

MEDICAL POLICY

SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS	EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01 REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18
POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34 CATEGORY: Technology Assessment	PAGE: 1 OF: 13
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>If a product excludes coverage for a service, it is not covered, and medical policy criteria do not apply.</i>• <i>If a commercial product, including an Essential Plan product, covers a specific service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.</i>• <i>If a Medicare product covers a specific service, and there is no national or local Medicare coverage decision for the service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.</i>	

POLICY STATEMENT:

Based upon our criteria and assessment of the peer-reviewed literature:

- I. Transcatheter closure of *secundum atrial septal defects (ASD)* is considered **medically appropriate** when using a device that has been FDA approved for that purpose and used according to the labeled indications.
- II. Percutaneous closure of *patent ductus arteriosus (PDA)* is considered **medically appropriate** when using a device that has been FDA approved for that purpose and used according to the labeled indications.
- III. Transcatheter closure of *complex ventricular septal defects (VSD)* is considered **medically appropriate** when using a device that has been FDA approved for that purpose and used according to the labeled indications.
- IV. Periventricular (transmyocardial) closure of *ventricular septal defects (VSDs)* has not been medically proven to be effective and is considered **investigational**.
- V. Closure of *patent foramen ovale (PFO)* using a transcatheter approach to decrease or eliminate the occurrence of cryptogenic stroke or migraines is considered **investigational** due to insufficient evidence that this technology improves long-term health outcomes in these patients.

POLICY GUIDELINES:

- I. The Federal Employee Health Benefit Program (FEHBP/FEP) requires that procedures, devices or laboratory tests approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) may not be considered investigational and thus these procedures, devices or laboratory tests may be assessed only on the basis of their medical necessity.

DESCRIPTION:

Transcatheter closure devices are permanent implants designed to close defects between chambers of the heart or a patent ductus arteriosus. These are self-expandable, self-centering umbrella-like devices. The design and shape of the devices vary, as does their exact mode of deployment. They are implanted in the defect in a cardiac catheterization laboratory, through catheters inserted into either a vein or an artery (transcatheter or percutaneous approach). There are several types of defects, which include atrial septal defect (ASD), persistent patent ductus arteriosus (PDA), ventricular septal defect (VSD) and patent foramen ovale (PFO). Most of these defects are congenital, but can occur after a myocardial infarction or can be the result of a surgical repair of other congenital heart defects (e.g. fenestrated Fontans).

The standard for managing clinically significant defects mentioned above has been surgical closure, which except for complex ventricular septal defects is associated with very low mortality. Conventional surgical closure is done through a midline sternotomy. More recently developed approaches, such as transcatheter or percutaneous route, utilizing these closure devices, offer repair of the defect without major thoracic surgery, less post-operative pain, and decreased hospital stay without compromising outcomes in many situations.

RATIONALE:

Despite the success of standard open-heart surgery to repair cardiac defects, the risks and morbidity of open-heart surgery remain. Over the last two decades, interventional cardiac catheterization techniques have advanced to a point where percutaneous transcatheter devices can be offered as an alternative for carefully selected patients. The clinical data derived from case series investigating closure devices for FDA approval indicate that the use of these devices does

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 2 OF: 13</p>
--	--

not expose patients to unreasonable or significant risk of illness or injury and the probable health benefit derived from the use of these devices outweighs their risks.

Atrial Septal Defects (ASDs)

Both the Amplatzer® Septal Occluder's and the HELEX Septal Occluder are approved by the FDA Circulatory System Devices Committee for use in patients who have an ostium secundum ASD that needs to be closed.

The three major types of ASDs, ostium secundum, ostium primum and sinus venosus, are named for their position in the atrial septum. Ostium secundum ASDs constitute 75–80% of all atrial septal defects and are located in the central portion of the septum. Transcatheter closure is not an option for ostium primum and sinus venosus ASDs. These defects are located at the very lower and upper edges of the atrial septum, respectively.

Transcatheter closure of ostium secundum ASDs has been evaluated in several case series. The consensus in these studies was that transcatheter closure is safe and effective with complication and complete closure rates were comparable to those seen with surgical closure, and transcatheter closure offered the advantages of less morbidity and shorter hospitalizations.

Patent Ductus Arteriosus (PDA)

The Amplatzer® Duct Occluder (ADO) is the only FDA approved device (May 2003) specifically designed for non-surgical closure of a PDA. Previously, the Gianturco coil or Cook embolization coil (arterial and venous occlusive devices) was used in the closure of patent ductus arteriosus, as an off-label use. Use of the Amplatzer® Duct Occluder for closure of PDAs has been demonstrated to be safe and effective for transcatheter closure of a PDA.

Complex Ventricular Septal Defects (VSDs)

The CardioSEAL® Septal Occlusion System received FDA approval through the Premarket Approval process on December 5, 2001, for use in patients with complex (VSDs) of significant size to warrant closure and who are considered at high risk for standard surgical closure based on anatomical conditions and/or overall medical condition. The Amplatzer Muscular VSD Occluder received FDA approval through the PMA process on September 7, 2007. The device is indicated for use in patients with a complex VSD of significant size to warrant closure (large volume, left to right shunt, pulmonary hypertension and/or clinical symptoms of congestive heart failure) who are considered to be at high risk for standard transatrial or transarterial surgical closure based on anatomical conditions and/or based on overall medical condition. The approval letter lists the same high-risk anatomical factors included in the approval letter for the CardioSEAL Septal Occlusion System. A modified version of the CardioSEAL device, the STARFlex® Septal Occlusion System, received approval through the Premarket Approval process on March 5, 2009. The STARFlex device is indicated for use in patients with a complex ventricular septal defect that warrants closure, but cannot be closed with standard approaches due to the defects location.

