Diagn Interv Radiol*. May 2021; 27(3): 394-400. PMID 34003127
59. Chao B, Lepor H. *5-Year Outcomes Following Focal Laser Ablation of Prostate Cancer*. *Urology*. Sep 2021; 155: 124-129. PMID 34090887
60. Nahar B, Bhat A, Reis IM, et al. *Prospective Evaluation of Focal High Intensity Focused Ultrasound for Localized Prostate Cancer*. *J Urol*. Sep 2020; 204(3): 483-489. PMID 32167866
61. Lian H, Zhuang J, Yang R, et al. *Focal cryoablation for unilateral low-intermediate-risk prostate cancer: 63-month mean follow-up results of 41 patients*. *Int Urol Nephrol*. Jan 2016; 48(1): 85-90. PMID 26531063

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

62. Mendez MH, Passoni NM, Pow-Sang J, et al. Comparison of Outcomes Between Preoperatively Potent Men Treated with Focal Versus Whole Gland Cryotherapy in a Matched Population. *J Endourol.* Oct 2015; 29(10): 1193-8. PMID 26058496
63. Ward JF, Jones JS. Focal cryotherapy for localized prostate cancer: a report from the national Cryo On-Line Database (COLD) Registry. *BJU Int.* Jun 2012; 109(11): 1648-54. PMID 22035200
64. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). *NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: prostate cancer. Version 4.2023.*
65. National Cancer Institute. *Prostate Cancer Treatment (PDQ) Patient Version: Treatment Option Overview. 2021.*
66. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. *Final Recommendation Statement: Prostate Cancer: Screening. 2018;*
67. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). *Interventional procedures guidance: prostatic urethral temporary implant insertion for lower urinary tract symptoms caused by benign prostatic hyperplasia [IPG737]. September 21, 2022*
68. Sarma AV, Wei JT. *Clinical practice. Benign prostatic hyperplasia and lower urinary tract symptoms. N Engl J Med.* Jul 19 2012; 367(3): 248-57. PMID 22808960
69. Barry MJ, Fowler FJ, O'Leary MP, et al. *Measuring disease-specific health status in men with benign prostatic hyperplasia. Measurement Committee of The American Urological Association. Med Care.* Apr 1995; 33(4 Suppl): AS145-55. PMID 7536866
70. O'leary MP. *Validity of the "bother score" in the evaluation and treatment of symptomatic benign prostatic hyperplasia. Rev Urol.* 2005; 7(1): 1-10. PMID 16985801
71. Djavan B, Marberger M. *A meta-analysis on the efficacy and tolerability of alpha1-adrenoceptor antagonists in patients with lower urinary tract symptoms suggestive of benign prostatic obstruction. Eur Urol.* 1999; 36(1): 1-13. PMID 10364649
72. Lerner LB, McVary KT, Barry MJ, et al. *Management of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Attributed to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: AUA GUIDELINE PART II-Surgical Evaluation and Treatment. J Urol.* Oct 2021; 206(4): 818-826. PMID 34384236
73. Foster HE, Barry MJ, Dahm P, et al. *Surgical Management of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Attributed to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: AUA Guideline. J Urol.* Sep 2018; 200(3): 612-619. PMID 29775639
74. Reich O, Gratzke C, Bachmann A, et al. *Morbidity, mortality and early outcome of transurethral resection of the prostate: a prospective multicenter evaluation of 10,654 patients. J Urol.* Jul 2008; 180(1): 246-9. PMID 18499179
75. Amparore D, De Cillis S, Volpi G, et al. *First- and Second-Generation Temporary Implantable Nitinol Devices As Minimally Invasive Treatments for BPH-Related LUTS: Systematic Review of the Literature. Curr Urol Rep.* Jul 05 2019; 20(8): 47. PMID 31278441
76. Fiori C, De Cillis S, Volpi G, et al. *iTIND for BPH: Technique and procedural outcomes: A narrative review of current literature. Turk J Urol.* Nov 2021; 47(6): 470-481. PMID 35118965
77. Balakrishnan D, Jones P, Somani BK. *iTIND: the second-generation temporary implantable nitinol device for minimally invasive treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia. Ther Adv Urol.* 2020; 12: 1756287220934355. PMID 32655690
78. Rosen RC, Catania JA, Althof SE, et al. *Development and validation of four-item version of Male Sexual Health Questionnaire to assess ejaculatory dysfunction. Urology.* May 2007; 69(5): 805-9. PMID 17482908

