

EFFECTIVE DATE: 09|01|2015
POLICY LAST UPDATED: 08|07|2015

OVERVIEW

Radiotherapy (RT) is an integral component in the treatment of prostate cancer. Intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT) has been proposed as a method of RT that allows adequate RT to the tumor while minimizing the radiation dose to surrounding normal tissues and structures.

MEDICAL CRITERIA

BlueCHiP for Medicare and Commercial Products

Not applicable

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

Not applicable

POLICY STATEMENT

BlueCHiP for Medicare and Commercial Products

Intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT) may be considered medically necessary in the treatment of localized prostate cancer at radiation doses of 75 to 80 Gy.

IMRT is considered not medically necessary for the treatment of non-localized prostate cancer as there is insufficient peer-reviewed scientific literature that demonstrates that the procedure/service is effective..

BACKGROUND

Radiation Techniques

Conventional External Beam Radiotherapy

Over the past several decades, methods to plan and deliver RT have evolved in ways that permit more precise targeting of tumors with complex geometries. Most early trials used 2-dimensional treatment planning based on flat images and radiation beams with cross-sections of uniform intensity that were sequentially aimed at the tumor along 2 or 3 intersecting axes. Collectively, these methods are termed conventional external beam radiotherapy (EBRT).

Three-Dimensional Conformal Radiation

Treatment planning evolved by using 3-dimensional images, usually from computed tomography (CT) scans, to delineate the boundaries of the tumor and discriminate tumor tissue from adjacent normal tissue and nearby organs at risk for radiation damage. Computer algorithms were developed to estimate cumulative radiation dose delivered to each volume of interest by summing the contribution from each shaped beam. Methods also were developed to position the patient and the radiation portal reproducibly for each fraction and immobilize the patient, thus maintaining consistent beam axes across treatment sessions. Collectively, these methods are termed 3-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3D-CRT).

Intensity-Modulated Radiotherapy

IMRT, which uses computer software and CT and magnetic resonance imaging images, offers better conformality than 3D-CRT, as it is able to modulate the intensity of the overlapping radiation beams projected on the target and to use multiple-shaped treatment fields. It uses a device (a multileaf collimator) which, coupled to a computer algorithm, allows for “inverse” treatment planning. The radiation oncologist delineates the target on each slice of a CT scan and specifies the target’s prescribed radiation dose, acceptable

limits of dose heterogeneity within the target volume, adjacent normal tissue volumes to avoid, and acceptable dose limits within the normal tissues. Based on these parameters and a digitally reconstructed radiographic image of the tumor and surrounding tissues and organs at risk, computer software optimizes the location, shape, and intensities of the beam's ports, to achieve the treatment plan's goals. Increased conformality may permit escalated tumor doses without increasing normal tissue toxicity and thus may improve local tumor control, with decreased exposure to surrounding normal tissues, potentially reducing acute and late radiation toxicities. Better dose homogeneity within the target may also improve local tumor control by avoiding underdosing within the tumor and may decrease toxicity by avoiding overdosing. Because most tumors move as patients breathe, dosimetry with stationary targets may not accurately reflect doses delivered within target volumes and adjacent tissues in patients. Furthermore, treatment planning and delivery are more complex, time-consuming, and labor-intensive for IMRT than for 3D-CRT. Thus, clinical studies must test whether IMRT improves tumor control or reduces acute and late toxicities when compared with 3D-CRT.

Methodologic Issues in IMRT Research

Multiple-dose planning studies have generated 3D-CRT and IMRT treatment plans from the same scans, then compared predicted dose distributions within the target and in adjacent organs at risk. Results of such planning studies show that IMRT improves on 3D-CRT with respect to conformality to, and dose homogeneity within, the target. Dosimetry using stationary targets generally confirms these predictions. Thus, radiation oncologists hypothesized that IMRT may improve treatment outcomes compared with those of 3D-CRT. However, these types of studies offer indirect evidence on treatment benefit from IMRT, and it is difficult to relate results of dosing studies to actual effects on health outcomes.

