

MEDICAL POLICY



MEDICAL POLICY DETAILS	
Medical Policy Title	PROTON BEAM RADIATION THERAPY
Policy Number	6.01.11
Category	Technology Assessment
Effective Date	10/18/01
Revised Date	07/18/02, 07/17/03, 06/17/04, 05/18/05, 03/16/06, 01/18/07, 12/20/07, 01/15/09, 03/18/10, 03/17/11, 02/16/12, 02/21/13, 02/20/14, 06/19/14, 02/19/15, 04/21/16, 06/15/17, 04/19/18, 05/16/19
Product Disclaimer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a product excludes coverage for a service, it is not covered, and medical policy criteria do not apply. • If a commercial product (including an Essential Plan product) or a Medicaid product covers a specific service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit. • 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.

POLICY STATEMENT

- I. Based upon our criteria and review of the peer-reviewed literature charged particle irradiation with proton ion beams has been medically proven to be effective and therefore, a **medically appropriate** treatment for the following indications:
 - A. Primary therapy for *melanoma of the uveal tract* (iris, choroid, or ciliary body), with no evidence of metastasis or extrascleral extension, and with tumors up to 24 mm in largest diameter and 14 mm in height; or
 - B. Post-operative therapy (with or without conventional high-energy x-rays) in patients who have undergone biopsy or partial resection of the *chordoma* or *low-grade (I or II) chondrosarcoma* of the basisphenoid region (*skull-base chordoma* or *chondrosarcoma*) or *cervical spine*. Patients eligible for this treatment have residual localized tumor without evidence of metastasis; or
 - C. Localized unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma, when considered preferential to Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy (SBRT) or radiofrequency ablation; or
- II. Based on our criteria and review of the peer reviewed literature charged particle irradiation with proton ion beams is considered **not medically necessary** for the treatment of *prostate cancer*.
- III. Based upon our criteria and review of the peer reviewed literature charged particle irradiation with proton ion beams has not been medically proven to be effective and is therefore considered **not medically necessary** for all other indications, including but not limited to non-small-cell lung cancer, and esophageal cancer.

Refer to Corporate Medical Policy #6.01.12 regarding Stereotactic Radiosurgery and Stereotactic Radiotherapy.

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

Refer to Corporate Medical Policy #11.01.10 regarding Clinical Trials.

Refer to Corporate Medical Policy #11.01.13 regarding Out of Area/Out of Network Services.

POLICY GUIDELINES

This technology is limited to specialized centers. There are twenty-five operating in the USA and an additional eleven being planned or under construction (please refer to the National Association of Proton Centers (<http://proton-therapy.org/find-a-facility/>)).

The Federal Employees 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.

Medical Policy: PROTON BEAM RADIATION THERAPY

Policy Number: 6.01.11

Page: 2 of 6

DESCRIPTION

Charged particle beams consisting of protons or helium ions are an alternative to conventional x-rays, and other types of photon irradiation in the treatment of malignant disease. When positively charged atomic particles called protons travel through tissue, they have a limited range, depending on the power of the proton beam. As they reach the end of their range, protons release a burst of energy within a very limited area. Controlling the power of the beam allows delivery of radiation to the tumor, but not to tissues lying behind the tumor, thereby minimizing radiation exposure to surrounding normal tissue. Proton beam radiation requires specialized equipment in the form of accelerators (cyclotrons, synchrotrons, synchrocyclotrons, or linear accelerators) that can generate a beam of particles (protons or helium ions). They also require accurate localization of the malignancy by using tomographic scanning (with x-ray and/or magnetic resonance imaging), and precise and reproducible positioning (relative to the beam) and immobilization of the patient during both tomographic scanning and treatment.

Proton beam radiation is a form of radiation therapy that can be used for either stereotactic radiosurgery or conventional fractionated radiation therapy. It can also be used without stereotactic guidance.

Radiation therapy with charged-particle beams such as protons proposes clinical gains when:

- I. Conventional treatment modalities do not provide adequate local tumor control;
- II. The likelihood of metastasis prior to radiotherapy is small to nonexistent;
- III. There is evidence that local tumor response depends on the dose of radiation delivered; or
- IV. Delivery of an adequate radiation dose to the tumor is limited by the proximity of vital radiosensitive tissues or structures.

RATIONALE

Radiotherapy is a procedure and therefore is not subject to FDA regulations. However, the accelerators and other equipment used to generate and deliver charged particle radiation are devices, and thus do require FDA approval. The equipment used to deliver proton beam therapy is approved as a Class II, 510(k) device by the FDA.