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

79. Cappelleri JC, Rosen RC. *The Sexual Health Inventory for Men (SHIM): a 5-year review of research and clinical experience. Int J Impot Res. 2005; 17(4): 307-19. PMID 15875061*
80. Sønksen J, Barber NJ, Speakman MJ, et al. *Prospective, randomized, multinational study of prostatic urethral lift versus transurethral resection of the prostate: 12-month results from the BPH6 study. Eur Urol. Oct 2015; 68(4): 643-52. PMID 25937539*
81. Barry MJ, Williford WO, Chang Y, et al. *Benign prostatic hyperplasia specific health status measures in clinical research: how much change in the American Urological Association symptom index and the benign prostatic hyperplasia impact index is perceptible to patients?. J Urol. Nov 1995; 154(5): 1770-4. PMID 7563343*
82. Roehrborn CG, Wilson TH, Black LK. *Quantifying the contribution of symptom improvement to satisfaction of men with moderate to severe benign prostatic hyperplasia: 4-year data from the CombAT trial. J Urol. May 2012; 187(5): 1732-8. PMID 22425127*
83. Porpiglia F, Fiori C, Bertolo R, et al. *Temporary implantable nitinol device (TIND): a novel, minimally invasive treatment for relief of lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) related to benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH): feasibility, safety and functional results at 1 year of follow-up. BJU Int. Aug 2015; 116(2): 278-87. PMID 25382816*
84. Porpiglia F, Fiori C, Bertolo R, et al. *3-Year follow-up of temporary implantable nitinol device implantation for the treatment of benign prostatic obstruction. BJU Int. Jul 2018; 122(1): 106-112. PMID 29359881*
85. Franco JV, Jung JH, Imamura M, et al. *Minimally invasive treatments for lower urinary tract symptoms in men with benign prostatic hyperplasia: a network meta-analysis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Jul 15 2021; 7(7): CD013656. PMID 34693990*
86. Chughtai B, Elterman D, Shore N, et al. *The iTind Temporarily Implanted Nitinol Device for the Treatment of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Secondary to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: A Multicenter, Randomized, Controlled Trial. Urology. Jul 2021; 153: 270-276. PMID 33373708*
87. Porpiglia F, Fiori C, Amparore D, et al. *Second-generation of temporary implantable nitinol device for the relief of lower urinary tract symptoms due to benign prostatic hyperplasia: results of a prospective, multicentre study at 1 year of follow-up. BJU Int. Jun 2019; 123(6): 1061-1069. PMID 30382600*
88. Kadner G, Valerio M, Giannakis I, et al. *Second generation of temporary implantable nitinol device (iTind) in men with LUTS: 2 year results of the MT-02-study. World J Urol. Dec 2020; 38(12): 3235-3244. PMID 32124019*
89. Amparore D, Fiori C, Valerio M, et al. *3-Year results following treatment with the second generation of the temporary implantable nitinol device in men with LUTS secondary to benign prostatic obstruction. Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis. Jun 2021; 24(2): 349-357. PMID 33005003*
90. De Nunzio C, Cantiello F, Fiori C, et al. *Urinary and sexual function after treatment with temporary implantable nitinol device (iTind) in men with LUTS: 6-month interim results of the MT-06-study. World J Urol. Jun 2021; 39(6): 2037-2042. PMID 3285143*
91. *Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Medical Policy Reference Manual. 8.01.61, Focal Treatments for Prostate Cancer, October, 2022.*