Comparative studies of radiation-induced adverse effects from IMRT versus alternative radiation delivery are probably the most important type of evidence in establishing the benefit of IMRT. Such studies would answer the question of whether the theoretic benefit of IMRT in sparing normal tissue translates into real health outcomes. Single-arm series of IMRT can give some insights into the potential for benefit, particularly if an adverse effect that is expected to occur at high rates is shown to decrease by a large amount. Studies of treatment benefit are also important to establish that IMRT is at least as good as other types of delivery, but in the absence of such comparative trials, it is likely that benefit from IMRT is at least as good as with other types of delivery.

The evidence base for IMRT of the prostate consists largely of lower quality studies, with a lack of high-quality comparative studies reporting on clinical outcomes. In general, where the radiation doses are similar, the available evidence suggests that IMRT provides tumor control rates comparable with existing radiotherapy (RT) techniques. In addition, while results are not uniform and are based primarily on retrospective cohort trials, some studies show reductions in gastrointestinal and genitourinary toxicity. A reduction in clinically significant complications of RT is likely to lead to an improved quality of life for treated patients. Thus, despite limitations in the published literature, IMRT is another technique that can be used to deliver RT in the treatment of localized prostate cancer, and its use for this clinical application may be considered medically necessary.

CODING

BlueCHiP for Medicare and Commercial Products

A4648 Tissue marker, implantable, any type, each (Note: This code is not separately reimbursed for institutional providers.)

Note: To ensure correct pricing of HCPC code **A4648** for the Calypso 4D localization system, the procedure/clinical notes and the invoice must be submitted.

The following codes are covered for BlueCHiP for Medicare and commercial products when billed with diagnosis code listed below:

77301

77338

77385

77386

G6015 Intensity modulated treatment delivery, single or multiple fields/arcs, via narrow spatially and temporally modulated beams, binary, dynamic MLC, per treatment session

G6016 Compensator-based beam modulation treatment delivery of inverse planned treatment using 3 or more high-resolution (milled or cast) compensator, convergent beam modulated fields, per treatment session

ICD9

185

ICD10

C61

RELATED POLICIES

None

PUBLISHED

Provider Update, October 2015

REFERENCES

1. Bauman G, Rumble RB, Chen J, et al. Intensity-modulated radiotherapy in the treatment of prostate cancer. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. Sep 2012;24(7):461-473. PMID 22673744
2. Yong JH, Beca J, McGowan T, et al. Cost-effectiveness of intensity-modulated radiotherapy in prostate cancer. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. Sep 2012;24(7):521-531. PMID 22705100
3. Wilt TJ, Shamliyan T, Taylor B et al. Comparative effectiveness of therapies for clinically localized prostate cancer. Comparative Effectiveness Review No. 13. February 2008; <http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/searchfor-guides-reviews-and-reports/?pageaction=displayproduct&uctid=79>. Accessed March 2015.
4. Ip S, Dvorak T, Yu W, et al. Radiation Therapy for Localized Prostate Cancer: an Update. Technology Assessment Report. August 13, 2010; <https://www.cms.gov/coveragegeninfo/downloads/id69ta.pdf>. Accessed March 2015.
5. AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Review Surveillance Program. Surveillance Report. CER #13: Comparative Effectiveness of Therapies for Clinically Localized Prostate Cancer. 2012; http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/9/80/TX-for-Localized-ProstateCancer_SurveillanceAssesment_20120614.pdf. Accessed March 2015.
6. Hummel S SE, Hemingway P, Stevenson MD, Rees A. Intensity modulated radiotherapy for the treatment of prostate cancer: a systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technology Assessment*. 2011;14:1-137.
7. Hummel SR, Stevenson MD, Simpson EL, et al. A model of the cost-effectiveness of intensity-modulated radiotherapy in comparison with three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy for the treatment of localised prostate cancer. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. Dec 2012;24(10):e159-167. PMID 23040143
8. Pearson SD, Ladapo J, Prosser L. Intensity modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) for localized prostate cancer. Institute for Clinical and Economic Review. 2007; http://www.icer-review.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/04/IMRT_Final.pdf. Accessed March 2015.
9. Dolezel M, Odrazka K, Zouhar M, et al. Comparing morbidity and cancer control after 3D-conformal (70/74 Gy) and intensity modulated radiotherapy (78/82 Gy) for prostate cancer. *Strahlenther Onkol*. Jan 15 2015. PMID 25589224