The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) 2010 systematic review of endovascular closure of perimembranous ventricular septal defect concluded that current evidence on the safety and efficacy of endovascular closure of perimembranous ventricular septal defect (VSD) appears adequate to support the use of this procedure. Careful patient selection is important, especially in children and asymptomatic patients. Current evidence on the safety and efficacy of endovascular closure of complex perimembranous ventricular septal defects appears adequate to support the use of this procedure in carefully selected patients.

The use of a perventricular approach, also referred to as a transmyocardial approach, has been explored as an alternative to the transcatheter approach for VSD closure. This hybrid approach has been investigated in the treatment of patients for whom transcatheter is challenging, including small infants and patients with poor vascular access. There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of perventricular (transmyocardial) closure of VSD. In addition, no devices have received FDA approval for this application.

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 3 OF: 13</p>
--	--

Patent Foramen Ovale (PFO)

Although the relationship between (PFO) and paradoxical embolus has been controversial for some time, evidence is accumulating that supports a causal relationship between the two. It is estimated that patients with PFO and a history of paradoxical embolism have a 3.4% and 3.8% yearly risk of recurrent stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA), respectively. In addition, there is accumulating evidence that closure of the PFO may decrease the incidence of recurrent paradoxical emboli. To date, there have been no randomized trials to verify that closure of a PFO will result in a decreased incidence of recurrent paradoxical emboli. It is likely that PFO is not the only risk factor for recurrent paradoxical embolus.

In late October 2016, the FDA granted premarket approval (PMA) for the AMPLATZER PFO Occluder. The device is indicated for percutaneous transcatheter closure of a patent foramen ovale (PFO) to reduce the risk of recurrent ischemic stroke in patients, predominantly between the ages of 18 and 60 years, who have had a cryptogenic stroke due to a presumed paradoxical embolism, as determined by a neurologist and cardiologist following an evaluation to exclude known causes of ischemic stroke.

FDA approval was based on results of the RESPECT trial. The RESPECT trial was a prospective, multi-center, randomized (1:1), event driven, unblinded clinical study designed to evaluate whether PFO closure with the AMPLATZER PFO Occluder (the Device) is superior to standard of care medical management (MM) in reducing the risk of recurrent embolic stroke. Patients were enrolled at 69 investigational sites between August 23, 2003 and December 28, 2011. A total of 980 subjects between 18 and 60 years of age were randomized to PFO Closure (N=499) or medical management (N=481). The newest study results further extended follow-up, analyzing data from August 2003 through May 2016 for outcomes of recurrent ischemic strokes and recurrent ischemic strokes of unknown mechanism. The mean follow-up for the PFO group was 6.3 years and 5.5 years for the medical management (MM) group [total patient years: 3,141 (PFO) and 2,669 (medical management)]. Key findings showed that in the intention-to-treat cohort, there was a 45% relative risk reduction [HR 0.55 (95% CI: 0.305, 0.999) Log-rank 2-sided P-value: 0.046] in recurrent ischemic stroke for the PFO group and a 62% risk reduction [HR 0.38 (95% CI: 0.18, 0.79) Log-rank 2-sided P-value: 0.007] from recurrent ischemic stroke of unknown mechanism. An additional sensitivity analysis of all-cause stroke in patients under age 60 showed a 58% relative risk reduction [HR 0.42 (95% CI: 0.21, 0.83) Log-rank 2-sided P-value=0.010].

Although the difference in the rate of recurrent ischemic stroke was lower in the Device group vs. the MM group in the ITT population (the pre-specified primary analysis cohort), the difference did not achieve statistical significance. The safety evaluation performed during the RESPECT study showed an acceptable rate of adverse events. The risk of device- or implantation procedure-related serious adverse events (SAEs) in patients undergoing an AMPLATZER PFO Occluder implantation procedure was 4.2% in the Device group in the RESPECT trial. There were no device- or implantation procedure-related deaths. However, it should be noted that the Device group experienced a numerically higher rate of atrial fibrillation, deep venous thrombosis, and pulmonary embolism compared to the MM group.