Prostatic Urethral Lift

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

1. Sarma AV, Wei JT. *Clinical practice. Benign prostatic hyperplasia and lower urinary tract symptoms.* N Engl J Med. Jul 19 2012; 367(3): 248-57. PMID 22808960
2. Barry MJ, Fowler FJ, O'Leary MP, et al. *Measuring disease-specific health status in men with benign prostatic hyperplasia.* Measurement Committee of The American Urological Association. Med Care. Apr 1995; 33(4 Suppl): AS145-55. PMID 7536866
3. O'leary MP. *Validity of the "bother score" in the evaluation and treatment of symptomatic benign prostatic hyperplasia.* Rev Urol. 2005; 7(1): 1-10. PMID 16985801
4. Djavan B, Marberger M. *A meta-analysis on the efficacy and tolerability of alpha1-adrenoceptor antagonists in patients with lower urinary tract symptoms suggestive of benign prostatic obstruction.* Eur Urol. 1999; 36(1): 1-13. PMID 10364649
5. Foster HE, Barry MJ, Dahm P, et al. *Surgical Management of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Attributed to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: AUA Guideline.* J Urol. Sep 2018; 200(3): 612-619. PMID 29775639
6. Reich O, Gratzke C, Bachmann A, et al. *Morbidity, mortality and early outcome of transurethral resection of the prostate: a prospective multicenter evaluation of 10,654 patients.* J Urol. Jul 2008; 180(1): 246-9. PMID 18499179
7. Lerner LB, McVary KT, Barry MJ, et al. *Management of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Attributed to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: AUA GUIDELINE PART II-Surgical Evaluation and Treatment.* J Urol. Oct 2021; 206(4): 818-826. PMID 34384236
8. Sundaram D, Sankaran PK, Raghunath G, et al. *Correlation of Prostate Gland Size and Uroflowmetry in Patients with Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms.* J Clin Diagn Res. May 2017; 11(5): AC01-AC04. PMID 28658743
9. Rosen RC, Catania JA, Althof SE, et al. *Development and validation of four-item version of Male Sexual Health Questionnaire to assess ejaculatory dysfunction.* Urology. May 2007; 69(5): 805-9. PMID 17482908
10. Cappelleri JC, Rosen RC. *The Sexual Health Inventory for Men (SHIM): a 5-year review of research and clinical experience.* Int J Impot Res. Jul-Aug 2005; 17(4): 307-19. PMID 15875061
11. Sonksen J, Barber NJ, Speakman MJ, et al. *Prospective, randomized, multinational study of prostatic urethral lift versus transurethral resection of the prostate: 12-month results from the BPH6 study.* Eur Urol. Oct 2015; 68(4): 643-52. PMID 25937539
12. Barry MJ, Williford WO, Chang Y, et al. *Benign prostatic hyperplasia specific health status measures in clinical research: how much change in the American Urological Association symptom index and the benign prostatic hyperplasia impact index is perceptible to patients?.* J Urol. Nov 1995; 154(5): 1770-4. PMID 7563343
13. Roehrborn CG, Wilson TH, Black LK. *Quantifying the contribution of symptom improvement to satisfaction of men with moderate to severe benign prostatic hyperplasia: 4-year data from the CombAT trial.* J Urol. May 2012; 187(5): 1732-8. PMID 22425127
14. McVary KT, Roehrborn CG, Avins AL, et al. *American Urological Association Guideline: Management of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia (BPH). 2010 (affirmed 2014);*
15. Perera M, Roberts MJ, Doi SA, et al. *Prostatic urethral lift improves urinary symptoms and flow while preserving sexual function for men with benign prostatic hyperplasia: a systematic review and meta-analysis.* Eur Urol. Apr 2015; 67(4): 704-13. PMID 25466940