Uveal melanoma, chordoma, chondrosarcoma of skull base or cervical spine. Clinical evidence supports that proton beam radiation improves health outcomes for patients with uveal melanoma and chordoma or chondrosarcoma of the skull base or cervical spine. Most of these patients have few other treatment options. A small case series of patients with recurrent uveal melanoma indicated a second course of proton beam radiation therapy (PBT) was associated with a relatively good probability of local control and a low enucleation rate.

Hepatocellular cancer. In hepatocellular cancer, radiation therapy plays a role in unresectable cancers and in those not amenable to radiofrequency ablation. SBRT has been used as well as PBT. The larger PBT series are from Japan suggesting excellent local control rates and modest two-five year survival rates. Four retrospective (360 patients) and twoprospective studies (64 patients) of PBT in patients with hepatocellular cancer show results similar to those achieved with SBRT. In patients with unresectable hepatocellular cancers who are not optimally treated with radiofrequency ablation or SBRT, PBT will be considered medically necessary.

Prostate cancer. Data published concerning use of proton beam therapy in localized prostate cancer report that treating large numbers of patients demonstrate results comparable to those obtained with alternative techniques. A 2008 comparative effectiveness review of therapies for clinically localized prostate cancer from the Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) indicated that, based on nonrandomized comparisons, the absolute rates of outcomes after proton radiation appear similar to other treatments. However, the clinical utility of dose escalation using proton beam therapy (PBT), to doses similar to those currently used in IMRT (e.g., 79-81 Gy), is still not known and further studies are needed. A 2010 BlueCross BlueShield TEC Assessment addressed the use of proton beam therapy for prostate cancer, and concluded that it has not yet been established whether proton beam therapy improves outcomes in any setting in prostate cancer. The American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) published a position statement in February 2013 which states the following: "At the present time, ASTRO believes the comparative efficacy evidence of proton beam therapy with other prostate cancer treatments is still being developed, and thus the role of proton beam therapy for localized prostate cancer within the current availability of treatment options remains unclear." In September 2013, as part of its

Medical Policy: PROTON BEAM RADIATION THERAPY

Policy Number: 6.01.11

Page: 3 of 6

national “Choosing Wisely” initiative, ASTRO listed PBT for prostate cancer as one of five radiation oncology practices that should not be routinely used because they are not supported by evidence.

Other indications. Case series with small sample sizes addressing proton beam radiotherapy in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma, nonsmall-cell lung cancer and invasive bladder carcinoma indicate favorable results, but these studies have limitations of small sample size and short follow-up period. Small retrospective studies indicate the use of proton beam radiotherapy appears promising for the treatment of Stage I non-small-cell lung cancer; however, prospective clinical trials with larger study populations and longer follow-up periods are needed. A 2010 BlueCross BlueShield TEC Assessment addressed the question of how health outcomes (overall survival, disease-specific survival, local control, disease-free survival, and adverse events) with PBT compare with outcomes observed for stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT), which is an accepted approach for using radiation therapy to treat NSCLC. The report concluded that the evidence is insufficient to permit conclusions about the results of PBT for any stage of NSCLC.

In May 2014, the American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) published a model policy for PBT. PBT is considered reasonable in instances where sparing the surrounding normal tissue cannot be adequately achieved with photon-based radiotherapy and is of added clinical benefit to the patient. The policy lists four examples of when PBT might be preferred over conventional radiotherapy. In addition to meeting criteria in the one of the four listed examples, the radiation oncologist must determine the patient’s suitability for PBT allowing for reproducible delivery, adequate definition of the target volumes and organs at risk, equipment capability, physician, physicist and staff training, and adequate quality assurance procedures. Normal tissue dose volume histograms (DVHs) must be demonstrably improved with a PBT plan to validate coverage. Coverage decisions must extend beyond ICD-9 and ICD-10 codes to incorporate considerations of clinical scenario and medical necessity with appropriate documentation. The final determination of the appropriateness and medical necessity for PBT resides with the treatment radiation oncologist who should document the justification for PBT for each patient. On the basis of the medical necessity requirements and published clinical data, disease sites that frequently support the use of PBT include the following: ocular tumors, including intraocular melanomas, tumors that approach or are located at the base of the skull (e.g., chordoma, chondrosarcomas), primary or metastatic tumors of the spine (where the spinal cord tolerance may be exceeded with conventional treatment or where the spinal cord has been previously irradiated), primary hepatocellular cancer treated in a hypofractionated regimen, primary or benign solid tumors in children treated with curative intent and occasional palliative treatment of childhood tumors when at least one of four example criteria is met, patients with genetic syndromes making total volume of irradiation minimization crucial such as but not limited to NF-1 patients and retinoblastoma patients. PBT would be considered as part of “coverage with evidence development” (CED) for the following indications (but not limited to): head and neck malignancies, thoracic malignancies, abdominal malignancies, pelvic malignancies, including genitourinary, gynecological, and gastrointestinal carcinomas. In the treatment of prostate cancer, the use of PBT is evolving as the comparative efficacy evidence is still being developed. Proton beam therapy for primary treatment of prostate cancer should only be performed within the context of a prospective clinical trial or registry.