An updated practice parameter from the American Academy of Neurology for patients with stroke and patent foramen ovale, based on a systematic review of the current literature, was published in August 2016 by Messe, et al. They found that percutaneous PFO closure with the STARFlex device possibly does not provide a benefit in preventing stroke vs medical therapy alone (risk difference [RD] 0.13%, 95% confidence interval [CI] -2.2% to 2.0%). Percutaneous PFO closure with the AMPLATZER PFO Occluder possibly decreases the risk of recurrent stroke (RD -1.68%, 95% CI -3.18% to -0.19%), possibly increases the risk of new-onset atrial fibrillation (AF) (RD 1.64%, 95% CI 0.07%-3.2%), and is highly likely to be associated with a procedural complication risk of 3.4% (95% CI 2.3%-5%). The investigators concluded that there is insufficient evidence to determine the efficacy of anticoagulation compared with antiplatelet therapy in preventing recurrent stroke (RD 2%, 95% CI -21% to 25%). Their recommendation is as follows: Clinicians should not routinely offer percutaneous PFO closure to patients with cryptogenic ischemic stroke outside of a research setting (Level R). In rare circumstances, such as recurrent strokes despite adequate medical therapy with no other mechanism identified, clinicians may offer the AMPLATZER PFO Occluder if it is available (Level C). In the absence

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 4 OF: 13</p>
--	--

of another indication for anticoagulation, clinicians may routinely offer antiplatelet medications instead of anticoagulation to patients with cryptogenic stroke and PFO (Level C).

Guidelines for the Prevention of Stroke in Patients With Stroke and Transient Ischemic Attack: A Guideline for Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association updated the recommendations in 2014. The update includes the following changes: for patients with a cryptogenic ischemic stroke or TIA and a PFO without evidence for DVT, available data do not support a benefit for PFO closure (Class III; Level of Evidence A). In the setting of PFO and DVT, PFO closure by a transcatheter device might be considered, depending on the risk of recurrent DVT (Class IIb; Level of Evidence C).

Literature investigating PFO closure as a treatment of migraine headache consists mainly of small studies that lack long-term data on effectiveness and safety. Publication of the MIST trial (Dowson, et al. 2008), a prospective, multicenter, randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled trial to investigate the effects of PFO closure for migraine, reported failure to meet either the primary or secondary end points of the study. The authors reported no difference in the primary end point of number of patients with no migraine attacks between 91 and 180 days postprocedure. Results were the same in the per-protocol analysis and in the intention-to-treat analysis (PFOs could not be found or crossed in five of 74 patients). They also saw no differences in the secondary end points, including severity of migraine, change in frequency of migraines, or total headache days. In an "exploratory analysis" that excluded two outliers (two patients in the intervention arm seemed to account for more than one-third of all headache days) the number of headache days was significantly - if modestly - reduced in the implant group (2.2 days per month vs. 1.3 days per month; p=0.027.) In the device arm, there was one case each of cardiac tamponade, pericardial effusion, and retroperitoneal bleed and two cases of atrial fibrillation. In the sham-treated patients, authors reported adverse events mostly related to study medications, including antiplatelet drugs. In an accompanying editorial, Carroll highlighted the high frequency of patients not found to have a PFO during their procedure, calling into question the quality of the echocardiographic screening process; the higher-than-expected rate of serious adverse events in the device-treated patients, raising concerns about the quality of the procedures; and the "unclear number" of residual shunts, raising a red flag about the efficacy of the device itself.

CODES: Number Description

Eligibility for reimbursement is based upon the benefits set forth in the member's subscriber contract.

CODES MAY NOT BE COVERED UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES. PLEASE READ THE POLICY AND GUIDELINES STATEMENTS CAREFULLY.

Codes may not be all inclusive as the AMA and CMS code updates may occur more frequently than policy updates.

Code Key: Experimental/Investigational = (E/I), Not medically necessary/ appropriate = (NMN).

<u>CPT:</u>	93580	Percutaneous transcatheter closure of congenital interatrial communication (ie fontan fenestration, atrial septal defect) with implant (includes right heart catheterization)
	93581	Percutaneous transcatheter closure of congenital ventricular septal defect with implant
	93582	Percutaneous transcatheter closure of patent ductus arteriosus
		<i>Copyright © 2018 American Medical Association, Chicago, IL</i>
<u>HCPCS:</u>	C1760	Closure device, vascular (implantable/insertable)
	C1817	Septal defect implant system, intracardiac
<u>ICD10:</u>	Q21.0-Q21.2	Atrial and ventricular septal defect (code range)
	Q25.0	Patent ductus arteriosus

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 5 OF: 13</p>
--	--

REFERENCES:

- *Abaci A, et al. Short and long term complications of device closure of atrial septal defect and patent foramen ovale: meta-analysis of 28,142 patients from 203 studies. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2013 Dec 1;82(7):1123-38.
- *Agarwal S, et al. Meta-analysis of transcatheter closure versus medical therapy for patent foramen ovale in prevention of recurrent neurological events after presumed paradoxical embolism. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2012 Jul;5(7):777-89.
- *Aldo A, et al. Transcatheter closure of patent ductus arteriosus: experience with a new device. Clin Cardiol 2009 Nov;32(11):E71-74.
- *Anzola GP, et al. Does transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale really "shut the door?" A prospective study with transcranial Doppler. Stroke 2004 Sep;35(9):2140-4.
- *Anzola GP, et al. Shunt-associated migraine responds favorably to atrial septal repair: a case-control study. Stroke 2006 Feb;37(2):430-4.
- Araszkiwicz A, et al. Long-term follow-up after percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale with Amplatzer PFO occlude: a single center experience. Adv Interv Cardiol 2016;12(1):49-54.
- *Azarbal B, et al. Association of interatrial shunts and migraine headaches: impact of transcatheter closure. J Am Coll Cardiol 2005 Feb 15;45(4):489-92.
- *Bacha EA, et al. Multicenter experience with periventricular device closure of muscular ventricular septal defects. Pediatr Cardiol 2005 Mar-Apr;26(2):169-75.
- *Bartakian S, et al. Device closure of secundum atrial septal defects in children < 15 kg: complication rates and indications for referral. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2012 Nov;5(11):1178-84.
- *Becker M, et al. Impact of occluder device type on success of percutaneous closure of atrial septal defects- a medium-term follow-up study. J Interv Cardiol 2009 Dec;22(6):503-10.
- *Bhindi R, et al. Acute worsening in migraine symptoms following PFO closure: a matter of fact? Int J Cardiol 2010 Oct 8;144(2):299-300.
- *Bialkowski J, et al. Closure of atrial septal defects in children: surgery versus Amplatzer device implantation. Tex Heart Inst J 2004;31(3):220-3.
- *Biasco L. et al. Impact of transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale in the evolution of migraine and role of residual shunt. J Cardiol 2014 Nov;64(5):390-4.
- *Bilkis AA, et al. The Amplatzer Duct Occluder: Experience in 209 patients. JACC 2001 Jan;37(1):258-61.
- *Bissessor N, et al. Percutaneous patent foramen ovale closure: outcomes with Premere and Amplatzer devices. Cardiovasc Revasc Med 2011 May-Jun;12(3):164-9.
- BlueCross BlueShield Association. Closure devices for patent foramen ovale and atrial septal defects. Medical Policy Reference Manual Policy #2.02.09. 2017 May 08.
- *BlueCross BlueShield Association. Transcatheter closure of patent ductus arteriosus. Medical Policy Reference Manual Policy #7.01.61. Archived 2013 Oct 10.
- *Brochu MC, et al. Improvement in exercise capacity in asymptomatic and mildly symptomatic adults after atrial septal defect percutaneous closure. Circ 2002 Oct 1;106(14):1821-6.
- *Butera G, et al. CardioSEAL/STARflex versus Amplatzer devices for percutaneous closure of small to moderate (up to 18 mm) atrial septal defects. Am Heart J 2004 Sep;148(3):507-10.

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 6 OF: 13</p>
--	--

*Butera G, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of currently available clinical evidence on migraine and patent foramen ovale percutaneous closure: much ado about nothing? Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2010 Mar 1;75(4):494-504.

*Butera G, et al. Percutaneous versus surgical closure of secundum atrial septal defects: a systematic review and meta-analysis of currently available clinical evidence. Eurointervention 2011 Jul;7(3):377-85.

*Capodanno D, et al. Updating the evidence on patent foramen ovale closure versus medical therapy in patients with cryptogenic stroke: a systematic review and comprehensive meta-analysis of 2,303 patients from three randomized trials and 2,231 patients from 11 observational studies. Eurointervention 2014 Mar 20;9(11):1342-9.

*Carroll JD, et al. Closure of patent foramen ovale versus medical therapy after cryptogenic stroke. New Engl J Med 2013;368(12):1092-100.

*Chen H, et al. Comparison of long-term clinical outcomes and costs between video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery and transcatheter amplatzer occlusion of the patent ductus arteriosus. Pediatr Cardiol 2012 Feb;33(2):316-21.

*Chen L, et al. A systematic review of closure versus medical therapy for preventing recurrent stroke in patients with patent foramen ovale and cryptogenic stroke or transient ischemic attack. J Neurol Sci 2014 Feb 15;337(1-2):3-7.

*Chessa M, et al. Transcatheter closure of congenital ventricular septal defects in adults: mid-term results and complications. Int J Cardiol 2009 Mar 20;133(1):70-3.

*Cifarelli A, et al. Long-term outcome of transcatheter patent foramen ovale closure in patients with paradoxical embolism. Int J Cardiol 2010 Jun 11;141(3):304-10.

*Darsaklis K, et al. A novel system for transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale: clinical and echocardiographic outcome comparison with other contemporary devices. Can J Cardiol 2014 Jun;30(6):639-46.

Dellborg M, et al. Randomized trials of closure of persistent foramen ovale (PFO) vs medical therapy for patients with cryptogenic stroke-effect of lost-to-follow-up and withdrawal of consent. Int J Cardiol 2016 March 15;207:308-309.

*Diveka A, et al. Cardiac perforation after device closure of atrial septal defects with the Amplatzer septal occluder. J Am Coll Cardiol 2005 Apr 19;45(8):1213-8.

*Dua JS, et al. Transcatheter closure of postsurgical residual ventricular septal defects: Early and mid-term results. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2010 Feb 1;75(2):246-55.

Ebeid MR, et al. Percutaneous closure of perimembranous ventricular defects using the second-generation Amplatzer vascular occluders. Am J Cardiol 2016 Jan 1;117(1):127-30.

*Fischer G, et al. Experience with transcatheter closure of secundum atrial septal defect using Amplatzer septal occluder: a single centre study in 236 consecutive patients. Heart 2003;89:199-204.

Food and Drug Administration. Safety and effectiveness data Amplatzer PFO Occluder. [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf12/P120021b.pdf]. accessed 1/18/18.

*Ford MA, et al. Percutaneous device closure of patent foramen ovale in patients with presumed cryptogenic stroke or transient ischemic attack: the Mayo Clinic experience. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2009 May;2(5):404-11.