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

16. Cantwell AL, Bogache WK, Richardson SF, et al. Multicentre prospective crossover study of the 'prostatic urethral lift' for the treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia. *BJU Int.* Apr 2014; 113(4): 615-22. PMID 24765680
17. Shore N, Freedman S, Gange S, et al. Prospective multi-center study elucidating patient experience after prostatic urethral lift. *Can J Urol.* Feb 2014; 21(1): 7094-101. PMID 24529008
18. McNicholas TA, Woo HH, Chin PT, et al. Minimally invasive prostatic urethral lift: surgical technique and multinational experience. *Eur Urol.* Aug 2013; 64(2): 292-9. PMID 23357348
19. Chin PT, Bolton DM, Jack G, et al. Prostatic urethral lift: two-year results after treatment for lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Urology.* Jan 2012; 79(1): 5-11. PMID 22202539
20. Woo HH, Bolton DM, Laborde E, et al. Preservation of sexual function with the prostatic urethral lift: a novel treatment for lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia. *J Sex Med.* Feb 2012; 9(2): 568-75. PMID 22172161
21. Woo HH, Chin PT, McNicholas TA, et al. Safety and feasibility of the prostatic urethral lift: a novel, minimally invasive treatment for lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH). *BJU Int.* Jul 2011; 108(1): 82-8. PMID 21554526
22. Hoffman RM, Monga M, Elliott SP, et al. Microwave thermotherapy for benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Sep 12 2012; (9): CD004135. PMID 22972068
23. Roehrborn CG, Gange SN, Shore ND, et al. The prostatic urethral lift for the treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms associated with prostate enlargement due to benign prostatic hyperplasia: the L.I.F.T. Study. *J Urol.* Dec 2013; 190(6): 2161-7. PMID 23764081
24. Shore N. A Review of the Prostatic Urethral Lift for Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms: Symptom Relief, Flow Improvement, and Preservation of Sexual Function in Men With Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *Curr Bladder Dysfunct Rep.* NA 2015; 10(2): 186-192. PMID 25984251
25. Roehrborn CG, Rukstalis DB, Barkin J, et al. Three year results of the prostatic urethral L.I.F.T. study. *Can J Urol.* Jun 2015; 22(3): 7772-82. PMID 26068624
26. McVary KT, Gange SN, Shore ND, et al. Treatment of LUTS secondary to BPH while preserving sexual function: randomized controlled study of prostatic urethral lift. *J Sex Med.* Jan 2014; 11(1): 279-87. PMID 24119101
27. Garrido Abad P, Coloma Del Peso A, Sinues Ojas B, et al. [Urolift(R), a new minimally invasive treatment for patients with low urinary tract symptoms secondary to BPH. Preliminary results]. *Arch Esp Urol.* Jul-Aug 2013; 66(6): 584-91. PMID 23985459
28. Jones P, Rajkumar GN, Rai BP, et al. Medium-term Outcomes of Urolift (Minimum 12 Months Follow-up): Evidence From a Systematic Review. *Urology.* Nov 2016; 97: 20-24. PMID 27208817
29. Bozkurt A, Karabakan M, Keskin E, et al. Prostatic Urethral Lift: A New Minimally Invasive Treatment for Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Secondary to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *Urol Int.* 2016; 96(2): 202-6. PMID 26613256
30. Ray A, Morgan H, Wilkes A, et al. The Urolift System for the Treatment of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Secondary to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: A NICE Medical Technology Guidance. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy.* Oct 2016; 14(5): 515-26. PMID 26832146