10. Morimoto M, Yoshioka Y, Konishi K, et al. Comparison of acute and subacute genitourinary and gastrointestinal adverse events of radiotherapy for prostate cancer using intensity-modulated radiation therapy, threedimensional conformal radiation therapy, permanent implant brachytherapy and high-dose-rate brachytherapy. *Tumori*. May-Jun 2014;100(3):265-271. PMID 25076236
11. Michalski JM, Yan Y, Watkins-Bruner D, et al. Preliminary toxicity analysis of 3-dimensional conformal radiation therapy versus intensity modulated radiation therapy on the high-dose arm of the Radiation Therapy Oncology Group 0126 prostate cancer trial. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. Dec 1 2013;87(5):932-938. PMID 24113055
12. Vora SA, Wong WW, Schild SE, et al. Nine-Year Outcome and Toxicity in Patients treated with IMRT for Localized Prostate Cancer. *J Urol*. Feb 12 2013. PMID 23415964
13. Alicikus ZA, Yamada Y, Zhang Z, et al. Ten-year outcomes of high-dose, intensity-modulated radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer. *Cancer*. Apr 1 2011;117(7):1429-1437. PMID 21425143
14. Zelefsky MJ, Levin EJ, Hunt M, et al. Incidence of late rectal and urinary toxicities after three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy and intensity-modulated radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer. *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics*. Mar 15 2008;70(4):1124-1129. PMID 18313526
15. Cahlon O, Zelefsky MJ, Shippy A, et al. Ultra-high dose (86.4 Gy) IMRT for localized prostate cancer: toxicity and biochemical outcomes. *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics*. Jun 1 2008;71(2):330-337. PMID 18164858
16. Wong WW, Vora SA, Schild SE, et al. Radiation dose escalation for localized prostate cancer: intensitymodulated radiotherapy versus permanent transperineal brachytherapy. *Cancer*. Dec 1 2009;115(23):5596-5606. PMID 19670452
17. Gandaglia G, Karakiewicz PI, Briganti A, et al. Intensity-modulated radiation therapy leads to survival benefit only in patients with high-risk prostate cancer: a population-based study. *Ann Oncol*. May 2014;25(5):979-986. PMID 24562445
18. Cary KC, Punnen S, Odisho AY, et al. Nationally representative trends and geographic variation in treatment of localized prostate cancer: the Urologic Diseases in America project. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis*. Feb 10 2015. PMID 25667110
19. Nguyen PL, Aizer A, Assimos DG, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria(R) Definitive External-Beam Irradiation in stage T1 and T2 prostate cancer. *Am J Clin Oncol*. Jun 2014;37(3):278-288. PMID 25180754

[CLICK THE ENVELOPE ICON BELOW TO SUBMIT COMMENTS](#)

This medical policy is made available to you for informational purposes only. It is not a guarantee of payment or a substitute for your medical judgment in the treatment of your patients. Benefits and eligibility are determined by the member's subscriber agreement or member certificate and/or the employer agreement, and those documents will supersede the provisions of this medical policy. For information on member-specific benefits, call the provider call center. If you provide services to a member which are determined to not be medically necessary (or in some cases medically necessary services which are non-covered benefits), you may not charge the member for the services unless you have informed the member and they have agreed in writing in advance to continue with the treatment at their own expense. Please refer to your participation agreement(s) for the applicable provisions. This policy is current at the time of publication; however, medical practices, technology, and knowledge are constantly changing. BCBSRI reserves the right to review and revise this policy for any reason and at any time, with or without notice. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