*Fu YC, et al. Influence of ductal size on the results of transcatheter closure of patent ductus arteriosus with coils. Jpn Heart J 2003 May;44(3):395-401.

*Furlan AJ, et al. Study design of the CLOSURE I Trial: a prospective, multicenter, randomized, controlled trial to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the STARFlex septal closure system versus best medical therapy in patients with stroke or transient ischemic attack due to presumed paradoxical embolism through a patent foramen ovale. Stroke 2010 Dec;41(12):2872-83.

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 7 OF: 13</p>
--	--

*Furlan AJ, et al. Closure or medical therapy for cryptogenic stroke with patent foramen ovale. N Engl J Med 2012 Mar 15;366(11):991-9.

*Grohmann J, et al. Transcatheter closure of atrial septal defects in children and adolescents: single-center experience with the GORE® septal occluder. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2014 Nov 15;84(6):E51-7.

*Guerin P, et al. Transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale in patients with platypnea-orthodoxia: results of a multicentric French registry. Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol 2005 Mar-Apr;28(2):164-8.

*Guo JJ, et al. Long-term outcomes of device closure of very large secundum atrial septal defects: a comparison of transcatheter vs intraoperative approaches. Clin Cardiol 2012 Oct;36(10):626-31.

*Hakeem A, et al. safety and efficacy of device closure for patent foramen ovale for secondary prevention of neurological events: Comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Cardiovasc Revasc Med 2013 Nov-Dec;14(6):349-55.

*Holmes DR Jr, et al. Patent foramen ovale, systemic embolization and closure. Curr Probl Cardiol 2004 Feb;29(2):56-94.

*Homma S, et al. Effect of medical treatment in stroke patients with patent foramen ovale – patent foramen ovale in cryptogenic stroke study. Circ 2002;105:2625-31.

*Hongxin L, et al. New minimally invasive technique of perpulmonary device closure of patent ductus arteriosus through a parasternal approach. Ann Thorac Surg 2012 Mar;93(3):862-8.

Hongxin L, et al. Periventricular closure of a doubly committed juxtaarterial ventricular septal defect through a left parasternal approach: midterm follow-up results. J Cardiothorac Surg 2015 Nov 26;10(1):175.

Hu Y, et al. Results of comparing transthoracic device closure and surgical repair with right infra-axillary thoracotomy for membranous ventricular septal defects. Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg 2015 Apr;20(4):493-8.

*Inglessis I, et al. Long-term experience and outcomes with transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2013 Nov;6(11):1176-83.

*Jacobs JP, et al. The modern approach to patent ductus arteriosus treatment: complementary roles of video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery and interventional cardiology coil occlusion. Ann Thorac Surg 2003 Nov;76(5):1421-7; discussion 1427-8.

Jalal Z, et al. Long-term complications after transcatheter atrial septal defect closure: a review of the medical literature. Can J Cardiol 2016 Nov;32(11):1315.

*Jarral OA, et al. Does patent foramen ovale closure have an antiarrhythmic effect? A meta-analysis. Int J Cardiol 2011 Nov 17;153(1):4-9.

*Javois AJ, et al. Results of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration continued access clinical trial of the GORE HELEX septal occluder for secundum atrial septal defect. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2014 Aug;7(8):905-12.

*Kaya MG, et al. Intermediate-term effects of transcatheter secundum atrial septal defect closure on cardiac remodeling in children and adults. Pediatr Cardiol 2010 May;31(4):474-82.

Kent DM, et al. Device closure of patent foramen ovale after stroke: pooled analysis of completed randomized trials. J Am Coll Cardiol 2016 March 1;67(8):907-917.

Kernan WN, et al. Guidelines for the prevention of stroke in patients with stroke and transient ischemic attack: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. Stroke. 2014 Jul;45(7):2160-236.