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

31. Tanneru K, Gautam S, Norez D, et al. Meta-analysis and systematic review of intermediate-term follow-up of prostatic urethral lift for benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Int Urol Nephrol*. Jun 2020; 52(6): 999-1008. PMID 32065331
32. Rukstalis D, Rashid P, Bogache WK, et al. 24-month durability after crossover to the prostatic urethral lift from randomised, blinded sham. *BJU Int*. Oct 2016; 118 Suppl 3: 14-22. PMID 27684483
33. Sievert KD, Schonthal M, Berges R, et al. Minimally invasive prostatic urethral lift (PUL) efficacious in TURP candidates: a multicenter German evaluation after 2 years. *World J Urol*. Jul 2019; 37(7): 1353-1360. PMID 30283994
34. Jung JH, Reddy B, McCutcheon KA, et al. Prostatic urethral lift for the treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms in men with benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. May 25 2019; 5: CD012832. PMID 31128077
35. Gratzke C, Barber N, Speakman MJ, et al. Prostatic urethral lift vs transurethral resection of the prostate: 2-year results of the BPH6 prospective, multicentre, randomized study. *BJU Int*. May 2017; 119(5): 767-775. PMID 27862831
36. Franco JVA, Jung JH, Imamura M, et al. Minimally invasive treatments for benign prostatic hyperplasia: a Cochrane network meta-analysis. *BJU Int*. Aug 2022; 130(2): 142-156. PMID 34820997
37. Roehrborn CG. Prostatic Urethral Lift: A Unique Minimally Invasive Surgical Treatment of Male Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Secondary to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *Urol Clin North Am*. Aug 2016; 43(3): 357-69. PMID 27476128
38. Roehrborn CG, Barkin J, Gange SN, et al. Five year results of the prospective randomized controlled prostatic urethral L.I.F.T. study. *Can J Urol*. Jun 2017; 24(3): 8802-8813. PMID 28646935
39. Rukstalis D, Grier D, Stroup SP, et al. Prostatic Urethral Lift (PUL) for obstructive median lobes: 12 month results of the MedLift Study. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis*. Sep 2019; 22(3): 411-419. PMID 30542055
40. Shah BB, Tayon K, Madiraju S, et al. Prostatic Urethral Lift: Does Size Matter?. *J Endourol*. Jul 2018; 32(7): 635-638. PMID 29631445
41. Eure G, Gange S, Walter P, et al. Real-World Evidence of Prostatic Urethral Lift Confirms Pivotal Clinical Study Results: 2-Year Outcomes of a Retrospective Multicenter Study. *J Endourol*. Jul 2019; 33(7): 576-584. PMID 31115257
42. Kaplan SA. Surgical Reintervention Rate after Prostatic Urethral Lift: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Involving over 2,000 Patients. *Letter. J Urol*. Mar 2021; 205(3): 939-940. PMID 33393811
43. Miller LE, Chughtai B, Dornbier RA, et al. Surgical Reintervention Rate after Prostatic Urethral Lift: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Involving over 2,000 Patients. Reply. *J Urol*. Mar 2021; 205(3): 940-941. PMID 33393812
44. McVary KT, Kaplan SA. A Tower of Babel in Today's Urology: Disagreement in Concepts and Definitions of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms/Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia Re-Treatment. *J Urol*. Aug 2020; 204(2): 213-214. PMID 32469261
45. Miller LE, Chughtai B, Dornbier RA, et al. Surgical Reintervention Rate after Prostatic Urethral Lift: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Involving over 2,000 Patients. *J Urol*. Nov 2020; 204(5): 1019-1026. PMID 32396049

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

46. Gaffney CD, Basourakos SP, Al Hussein Al Awamlh B, et al. Adoption, Safety, and Retreatment Rates of Prostatic Urethral Lift for Benign Prostatic Enlargement. *J Urol.* Aug 2021; 206(2): 409-415. PMID 33793296
47. Page T, Veeratterapillay R, Keltie K, et al. Prostatic urethral lift (UroLift): a real-world analysis of outcomes using hospital episodes statistics. *BMC Urol.* Apr 07 2021; 21(1): 55. PMID 33827525
48. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Insertion of prostatic urethral lift implants to treat lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia [IPG475]. 2014; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg475/chapter/1-recommendations>. Accessed July 7, 2022.
49. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). UroLift for treating lower urinary tract symptoms of benign prostatic hyperplasia [MTG58]. 2021;
50. Lerner LB, McVary, KT, Barry MJ et al: Management of lower urinary tract symptoms attributed to benign prostatic hyperplasia: AUA Guideline part II, surgical evaluation and treatment . *J Urol* 2021; 206: 818.
51. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Medical Policy Reference Manual. 7.01.151, Prostatic Urethral Lift September 2022.