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

Code	Description
77520	Proton treatment delivery; simple, without compensation
77522	Proton treatment delivery; simple, with compensation
77523	Proton treatment delivery; intermediate
77525	Proton treatment delivery; complex

Copyright © 2019 American Medical Association, Chicago, IL

Medical Policy: PROTON BEAM RADIATION THERAPY**Policy Number: 6.01.11****Page: 4 of 6****HCPSC Codes**

Code	Description
No codes	

ICD10 Codes

Code	Description
C30.0-C31.9	Malignant neoplasm of nasal cavity and middle ear (code range)
C40.80-C40.82	Malignant neoplasm of overlapping sites of bone and articular cartilage of limb (code range)
C40.90-C40.92	Malignant neoplasm of unspecified bones and articular cartilage of limb (code range)
C41.0-C41.2	Malignant neoplasm of bone and articular cartilage of other and unspecified sites (code range)
C41.9	Malignant neoplasm of bone and articular cartilage, unspecified
C61	Malignant neoplasm of prostate
C69.30-C69.42	Malignant neoplasm of choroid or ciliary body (code range)
C72.20-C72.9	Malignant neoplasm of spinal cord, cranial nerves and other parts of central nervous system (code range)
C78.30-C78.39	Secondary malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified respiratory organs (code range)
C79.32	Secondary malignant neoplasm of cerebral meninges
C79.40-C79.49	Secondary malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified parts of nervous system (code range)
C79.51-C79.52	Secondary malignant neoplasm of bone or bone marrow (code range)
D02.3	Carcinoma in situ of other parts of respiratory system
D07.5	Carcinoma in situ of prostate

REFERENCES

*Allen AM, et al. An evidence based review of proton beam therapy: the report of ASTRO's emerging technology committee. *Radiother Oncol* 2012 Apr;103(1):8-11.

American Society for Radiation Oncology. Model policy: Proton Beam Therapy. 2014 May 20.

[https://www.astro.org/uploadedFiles/Main_Site/Practice_Management/Reimbursement/ASTRO%20PBT%20Model%20Policy%20FINAL.pdf] accessed 4/11/19.

BlueCross BlueShield Association. Charged-particle (proton or helium ion) radiation therapy. Medical Policy Reference Manual Policy #8.01.10. 2018 Jul 12.

BlueCross BlueShield Association. Stereotactic radiosurgery and Stereotactic radiotherapy. Medical Policy Reference Manual Policy #6.01.10. 2019 Jan 17.

*Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Proton beam therapy for non-small-cell lung cancer. *TEC Assessments* 2010; 25(7).

*Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Proton beam therapy for prostate cancer. *TEC Assessments* 2010;25(10).

Bryant C, et al. Five-year biochemical results, toxicity, and patient-reported quality of life following delivery of dose-escalated image-guided proton therapy for prostate cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2016 May1;95(1):422-34.

Bush DA, et al. Randomized clinical trial comparing proton beam radiation therapy with transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma: results of an interim analysis. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2016 May 1;95(1):477-82.

Medical Policy: PROTON BEAM RADIATION THERAPY

Policy Number: 6.01.11

Page: 5 of 6

*Bush DA, et al. High-dose hypofractionated proton beam radiation therapy is safe and effective for central and peripheral early-stage non-small cell lung cancer: results of a 12- year experience at Loma Linda University Medical Center. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2013 Aug;86(5):964-8.

*Caujolle JP, et al. Proton beam radiotherapy for uveal melanomas at Nice teaching hospital.: 16 years' experience. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2010 Sep 1;78(1):98-103.

Dutz A, et al. Early and late side effects, dosimetric parameters and quality of life after proton beam therapy and IMRT for prostate cancer: a matched-pair analysis. Acta Oncol 2019 Mar 18;1-10 [Epub ahead of print].

Fan C, et al. Advantages of proton therapy in non-small cell lung cancers. Cancer Biother Radiopharm 2013 Apr;28(3):183-6.

Fang C, et al. A case-matched study of toxicity outcomes after proton therapy and intensity-modulated radiation therapy for prostate cancer. Cancer 2015 Apr 1;121(7):1118-27.

*Hahn C, et al. Choosing wisely: the American Society for Radiation Oncology's top 5 list. Pract Radiat Oncol 2014;4(6):349-55.