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 8 OF: 13</p>
--	--

- *Khan AR, et al. Device closure of patent foramen ovale versus medical therapy in cryptogenic stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2014 Dec;6(12):1316-23.
- *Khositseth A, et al. Transcatheter Amplatzer device closure of atrial septal defect and patent foramen ovale in patients with presumed paradoxical embolism. Mayo Clin Proc 2004 Jan;79(1):35-41.
- *Kitsios GD, et al. Patent foramen ovale closure and medical treatments for secondary stroke prevention: a systematic review of observational and randomized evidence. Stroke 2012 Feb;43(2):422-31.
- *Kitsios GD, et al. Potentially large yet uncertain benefits: A meta-analysis of patent foramen ovale closure trials. Stroke 2013;44(9):2640-3.
- *Knepp MD, et al. Long-term follow-up of secundum atrial defect closure with the Amplatzer septal occluder. Congenit Heart Dis 2010 Jan;5(1):32-7.
- *Koenig P, et al Role of intracardiac echocardiographic guidance in transcatheter closure of atrial septal defects and patent foramen ovale using the Amplatzer device. J Interv Cardiol 2003 Feb;16(1):51-62.
- *Kretschmar O, et al. Interventional closure of atrial septal defects with the Solysafe Septal Occluder—preliminary results in children. Int J Cardiol 2010 Sep 3;143(3):373-7.
- *Kwong JS, et al. Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale for cryptogenic stroke: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Int J Cardiol 2013 Oct 9;168(4):4132-8.
- *Law MA, et al. Long-term follow-up of the STARFlex device for closure of secundum atrial septal defect. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2009 Feb 1;73(2):190-5.
- Li J, et al. Closure versus medical therapy for preventing recurrent stroke in patients with patent foramen ovale and a history of cryptogenic stroke or transient ischemic attack. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015 Sep 8;9:CD009938.
- *Martin F, et al. Percutaneous transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale in patients with paradoxical embolism. Circ 2002;106:1121-6.
- Mas JL, et al. Patent foramen ovale closure or anticoagulation vs. antiplatelets after stroke. N Engl J Med. 2017 Sep 14;377(11):1011-1021.
- *Mas JL, et al. Recurrent cerebrovascular events associated with patent foramen ovale, atrial septal aneurysm, or both. NEJM 2001;345:1740-6.
- *Masura J, et al. Long-term outcome of transcatheter patent ductus arteriosus closure using Amplatzer duct occluders. Am Heart J 2006 Mar;151(3):755.e7-755.e10
- *Masura J, et al. Long-term outcome of transcatheter secundum-type atrial septal defect closure using Amplatzer septal occluders. J Am Coll Cardiol 2005 Feb 15;45(4):505-7.
- Mattle HP, et al. Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale in migraine with aura, a randomized controlled trial. Eur Heart J 2016 July 7;37(26):2029-2036.
- *Meier B, et al. Contemporary management of patent foramen ovale. Circ 2003;107:5-9.
- *Meier B, et al. Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale in cryptogenic embolism. New Eng J Med 2013;368(12):1083-91.
- Merkler AE, et al. Safety outcomes after percutaneous transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale. Stroke 2017 Nov;48(11):3073-3077.
- *Messe SR, et al. Practice parameter: recurrent stroke with patent foramen ovale and atrial septal aneurysm: report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology 2004 Apr 13;62(7):1042-50.

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 9 OF: 13</p>
--	--

Messe SR, et al. Practice advisory: recurrent stroke with patent foramen ovale (update of practice parameter): Report of the Guideline development, Dissemination, and implementation Subcommittee of the American Academy of neurology. *Neurology* 2016 Aug 23;87(8):815-821.

Meyer MR, et al. Efficacy and safety of transcatheter closure in adults with large or small atrial septal defects. *Springerplus* 2016 Oct 21;5(1):1841.

Milev I, et al . Transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale: a single center experience. *Open Access Maced J Med Sci* 2016 Dec 15;4(4):613-618.

*Nagaraja V, et al. Is transcatheter closure better than medical therapy for cryptogenic stroke with patent foramen ovale? A meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Heart Lung Circ* 2013 Nov;22(11):903-9.

*National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). Endovascular closure of atrial septal defect. Interventional Procedure Consultation Document. London, UK: NICE; 2004 Jun [http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/IPG96] accessed 1/18/18.

*National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale for the prevention of cerebral embolic stroke. London, UK. NICE: 2013 Dec [https://www.nice.org.uk/Guidance/ipg472] accessed 1/18/18.

*National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Transcatheter endovascular closure of perimembranous ventricular septal defect. London, UK. NICE: 2010 Mar [https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg336] accessed 1/18/18.

*National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale for recurrent migraine. London, UK. NICE: 2010 Dec [https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg370] accessed 1/18/18.

Neuser J, et al. Mid-term results of interventional closure of patent foramen ovale with the Occlutech Figulla® Flex II Occluder. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord* 2016 Nov 10;16(1):217.

*Ntaios G, et al. PFO closure vs medical therapy in cryptogenic stroke or transient ischemic attack: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Cardiol* 2013 Oct 30;169(2):101-5.

*O’Gara PT, et al. Percutaneous device closure of patent foramen ovale for secondary stroke prevention: a call for completion of randomized clinical trials: a science advisory from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association and the American College of Cardiology Foundation. *Circulation* 2009 May 26;119(20):2743-2747.

Omelchenko A, et al. Perventricular device closure of ventricular septal defects: results in patients less than 1 year of age. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg* 2016 Jan;22(1):53-56.

Ooi YK, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical closure of atrial septal defects in children. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2016 Jan 11;9(1):79-86.

*Paciaroni M, et al. Risk of recurrent cerebrovascular events in patients with cryptogenic stroke or transient ischemic attack and patent foramen ovale: the FORI (Foramen Ovale Registro Italiano) study. *Cerebrovasc Dis* 2011;31(2):109-16.

*Pandit A, et al. Amplatzer PFO occluder device may prevent recurrent stroke in patients with patent foramen ovale and cryptogenic stroke: a meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Heart Lung Circ* 2014 Apr;23(4):303-8.

*Papa M, et al. Usefulness of transcatheter patent foramen ovale closure in migraineurs with moderate to large right-to-left shunt and instrumental evidence of cerebrovascular damage. *Am J Cardiol* 2009 Aug 1;104(3):434-9.

*Pass RH, et al. Multicenter USA Amplatzer patent ductus arteriosus occlusion device trial: initial and one-year results. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2004 Aug 4;44(3):513-9.