Hydrogel Spacer

1. Beyer, D., Bogart, J., Bosch, W., DeWeese, Ellis, R., Forsythe, K., T., Francke, P., Gay, H., Hamstra, D., His, R., Hudes, R., Karsh, L., Kos, M., Kurtzman, S., Logsdon, M., Mantz, D., Mariados, N., Michalski, J., Rossi, P., Zimberg, S. (2015). Hydrogel spacer prospective multicenter randomized controlled pivotal trial: dosimetric and clinical effects of perirectal spacer application in men undergoing prostate image guided intensity modulated radiation therapy. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology* 92(5), 971-977.
2. Chao M, Ow D, Ho H, et al. Improving rectal dosimetry for patients with intermediate and high-risk prostate cancer undergoing combined high-dose-rate brachytherapy and external beam radiotherapy with hydrogel space. *J Contemp Brachytherapy.* 2019 Feb; 11(1)8-13. PMID 30911304
3. Classification of prostatic carcinomas. *Cancer chemotherapy reports.* Mar 1966; 50(3):125-8. PMID 5948714
4. Continued Benefit to Rectal Separation for Prostate Radiation Therapy: Final Results of a Phase III Trial. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* Apr 1 2017; 97(5):976-985. PMID 28209443
5. Daniel A. Hamstra, MD, PhD, Nei I Mariados, M, John Sylvester, MD, Dhiren Shah, MD, Eric Gross, MD, Richard Hudes, MD, David Beyer, MD, Steven Kurtzman, MD, Jeffrey Bogart, MD, R. Alex Hsi, MD, Michael Kos, MD, Rodney Ellis, MD, Mark Logsdon, MD, Shawn Zimberg, MD, Kevin Forsythe, MD, Hong Zhang, MD, PhD, Edward Soffen, MD, Patrick Francke, MD, MBA; Sexual quality of life following prostate intensity modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) with a rectal/prostate spacer: Secondary analysis of Phase 3 trial. *Practical Radiation Oncology* (2018) 8, 2018) 8, e7-e15.ished,
6. Dearnaley DP, Khoo VS, Norman AR, et al. Comparison of radiation side-effects of conformal and conventional radiotherapy in prostate cancer: A randomised trial. *Lancet* 1999; 353:267-272.

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

7. Elizabeth Brooks PHD et al, TTI Health Research and Economics; Cost Effectiveness of the Insertion of Hydrogel Spacer in Men Treated with Radiation Therapy for Prostate Cancer; January 22, 2020.
8. Hamstra, Daniel A; Mariados, Neil; Sylvester, John; and et al, "Continued benefit to rectal separation for prostate radiation therapy: Final results of a phase III trial." *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics.*97, 5. 976-985. (2017).
9. Forero DF, Almeida N, Dendukuri N. Hydrogel Spacer to reduce rectal toxicity in prostate cancer radiotherapy: a health technology assessment. Report No. 82. April 16, 2018.
10. Jennifer Gordetsky and Jonathan Epstein; Department of Pathology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL USA Department of Urology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL USA Department of Pathology, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, The Weinberg Building Room 2242. 401 North Broadway St., Baltimore, MD 21231 USA Department of Urology, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore; Grading of prostatic adenocarcinoma: current state and prognostic implications; *Diagn Pathol.* 2016; 11: 25. Published online 2016 Mar 9. doi: 10.1186/s13000-016-0478-2; PMID: PMC4784293 PMID: 26956509
11. Hydrogel spacer distribution within the perirectal space in patients undergoing radiotherapy for prostate cancer: Impact of spacer symmetry on rectal dose reduction and the clinical consequences of hydrogel infiltration into the rectal wall. *Pract Radiat Oncol.* May - Jun 2017; 7(3):195-202. PMID 28089528
12. Hydrogel Spacer Prospective Multicenter Randomized Controlled Pivotal Trial: Dosimetric and Clinical Effects of Perirectal Spacer Application in Men Undergoing Prostate Image Guided Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* Aug 1 2015; 92(5):971-977. PMID 26054865
13. Hypofractionated Radiation Therapy for Localized Prostate Cancer: An ASTRO, ASCO, and AUA Evidence-Based Guideline. *J Urol.* Oct, 9 2018. pii: S0022-5347(18):43963-8. PMID 30316897
14. Mariados N, Sylvester J, Shah D, et al. Hydrogel spacer prospective multicenter randomized controlled pivotal trial: Dosimetric and clinical effects of perirectal spacer application in men undergoing prostate image guided intensity modulated radiation therapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2015; 91:971-977
15. Minimally important difference for the Expanded Prostate Cancer Index Composite Short Form. *Urology.* Jan 2015; 85(1):101-5. PMID 25530370
16. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Biodegradable spacer insertion to reduce rectal toxicity during radiotherapy for prostate cancer. IPG590 2017
17. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Prostate Cancer V1.2023
18. Pinkawa M, Berneking V, Konig L, et al. Hydrogel injection reduces rectal toxicity after radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer. *Strahlenther Onkol.* 2017 Jan; 193(1):22-28. PMID 27632342
19. Pinkawa M, Berneking V, Schlenter M, Krenkel B, Eble MJ. Quality of Life After Radiation Therapy for Prostate Cancer With a Hydrogel Spacer: 5-Year Results. *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics.* 2017; 99(2):374-377.
20. Pinkawa M, Piroth MD, Holy R, et al. Quality of life after intensity-modulated radiotherapy for prostate cancer with a hydrogel spacer. Matched-pair analysis. *Strahlenther Onkol.* 2012 Oct; 188(10):917-25. PMID 22933033

