

# MEDICAL POLICY

MEDICAL POLICY DETAILS	
Medical Policy Title	KERATOPROSTHESIS
Policy Number	9.01.15
Category	Technology Assessment
Effective Date	04/22/10
Revised Date	04/21/11, 04/19/12, 04/18/13, 04/17/14, 04/16/15, 04/21/16, 4/20/17, 04/19/18, 04/18/19
Product Disclaimer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a product excludes coverage for a service, it is not covered, and medical policy criteria do not apply.</li> <li>• If a commercial product (including an Essential Plan product) or a Medicaid product covers a specific service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

## POLICY STATEMENT

- I. Based upon our criteria and assessment of peer-reviewed literature, use of the Boston keratoprosthesis (type I or II) is considered **medically appropriate** for the treatment of corneal blindness for the following indications:
  - A. Severely opaque and vascularized cornea; AND either
  - B. One or more prior failed corneal transplants; OR
  - C. A prior failed corneal transplant is not required for an infant one year of age or less, OR
  - D. An ocular condition with a known low success rate for a primary corneal transplant (e.g., Stevens-Johnson syndrome, ocular cicatricial pemphigoid, autoimmune conditions with rare ocular involvement, ocular chemical burns).
- II. Based upon our criteria and assessment of peer-reviewed literature, all other types of keratoprotheses (e.g. AlphaCor, osteo-odonto-keratoprosthesis) have not been proven to be medically effective and are considered **investigational**.

*Refer to Corporate Medical Policy #11.01.03 regarding Experimental and Investigational Services.*

## POLICY GUIDELINES

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

The cornea, a clear, dome-shaped membrane that covers the front of the eye, is a key refractive element of the eye. Corneal tissue is arranged in a number of layers: the epithelium (outermost layer); Bowman's layer; the stroma, which comprises approximately 90% of the cornea; Descemet's membrane; and the endothelium. For optimal vision, all layers of the cornea must be of normal shape and curvature and free of any cloudy or opaque areas. While many corneal disorders can be managed medically, there are certain conditions such as severe corneal dystrophies and degenerations that require surgical intervention. Scarring from infection or trauma may also cause corneal changes that may require surgery. The established surgical treatment for severe corneal disease is penetrating keratoplasty (PK), which involves making a large central opening through the cornea and then filling the opening with full-thickness donor cornea. In certain conditions such as Stevens-Johnson syndrome, cicatricial pemphigoid, chemical injury, or prior failed corneal transplant, survival of transplanted cornea is poor.

A keratoprosthesis (KPro) is an artificial cornea that is intended to restore vision to patients with severe bilateral corneal disease (such as prior failed corneal transplants, chemical injuries, or certain immunological conditions) for whom a corneal transplant is not an option. Keratoprotheses are made of clear plastic with excellent tissue tolerance and optical properties. They vary in design, size and even the implantation techniques may differ across different treatment centers. In

**Medical Policy: KERATOPROSTHESIS**

**Policy Number: 9.01.15**

**Page: 2 of 6**

general, keratoprotheses consist of a transparent cylinder-shaped optical portion and a haptical portion. The optical cylinder is inserted into a central circular opening of the opacified cornea, focusing images on a functioning retina. The haptical section is fixed to and buried under neighboring tissue. The different designs of keratoprotheses vary primarily in the haptical portion of the devices. Although many keratoprotheses have been developed, the most commonly used include the Boston keratoprosthesis (Dohlman Doane Keratoprosthesis), Osteo-Odonto-Keratoprosthesis (OOKP) and AlphaCor, previously known as the Chirila keratoprosthesis.

This is considered to be a high risk procedure associated with numerous complications and probable need for additional surgery. Therefore, the likelihood of regaining vision and the patient’s visual acuity in the contralateral eye should be taken into account when considering the appropriateness of this procedure. Treatment should be restricted to centers experienced in treating this condition and staffed by surgeons adequately trained in techniques addressing implantation of this device.

**RATIONALE**

Permanent keratoprotheses that have received 510(k) marketing approval by the FDA include the Boston Keratoprosthesis (Boston Kpro)/Dohlman-Doane keratoprosthesis that was approved in 1992; the AlphaCOR™ (formerly Chirila KPro) that was approved in 2002 and the Oculaid® by Ophtec B.V. USA, Inc. that was approved in 2004. The Oculaid KPro is supplied by special request only.