Pezzini A, et al. Propensity score-based analysis of percutaneous closure versus medical therapy in patients with cryptogenic stroke and patent foramen ovale: the IPSYS Registry (Italian Project on Stroke in Young Adults). *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2016 Sept;9(9).

SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34 CATEGORY: Technology Assessment	EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01 REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18 PAGE: 10 OF: 13
---	--

- *Pickett CC, et al. percutaneous closure versus medical therapy alone for cryptogenic stroke patients with a patent foramen ovale: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Tex Heart Inst J 2014 Aug 1;41(4):357-67.
- *Pineda AM, et al. A meta-analysis of transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale versus medical therapy for prevention of recurrent thromboembolic events in patients with cryptogenic cerebrovascular events. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2013 Nov 15;82(6):968-75.
- Price MJ. Transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale: devices and technique. Interv Cardiol Clin 2017 Oct;6(4):555-567.
- *Rastogi N, et al. Factors related to successful transcatheter closure of atrial septal defects using the Amplatzer septal occluder. Ped Cardiol 2009 Oct;30(7):888-92.
- *Reisman M, et al. Migraine headache relief after transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale. J Am Coll Cardiol 2005 Feb 15;45(4):493-5.
- *Rengifo-Moreno P, et al. Patent foramen ovale transcatheter closure vs. medical therapy on recurrent vascular events: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Eur Heart J 2013 Nov;34(43):3342-3352.
- *Rhodes JF Jr, et al. Combined prospective United States clinical study data for the GORE® HELEX® septal occlude device. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2014 May 1;83(6):944-52.
- *Rigatelli G, et al. Transcatheter patent foramen ovale closure is effective in reducing migraine independently from specific interatrial septum anatomy and closure devices design. Cardiovasc Revasc Med 2010 Jan-Mar;11(1):29-33.
- *Rigatelli G, et al. Five-year follow-up of intracardiac echocardiography-assisted transcatheter closure of complex ostium secundum atrial septal defect. Congenit Heart Dis 2012 Mar-Apr;7(2):103-10.
- Rigatelli G, et al. Long-term outcomes and complications of intracardiac echocardiography-assisted patent foramen ovale closure in 1,000 consecutive patients. J Interv Cardiol 2016 Oct;29(5):530-538.
- Rigatelli G, et al. Clinically apparent long-term electric disturbances in the acute and very long-term of patent foramen ovale device-based closure. Cardiovasc Revasc Med 2017 Mar;18(2):118-122.
- *Ryan WH, et al. Safety and efficacy of minimally invasive atrial septal defect closure. Ann Thorac Surg 2003 May;75(5):1532-4.
- *Sacco RL, et al. Guidelines for prevention of stroke in patients with ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack: a statement for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association Council on Stroke: co-sponsored by the Council on Cardiovascular Radiology and Intervention: the American Academy of Neurology affirms the value of this guideline. Stroke 2006 Feb;37(2):577-617.
- *Saliba Z, et al. The Amplatzer duct occluder II: a new device for percutaneous ductus arteriosus closure. J Interv Cardiol 2009 Dec;22(6):446-502.
- Saver JL, et al. Long-term outcomes of patent foramen ovale closure or medical therapy after stroke. N Engl J Med. 2017 Sep 14;377(11):1022-1032.
- Scacciarella P, et al. Percutaneous closure of atrial septal defects in adults: very long-term clinical outcome and effects on aortic and mitral valve function. J Invasive Cardiol 2015 Jan;27(1):65-69.
- *Smith B, et al. UK multicenter experience using the Gore septal occluder (GSO™) for atrial septal defect closure in children and adults. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2014 Mar 1;83(4):581-6.
- *Snijder RJ, et al. Percutaneous closure of secundum type atrial septal defects: More than 5-year follow-up. World J Cardiol 2015 Mar 26;7(3):150-6.

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 11 OF: 13</p>
--	---

Snijder RJ, et al. Patent foramen ovale with atrial septal aneurysm is strongly associated with migraine with aura: a large observational study. J Am Heart Assoc 2016 Dec 1;5(12):

*Spies C, et al. Transcatheter closure of patent foramen ovale in patients with migraine headache. J Interv Cardiol 2006 Dec;19(6):552-7.

Søndergaard L, et al. Patent foramen ovale closure or antiplatelet therapy for cryptogenic stroke. N Engl J Med. 2017 Sep 14;377(11):1033-1042.

*Staubach S, et al. New onset atrial fibrillation after patent foramen ovale closure. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2009 Nov 15;74(6):889-95.

*Suchon E, et al. Transcatheter closure as an alternative and equivalent method to the surgical treatment of atrial septal defect in adults: comparison of early and late results. Med Sci Monit 2009 Dec;15(12):CR612-7.

Tariq N, et al. Patent foramen ovale and migraine: closing the debate—a review. Headache 2016 March;56(3):462-478.

*Thomson JD, et al. Patent foramen ovale closure with the Gore septal occlude: initial UK experience. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2014 Feb 15;83(3):467-73.

*Trabattoni D, et al. Sustained long-term benefit of patent foramen ovale closure on migraine. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2011 Mar 1;77(4):570-4.