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

21. Scott C. Morgan MD, MSc, FRCPC, et al. *Practical Radiation Oncology*. Volume 8, Issue 6, Pages A1-A10, e369-e392, 351-384 (November-December 2018)
22. Sheets NC, Goldin GH, Meyer AM, et al. *Intensity-modulated radiation therapy, proton therapy, or conformal radiation therapy and morbidity and disease control in localized prostate cancer*. *JAMA* 2012; 307:1611-1620.
23. Te Velde BL, Westhuyzen J, Awad N, et al. *Can a peri-rectal hydrogel spaceOAR programme for prostate cancer intensity-modulated radiotherapy be successfully implemented in a regional setting?* *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol*. 2017 Aug; 61(4):528-533. PMID 28151584
24. Te Velde BL, Westhuyzen J, Awad N, et al. *Late toxicities of prostate cancer radiotherapy with and without hydrogel SpaceAOR insertion*. *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol*. 2019 Dec; 63(6):836-841. PMID 31520465
25. Vanneste BG, Hoffmann AL, van Lin EN, et al. *Who will benefit most from hydrogel rectum spacer implantation in prostate cancer radiotherapy? A model-based approach for patient selection*. *Radiother Oncol* 2016; 121:118-123.
26. Whalley D, Hruby G, Alfieri F, et al. *SpaceOAR Hydrogel in Dose-escalated Prostate Cancer Radiotherapy: Rectal Dosimetry and Late Toxicity*. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. 2016 Oct; 28(10):e148-54. PMID 27298241
27. Morgan SC, Hoffman K, Loblaw DA, et al. *Hypofractionated Radiation Therapy for Localized Prostate Cancer: An ASTRO, ASCO, and AUA Evidence-Based Guideline*. *J Urol*. Oct 09 2018. PMID 30316897
28. *Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Medical Policy Reference Manual*. 7.02.164, *Hydrogel Spacer Use During Radiotherapy for Prostate Cancer*. August, 2022.