The KPro is intended for the relatively small number of patients who have lost vision and for whom a corneal transplant is not expected to result in satisfactory outcomes. Complications such as implant extrusion, formation of a retroprosthesis membrane requiring additional surgery, worsening of glaucoma, chronic inflammation and bacterial endophthalmitis can occur. However, patients with severe corneal damage have few treatment options to prevent blindness.

Since the implantation of a keratoprosthesis is considered to be a salvage procedure with no acceptable alternative treatment, comparative studies are lacking. The literature mainly consists of case series with small patient sample populations with short to mid-term follow-up. The Boston KPro is the most widely studied and utilized in the United States. With the Boston KPro short to mid-term visual outcomes demonstrate an improvement in a substantial percentage of patients. Longer follow-up is still needed to further evaluate the effect of this technology on health outcomes. Given the available evidence and the absence of alternative treatment options, use of the Boston KPro is considered appropriate,

While studies on the use of a keratoprosthesis in the pediatric population are extremely limited, corneal transplantation in this aged population has an even higher rate of corneal graft rejection. Coupled with an infant’s need to have a clear visual pathway to enable the brain to learn and process images, use of a keratoprosthesis as a primary procedure is reasonable.

**CODES**

- *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.*

**CPT Codes**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>
65770	Keratoprosthesis

*Copyright © 2019 American Medical Association, Chicago, IL*

**HCPCS Codes**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>
C1818	Integrated keratoprosthesis
L8609	Artificial cornea

*Proprietary Information of Univera Healthcare*

**Medical Policy: KERATOPROSTHESIS****Policy Number: 9.01.15****Page: 3 of 6****ICD10 Codes**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>
H17.10-H17.13	Central corneal opacity (code range)
H54.0-H54.8	Blindness and low vision (code range)
L51.1	Stevens-Johnson syndrome
T26.60xA-T26.62xA	Corrosion of cornea and conjunctival sac, eye, initial encounter (code range)
T85.318A	Breakdown (mechanical) of other ocular prosthetic devices, implants and grafts, initial encounter
T85.328A	Displacement of other ocular prosthetic devices, implants and grafts, initial encounter
T85.398A	Other mechanical complication of other ocular prosthetic devices, implants and grafts, initial encounter
T86.840-T86.841	Corneal transplant rejection or rejection code range

**REFERENCES**

Ahmad S, et al. Predictors of visual outcomes following Boston Type 1 keratoprosthesis implantation. Am J Ophthalmology 2014 Dec 30 [Epub ahead of print].

Ahmad S, et al. Boston type I keratoprosthesis versus repeat donor keratoplasty for corneal graft failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ophthalmology 2016 Jan;123(1):165-77.

\*Alio JL, et al. Five year follow-up of biocolonisable microporous fluorocarbon haptic (BIOKOP) keratoprosthesis implantation in patients with high risk of corneal graft failure. Br J Ophthalmol 2004;88:1585-9.

Alio JL, et al. A new epidescemetic keratoprosthesis: pilot investigation and proof of concept of a new alternative solution for corneal blindness. Br J Ophthalmol 2015 Nov;99(11):1483-7.

\*Akpek EK, et al. Outcomes of Boston Keratoprosthesis in aniridia: a retrospective multicenter study. Am J Ophthalmol 2007 Aug;144(2):227-31.

Akpek EK, et al. Artificial corneas versus donor corneas for repeat corneal transplants. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2014 Nov 5;11:CD009561.

\*Aldave AJ, et al. The Boston type I keratoprosthesis: improving outcomes and expanding indications. Ophthalmology 2009 Apr;116(4):640-51.

Aldave AJ, et al. International results with the Boston type I keratoprosthesis. Ophthalmology 2012 Aug;119(8):1530-8.

\*Aquavella JV, et al. Keratoprosthesis: the Dolhman-Doane device. Am J Ophthalmol 2005 Dec;140(6):1032-8.

\*Aquavella JV, et al. Pediatric keratoprosthesis. Ophthalmology 2007 May;114(5):989-94.

\*Ament JD, et al. Cost effectiveness of the Boston Keratoprosthesis. Am J Ophthalmol 2010 Feb;149(2):221-8.

Aravena C, et al. Long-term outcomes of the Boston Type 1 keratoprosthesis in the management of corneal limbal stem cell deficiency. Cornea 2016 Sept;35(9):1156-1164.

Avadhanam VS, et al. Keratoprostheses for corneal blindness: a review of contemporary devices. Clin Ophthalmol 2015 Apr 16;9:697-720.

Avadhanam VS, et al. A brief review of Boston type-1 and osteo-odonto keratoprostheses. Br J Ophthalmol 2015 Jul;99(7):878-87.