*Udell JA, et al. Patent foramen ovale closure vs medical therapy for stroke prevention: meta-analysis of randomized trials and review of heterogeneity in meta-analyses. Can J Cardiol 2014 Oct;30(10):1216-24.

U. S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Information for physicians and patients on the withdrawal of two humanitarian device exemptions (HDEs) for patent foramen ovale (PFO) occluders. [<https://www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/DeviceRegulationandGuidance/HowtoMarketYourDevice/PremarketSubmissions/HumanitarianDeviceExemption/ucm135747.htm>] accessed 1/18/18.

*U. S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Center for Devices and Radiological Health Information on Premarket Approval Applications Gore HELEX® Septal Occluder - P050006 August 11, 2006 HELEX [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf5/p050006b.pdf] accessed 1/18/18.

*Van den Branden BJ, et al. Patent foramen ovale closure using a bioabsorbable closure device: safety and efficacy at 6-month follow-up. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2010 Sep;3(9):968-73.

*Van den Branden BJ, et al. The BioSTAR® device versus CardioSEAL® device in patent foramen ovale closure: comparison of mid-term efficacy and safety. Eurointervention 2010 Sep;6(4):498-504.

*Van Den Branden BJ, et al. percutaneous atrial shunt closure using novel Occlutech Figulla device: 6-month efficacy and safety. J Interv Cardiol 2011 Jun;24(3):264-70.

Van de Bruaene A, et al. percutaneous closure of inter-atrial communications (atrial septal defect and patent foramen ovale): single centre experience and mid-term follow-up. Acta Cardiol 2015 Apr;70(2):133-40.

*Vecht JA, et al. Atrial septal defect closure is associated with a reduced prevalence of atrial tachyarrhythmia in the short to medium term: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Heart 2010 Nov;96(22):1789-97.

*Vijarnsorn C, et al. Transcatheter closure of atrial septal defects in children, middle-aged adults, and older adults: failure rates, early complications; and balloon sizing effects. Cardiol Res Pract 2012;2012:584236.

*Von Bardleben RS, et al. Long term follow-up after percutaneous closure of PFO in 357 patients in paradoxical embolism: Difference in occlusion systems and influence of atrial septum aneurysm. Int J Cardiol 2009 May 1;134(1):33-41.

<p>SUBJECT: TRANSCATHETER CLOSURE DEVICES FOR CARDIAC DEFECTS AND PATENT DUCTUS ARTERIOSUS</p> <p>POLICY NUMBER: 7.01.34</p> <p>CATEGORY: Technology Assessment</p>	<p>EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/18/01</p> <p>REVISED DATE: 01/17/02, 06/20/02, 05/21/03, 10/15/03, 08/19/04, 06/16/05, 04/20/06, 04/19/07, 04/17/08, 03/19/09, 02/18/10, 02/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 02/19/15, 02/18/16, 04/20/17, 02/15/18</p> <p>PAGE: 12 OF: 13</p>
--	---

- *Wahl A, et al. Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale for migraine headaches refractory to medical treatment. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2009 Jul 1;74(1):124-9.
- *Wahl A, et al. Long-term propensity score-matched comparison of percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale with medical treatment after paradoxical embolism. Circulation 2012 Feb 14;125(6):803-12.
- *Wallenborn J, et al. Recurrent events after percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2013 Oct 1;84(4):541-6.
- *Walters DL, et al. Percutaneous ASD closure in a large Australian series: short- and long-term outcomes. Heart Lung Circ 2012 Sep;21(9):572-5.
- *Wang JK, et al. Transcatheter closure of moderate-to-large patent ductus arteriosus in infants using Amplatzer duct occluder. Circ J 2010 Feb;74(2):361-4.
- Wang S, et al. Periventricular closure of perimembranous ventricular septal defects using the concentric occlude device. Pediatr Cardiol 2014 Apr;35(4):580-6.
- *Warnes CA, et al. ACC/AHA 2008 Guidelines for the Management of Adults with Congenital Heart Disease: Executive Summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (writing committee to develop guidelines for the management of adults with congenital heart disease). Circulation 2008 Dec 2;118(23):2395-451.
- *Windecker S, et al. Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale in patients with paradoxical embolism. Circ 2000 Feb 29;893-8.
- Wolfrum M, et al. Stroke prevention by percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Heart 2014 Mar;100(5):389-95.
- Xing YU, et al. Effectiveness and safety of transcatheter patent foramen ovale closure for migraine (EASTFORM) trial. Sci Rep 2016 Dec 14;6:39081.
- *Zhu D, et al. Periventricular device closure of residual muscular ventricular septal defects after repair of complex congenital heart defects in pediatric patients. Tex Heart Inst J 2013;40(5):534-40.
- *Zuo J, et al. Results of transcatheter closure of perimembranous ventricular septal defect. Am J Cardiol 2010 Oct 1;106(7):1034-7.

*Key article

KEY WORDS:

Atrial septal defect, Congenital Septal defect, Patent Foramen Ovale, Patent Ductus Arteriosus, Ventricular Septal Defect.

CMS COVERAGE FOR MEDICARE PRODUCT MEMBERS

Based on our review, transcatheter closure devices for cardiac defects and patent ductus arteriosus are not addressed in National or Regional Medicare coverage determinations or policies.