For Water Vapor Thermal Therapy and Water-Jet Aquablation

1. *Food and Drug Administration (2017). Aquabeam System Device Classification Under Section 513(f) (2) (De Novo)*.
2. Gilling P, Barber N, Bidair M, et al. *WATER: A Double-Blind, Randomized, Controlled Trial of Aquablation (R) vs Transurethral Resection of the Prostate in Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia*. *J Urol*. May 2018; 199(5): 1252-1261. PMID 29360529
3. Gilling PJ, Barber N, Bidair M, et al. *Randomized Controlled Trial of Aquablation versus Transurethral Resection of the Prostate in Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: One-year Outcomes*. *Urology*. Mar 2019; 125: 169-173. PMID 30552937
4. Gilling P, Barber N, Bidair M, et al. *Three-year outcomes after Aquablation therapy compared to TURP: results from a blinded randomized trial*. *Can J Urol*. Feb 2020; 27(1): 10072-10079. PMID 32065861
5. Hwang EC, Jung JH, Borofsky M, et al. *Aquablation of the prostate for the treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms in men with benign prostatic hyperplasia*. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Feb, 13 2019; 2: CD013143. PMID 30759311
6. *American Urological Association Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: Surgical Management of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia/Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms, 2018 (amended 2019)*
7. *National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2018). Transurethral water jet ablation for lower urinary tract symptoms caused by benign prostatic hyperplasia*.
8. Dixon CM, Cedano ER, Mynderse LA, Larson TR. *Transurethral convective water vapor as a treatment for lower urinary tract symptomatology due to benign prostatic hyperplasia using*

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

the Rezūm(®) system: evaluation of acute ablative capabilities in the human prostate. Res Rep Urol. 2015; 7:13-18. PMID: 25674555

9. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2018). Transurethral water vapour ablation for lower urinary tract symptoms caused by benign prostatic hyperplasia.
10. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2018). Rezum for treating lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia
11. Lerner LB, McVary, KT, Barry MJ et al: Management of lower urinary tract symptoms attributed to benign prostatic hyperplasia: AUA Guideline part II, surgical evaluation and treatment . J Urol 2021; 206: 818.
12. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Medical Policy Reference Manual. 2.01.49, Transurethral Water Vapor Thermal Therapy and Transurethral Water Jet Ablation (Aquablation) for Benign Prostatic Hypertrophy. July 2022.

Other references

1. Lerner LB, McVary, KT, Barry MJ et al: Management of lower urinary tract symptoms attributed to benign prostatic hyperplasia: AUA Guideline part II, surgical evaluation and treatment . J Urol 2021; 206: 818.
2. UpToDate Online Journal [serial online]. McVary, K: Surgical treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH)UpToDate; updated October 2021.

IX. POLICY HISTORY

[TOP](#)

MP 4.043	4/3/20 Consensus review. Policy Statement unchanged. ICD codes: N13.8; R33.8; R39.15; R39.16 added and updated. References reviewed and updated. Variations updated.
	7/16/2020 Minor Review. Policy Statement changed to include the Hydrogel Spacer. Variation Statement updated. References reviewed, updated and Hydrogel Spacer references added. Coding reviewed. New codes added: 55874; c61; C79.82; D07.5; D40.0; D49.59.
	11/18/20: Administrative update. Added code 55880. Effective 1/1/21
	12/14/2020 Administrative update. Deleted code C9747. Effective 1/1/2021.
	3/10/2021: Administrative update. Revised Code C9761. Effective 4/1/2021.
	9/8/2021 Minor Review. Addition of aquablation as INV. Update to include titanium and stainless-steel allergy. Updated coding, references, background, and rationale.
	6/24/2022 Administrative update. C9761 removed.
	12/2/2022 Minor review. Aquablation moved to NMN. HIFU now NMN, Updated to Urethral Lift criteria. Updated INV list to include PAE and temporary urethral stents. Updates and clarification to multiple other criteria statements. References, background, rationale and coding updated.

[Top](#)

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	TREATMENTS OF THE PROSTATE
POLICY NUMBER	MP 4.043

Health care benefit programs issued or administered by Capital Blue Cross and/or its subsidiaries, Capital Advantage Insurance Company[®], Capital Advantage Assurance Company[®], and Keystone Health Plan[®] Central. Independent licensees of the Blue Cross BlueShield Association. Communications issued by Capital Blue Cross in its capacity as administrator of programs and provider relations for all companies.