\*Bleckmann H, et al. preliminary results after implantation of four AlphaCor artificial corneas. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2006 Apr;244(4):502-6.

BlueCross BlueShield Association. Keratoprosthesis. Medical Policy Reference Manual Policy #9.03.01. 2018 Mar 8.

**Medical Policy: KERATOPROSTHESIS**

**Policy Number: 9.01.15**

**Page: 4 of 6**

\*Bradley JC, et al. Boston type 1 keratoprosthesis: the University of California Davis experience. Cornea 2009 Apr;28(3):321-7.

Bouhout S, et al. Corneal melt after Boston keratoprosthesis: clinical presentation, management, outcomes, and risk factor analysis. Occul Immunol Inflamm 2017 Jan 12:1-7.

\*Cade F, et al. Glaucoma in eyes with severe chemical burn, before and after keratoprosthesis. Cornea 2011 Dec;30(12):1322-7.

Chan CC, et al. Incidence, risk factors, and surgical management of Boston Type 1 keratoprosthesis corneal melts, leaks, and extrusions. Cornea 2016 Aug;35(8):1049-1056.

Chang HY, et al. Primary implantation of type 1 Boston keratoprosthesis in nonautoimmune corneal diseases. Cornea 2015 Mar;34(3):264-70.

\*Chew HF, et al. Boston keratoprosthesis outcomes and complications. Cornea 2009 Oct;28(9):989-96.

\*Colby KA, et al. Expanding indications for the Boston keratoprosthesis. Curr Opin Ophthalmol 2011 Jul;22(4):267-73.

Cortina MS, et al. Vision-related quality-of-life assessment using NEI VFQ-25 in patients after Boston keratoprosthesis implantation. Cornea 2015 Feb;34(2):160-4.

\*Crawford GJ, et al. The Chirila keratoprosthesis: phase I human clinical trial. Ophthalmology 2002 May;109(5):883-9.

\*De La Paz MF, et al. Impact of clinical factors on the long-term functional and anatomic outcomes of osteo-odonto-keratoprosthesis and tibial bone keratoprosthesis. Am J Ophthalmol 2011 May;151(5):829-39.

\*Dunlap K, et al. Short-term visual outcomes of Boston type 1 keratoprosthesis implantation. Ophthalmology 2010 Apr;117(4):687-92.

\*Eguchi H, et al. Cataract surgery with the AlphaCor artificial cornea. J Cataract Refract Surg 2004 Jul;30(7):1486-91.

Fadous R, et al. The Boston keratoprosthesis type I as primary penetrating corneal procedure. Br J Ophthalmology 2015 Dec;99(12):1664-8.

\*Falcinelli G, et al. Modified osteo-odonto-keratoprosthesis for treatment of corneal blindness: long-term anatomical and functional outcomes in 181 cases. Arch Ophthalmol 2005 Oct;123(10):1319-29.

Fry M, et al. Long-term outcomes of the Boston type I keratoprosthesis in eyes with previous herpes simplex keratitis. Br J Ophthalmol 2018 Jan;102(1):48-53.

Goins KM, et al. Boston Type 1 keratoprosthesis: visual outcomes, device retention, and complications. Cornea 2016 Sept;35(9):1165-1174.

\*Greiner MA, et al. Longer-term vision outcomes and complications with the Boston type I keratoprosthesis at the University of California, Davis. Ophthalmol 2011 Aug;118(8):1543-50.

\*Harissi-Dagher M, et al. The Boston keratoprosthesis in severe ocular trauma. Can J Ophthalmol 2008 Apr;43(2):165-9.

Hassanaly SI, et al. Outcomes following Boston type 1 keratoprosthesis implantation in aniridia patients at the University of Montreal. Am J Ophthalmol 2014 Aug;158(2):270-6.

\*Hicks CR, et al. AlphaCor cases: comparative outcomes. Cornea 2003 Oct;22(7):583-90.

\*Hicks CR, et al. Corneal replacement using a synthetic hydrogel cornea, AlphaCor: device, preliminary outcomes and complications. Eye 2003 Apr;17(3):385-92.

\*Holak SA, et al. AlphaCor keratoprosthesis: postoperative development of six patients. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2009 Apr;247(4):535-9.

Homayounfar G, et al. Boston keratoprosthesis type I in the elderly. Br J Ophthalmol 2017 April;101(4):514-518.