*Henderson RH, et al. Urinary functional outcomes and toxicity five years after proton therapy for low- and intermediate-risk prostate cancer: results of two prospective trials. Acta Oncol 2013 Apr;52(3):463-9.

*Hoppe BS, et al. Comparative effectiveness study of patient-reported outcomes after proton therapy or intensity-modulated radiotherapy for prostate cancer. Cancer 2014 Apr 1;120(7):1076-82.

*Hoppe BS, et al. Improving the therapeutic ratio by using proton therapy in patients with stage I or II seminoma. Am J Clin Oncol. 2013 Feb;36(1):31-7.

*Horwich A, et al. Second cancer risk and mortality in men treated with radiotherapy for stage I seminoma. Br J Cancer. 2014 Jan 7; 110(1): 256–263.

Iwata H, et al. Long-term outcomes of proton therapy for prostate cancer in Japan: a multi-institutional survey of the Japanese Radiation Oncology Study Group. Cancer Med 2018 Mar;7(3):677-689.

*Kanemoto A, et al. Outcomes and prognostic factors for recurrence after high-dose proton beam therapy for centrally and peripherally located stage I non-small-cell lung cancer. Clin Lung Cancer 2014 Mar;15(2):e7-12.

Kimura K, et al. Clinical results of proton beam therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma over 5 cm. Hepatol Res. 2017 Dec;47(13):1368-1374.

*Kuhlthau, KA, et al. Prospective study of health-related quality of life for children with brain tumors treated with proton radiotherapy. J Clin Oncol 2012;30(17):2079-86.

*Li W, et al. Tumor basal area and metastatic death after proton beam irradiation for choroidal melanoma. Arch Ophthalmol 2003 Jan;121(1):68-72.

*Liu H, et al. Proton therapy in clinical practice. Chin J Cancer 2011 May;30(5):315-26.

*McGee L, et al. Outcomes in men with large prostates (≥ 60 cm³) treated with definitive proton therapy for prostate cancer. Acta Oncol 2013 Apr;52(3):470-6.

*Miller ED, et al. Impact of proton beam availability on patient treatment schedule in radiation oncology. J Appl Clin Med Phys 2012 Nov 8;13(6):3968.

Nguyen QN, et al. Long-term outcomes after proton therapy, with concurrent chemotherapy, for stage II-III inoperable non-small lung cancer. Radiother Oncol 2015 Jun;11(3):367-72.

*Nihei K, et al. Multi-institutional phase II study of proton beam therapy for organ-confined prostate cancer focusing on the incidence of late rectal toxicities. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2011 Oct 1;81(2):390-6.

Royce TJ and Efstathiou JA./ Proton therapy for prostate cancer: a review of the rationale, evidence, and current state. Urol Oncol 2018 Dec 4 [Epub ahead of print].

Medical Policy: PROTON BEAM RADIATION THERAPY

Policy Number: 6.01.11

Page: 6 of 6

*Schild SE, et al. Proton beam therapy for locally advanced lung cancer: a review. World J Clin Oncol 2014 Oct 10;5(4):568-75.

*Sejpal S, et al. Early findings on toxicity of proton beam therapy with concurrent chemotherapy for non-small cell lung cancer. Cancer 2011 Jul 1;117(13):3004-13.

Takagi M, et al. Long-term outcomes in patients treated with proton therapy for localized prostate cancer. Cancer Med 2017 Oct;6(10):2234-2243.

Verma V, et al. A systematic review of the cost and cost-effectiveness studies of proton radiotherapy. Cancer 2016 May 15;122(10):1483-501.

Verma V, et al. Quality of life and patient-reported outcomes following proton radiation therapy: a systematic review. J Natl Cancer Inst 2018;110(4).

*Wilt TJ, et al. Systematic review: comparative effectiveness and harms of treatments for clinically localized prostate cancer. Ann Intern Med 2008 Mar 18;148(6):435-48. Also available at Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) [http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/repFiles/2008_0204ProstateCancerFinal.pdf] accessed 3/15/17.

*Wink KC, et al. Particle therapy for non-small cell lung tumors: where do we stand? A systematic review of the literature. Front Oncol 2014 Oct 29;4:292.

*Key Article

KEY WORDS

Charged particle radiation therapy, conformal proton beam radiation, proton beam radiation, proton beam therapy.

CMS COVERAGE FOR MEDICARE PRODUCT MEMBERS

There is currently a Local Coverage Determination (LCD) for Proton Beam Therapy. Please refer to the following LCD website for Medicare members: https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=35075&ver=22&CntrctrSelected=298*1&Cntrctr=298&s=41&DocType=Active&bc=AggAAAQBAAAA&