\*Iyer G, et al. Modified osteo-odonto keratoprosthesis- the Indian experience- results of the first 50 cases. Cornea 2010 Jul;29(7):771-6.

**Medical Policy: KERATOPROSTHESIS**

**Policy Number: 9.01.15**

**Page: 5 of 6**

- \*Kamrar R, et al. Glaucoma associated with Boston type I keratoprosthesis. Cornea 2010 Feb;31(2):134-9.
- \*Khan BF, et al. The Boston keratoprosthesis in herpetic keratitis. Arch Ophthalmol 2007 Jun;125(6):745-9.
- Lee WB, et al. Boston keratoprosthesis: outcomes and complications: a report by the American Academy of Ophthalmology. Ophthalmology 2015 Jul;122(7):1504-11.
- Lee R, et al. Long-term outcomes and complications of Boston keratoprosthesis type II implantation. Ophthalmology 2017 Jan;124(1):27-35.
- Lenis TL, et al. Safety of concurrent Boston Type 1 keratoprosthesis and glaucoma drainage device implantation. Ophthalmology 2017 Jan;124(1):12-19.
- \*Li JY, et al. Long-term complications associated with glaucoma drainage devices and Boston keratoprosthesis. Am J Ophthalmol 2011 Aug;152(2):209-18.
- Lin M, et al. Vision retention in early versus delayed glaucoma surgical intervention in patients with Boston Keratoprosthesis type I. PLoS One 2017 Aug 4;12(8):e0182190.
- \*Ma JJ, et al. Repeat penetrating keratoplasty versus the Boston keratoprosthesis in graft failure. Int Ophthalmol Clin 2005 Fall;45(4):49-59.
- \*Michael R, et al. Long-term functional and anatomical results of osteo-and osteo-odonto-keratoprosthesis. Graefes Arch Exp Ophthalmol 2008 Aug;246(8):1133-7.
- Muzychuk AK, et al. No light perception outcomes following Boston keratoprosthesis type I surgery. Am J Ophthalmol 2017 Sept;181:46-54.
- Noel CW, et al. Type I Boston keratoprosthesis: outcomes at two Canadian centres. Can J Ophthalmol 2016 April;51(2):76-82.
- Patel AP, et al. Boston type I keratoprosthesis: the New York Eye and Ear experience. Eye 2012 Mar;26(3):418-25.
- \*Pineles SL, et al. Binocular visual function in patients with Boston type 1 keratoprosthesis. Cornea 2010 Dec;29(12):1397-400.
- \*Robert MC, et al. Boston type I keratoprosthesis: the CHUM experience. Can J Ophthalmol 2011 Apr;46(2):164-8.
- Rudinsky CJ, et al. Visual acuity outcomes of the Boston keratoprosthesis type I: multicenter study results. Am J Ophthalmol 2016 Feb;162:89-98.
- Salvador-Culla B, et al. Boston keratoprosthesis Type I in chemical burns. Cornea 2016 June;35(6):911-916.
- \*Sayegh RR, et al. The Boston keratoprosthesis in Stevens-Johnson syndrome. Am J Ophthalmol 2008 Mar;145(3):438-44.
- Srikumaran D, et al. Long-term outcomes of Boston type 1 keratoprosthesis implantation: a retrospective multicenter cohort. Ophthalmology 2014 Nov;121(11):2159-64.
- \*Tay AB, et al. Osteo-odonto-keratoprosthesis surgery: a combined ocular-oral procedure for ocular blindness. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2007 Sep;36(9):807-13.
- Vaillancourt L, et al. Outcomes of bilateral sequential implantation of the Boston keratoprosthesis type I. Can J Ophthalmol 2017 Feb;52(1):80-84.
- Vasquez-Perez A, et al. Osteo-Odonto-Keratoprosthesis in Severe Thermal and Chemical Injuries. Cornea 2018;37:993–999.
- Wang JC, et al. Outcomes of Boston keratoprosthesis type 1 reimplantation: multicenter study results. Can J Ophthalmol 2018 Jun; 53(3): 284-290.
- \*Key Article

**Medical Policy: KERATOPROSTHESIS**

**Policy Number: 9.01.15**

**Page: 6 of 6**

**KEY WORDS**

AlphaCor, BIOKOP, Boston type I, Boston type II, Dolhman-Doane, keratoprosthesis, KPro, osteo-odonto, OOKP

**CMS COVERAGE FOR MEDICARE PRODUCT MEMBERS**

Based upon our review, the implantation of a keratoprosthesis is not addressed in National or Regional CMS coverage determinations or policies.