

Subject: Gastrointestinal Electrical Stimulation (GES) and Vagus Nerve Blocking Therapy (VBLOC) for Obesity		Original Effective Date: 7/8/15
Policy Number: MCP-243	Revision Date(s): 12/19/18	
Review Date: 12/16/15, 12/14/16, 6/22/17, 9/18/19, 9/16/20, 12/14/20		
MCPC Approval Date: 12/19/18, 9/18/19, 9/16/20		

DISCLAIMER

This Molina Clinical Policy (MCP) is intended to facilitate the Utilization Management process. It expresses Molina's determination as to whether certain services or supplies are medically necessary, experimental, investigational, or cosmetic for purposes of determining appropriateness of payment. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that this service or supply is covered (i.e., will be paid for by Molina) for a particular member. The member's benefit plan determines coverage. Each benefit plan defines which services are covered, which are excluded, and which are subject to dollar caps or other limits. Members and their providers will need to consult the member's benefit plan to determine if there are any exclusion(s) or other benefit limitations applicable to this service or supply. If there is a discrepancy between this policy and a member's plan of benefits, the benefits plan will govern. In addition, coverage may be mandated by applicable legal requirements of a State, the Federal government or CMS for Medicare and Medicaid members. CMS's Coverage Database can be found on the CMS website. The coverage directive(s) and criteria from an existing National Coverage Determination (NCD) or Local Coverage Determination (LCD) will supersede the contents of this Molina Clinical Policy (MCP) document and provide the directive for all Medicare members.¹

Contents

DISCLAIMER..... 1

Description of Procedure/Service/Pharmaceutical..... 1

Recommendation 2

Summary of Medical Evidence..... 2

Coding Information..... 4

References..... 5

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURE/SERVICE/PHARMACEUTICAL ²²

Gastrointestinal Electrical Stimulation (GES) therapy has been developed as a treatment for patients with obesity. The goal of gastric stimulation is to cause early satiety and reduce appetite causing subsequent weight loss. The exact mechanisms that result in changes in eating and behavior are uncertain. The mechanisms may be related to neuro-hormonal modulation and/or stomach muscle stimulation. There are two types of GES therapy, the first one developed called gastric neurostimulation, also known as gastric pacemaker or gastric modulation involves placement of gastric neurostimulator electrodes into the muscle of the pyloric antrum and connected to

a neurostimulator that has been secured in a subcutaneous pocket in the abdomen. The implantable pulse generator then delivers electrical pulses to the stomach muscles.

The second type of procedure developed, vagus nerve blocking therapy, also known as vagal blocking for obesity control or VBLOC, involves the insertion of a neuroregulator via laparoscope in the patient's subcutaneous tissue. Electrodes are attached to the trunk of each vagal nerve at the gastroesophageal junction and the distal ends attached to the neuroregulator. Low voltage, high frequency energy waves are sent to the vagus nerves to block the signals of hunger from the nerve to the brain.

The Maestro Rechargeable System was FDA approved as a VBLOC treatment in January, 2015 for patients aged 18 and older who have not been able to lose weight with a weight loss program, and who have a body mass index of 35 to 45 with at least one other obesity-related condition, such as type 2 diabetes.²

There are no other GES devices approved by the FDA for the treatment of obesity. The Transcend™ implantable gastric stimulation device, manufactured by Medtronic is currently being studied in the SHAPE clinical trial in the United States; Transneuronix, Inc. has developed an implantable gastric stimulator (IGS®), the TANTALUS(R) System by MetaCure is also being investigated in the treatment of obese/overweight patients with Type II Diabetes.²²

RECOMMENDATION

Gastrointestinal Electrical Stimulation (GES) therapy and vagal blocking for obesity control are considered investigational/experimental and unproven for obesity due to insufficient evidence in the peer reviewed medical literature that that have not established long term safety, efficacy and effect on net health outcomes.

SUMMARY OF MEDICAL EVIDENCE³⁻¹⁷

There is insufficient published evidence to support the efficacy and safety of gastrointestinal electrical stimulation (GES) therapy for promoting weight loss among patients with morbid obesity. There are no randomized controlled trials on GES for the treatment of obesity. Small clinical trials have reported positive outcomes in weight loss and maintenance of weight loss along with minimal complications.⁶⁻¹³ The best available evidence on VBLOC therapy consists of 2 published pivotal sham-controlled trials: ReCharge and EMPOWER. The primary efficacy endpoint was percent estimated weight loss (EWL) at 12 months. The study population in both trials was predominantly female (~86%) and middle-aged (mean age, 47 years). The third prospective multicenter study called the SHAPE trial evaluated the difference in the percentage of excess weight loss (EWL) between the control and treatment groups. In this study the EWL was the same for both groups. All three trials did not meet their primary efficacy endpoints.³⁻⁵ Summaries of the most relevant studies are provided below.

A randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled clinical trial called ReCharge enrolled 239 participants who were implanted with the Maestro RC2 System. Patients were then randomized to receive either active (n=162) or inactive sham therapy (n=77). The primary efficacy endpoints were percentage excess weight loss (EWL) at 12 months. The trial's preset margin for determining device efficacy was $\geq 10\%$ difference in mean percent EWL between active and sham VBLOC groups. The second efficacy endpoint was percentage of patients achieving $\geq 20\%$ EWL and $\geq 25\%$ EWL. Neither efficacy endpoint was met. The mean percent EWL was 24.4% in the active VBLOC group and 15.9% in the sham group, a difference of 8.5% that fell short of the preset 10% target.

The percentage of patients in each arm achieving $\geq 20\%$ and $\geq 25\%$ EWL did not meet statistical difference (38% of patients in the active group and 23% of patients in the sham group achieved $\geq 25\%$ EWL). A revision procedure was required in 8 patients; all were receiving active therapy. The authors noted that among patients with morbid obesity, the use of vagal nerve block therapy compared with a sham control device did not meet either of the prespecified coprimary efficacy objectives, although weight loss in the vagal block group was statistically greater than in the sham device group. The treatment was well tolerated, having met the primary safety objective.³

A randomized, double-blind, prospective, controlled trial called EMPOWER enrolled 294 patients who were implanted with an earlier version of the device used in the ReCharge trial (Maestro RF2). Patients randomized to receive active therapy had their devices turned on (n=192) and those in the sham control group had their devices turned off (n=102). The primary efficacy endpoint was percent EWL at 12 months. The secondary efficacy measure was percentage of patients that achieved $> 25\%$ EWL. Neither endpoint statistically differed between active and sham treatment groups. The percent EWL in each study arm was $\sim 16.5\%$. In addition, a statistically identical proportion of patients in each arm achieved 25% EWL (22% of patients in the active VBLOC group and 25% of patients in the sham group). During the study, the device was removed from 16 patients (for an adverse event in 8 cases and due to personal decision in the other 8 cases). A revision procedure was required in 14 patients. The authors noted that VBLOC® therapy to treat morbid obesity was safe, but weight loss was not greater in treated compared to controls; clinically important weight loss, however, was related to hours of device use. Post-study analysis suggested that the system electrical safety checks (low charge delivered via the system for electrical impedance, safety, and diagnostic checks) may have contributed to weight loss in the control group.⁴

A prospective, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, multicenter study called The SHAPE trial compared implantable gastric stimulation therapy with a standard diet and behavioral therapy regimen in 190 participants with obesity by evaluating the difference in the percentage of excess weight loss (EWL) between the control and treatment groups. All patients underwent implantation with the implantable gastric stimulator and were randomized to 1 of 2 treatment groups: the control group (stimulation off) or treatment group (stimulation on). The patients were evaluated on a monthly basis. All individuals who enrolled in this study agreed to consume a diet with a 500-kcal/d deficit and to participate in monthly support group meetings. The procedure resulted in no deaths and a low complication rate. The primary endpoint of a difference in weight loss between the treatment and control groups was not met. The control group lost 11.7% \pm 16.9% of excess weight and the treatment group lost 11.8% \pm 17.6% (P = .717) according to an intent-to-treat analysis. The authors noted that although implantable gastric stimulation as a surgical option for the treatment of morbid obesity is a less complex procedure than current bariatric operations, the results of the present study do not support its application. Additional research is indicated to understand the physiology and potential benefits of this therapy.⁵

A systematic review (2014) of the evidence (31 studies/1367 patients) was conducted to evaluate the effect of different types of gastric electrical stimulation (GES) on obesity. Published studies investigating the effect of GES using the Tantalus and Transcend devices, as well as vagus nerve stimulation, were included. Exclusion criteria for published studies were GES used for diseases other than obesity (e.g., gastroparesis); non-gastric stimulation, and non-clinical primary outcome. Studies were primarily non-randomized, with 4/31 randomized

trials. In all studies, the generator was externalized and in most cases they were implanted in subcutaneous layers of the anterior abdominal wall. The electrodes connected to the generator were implanted in different locations of the stomach, depending on the type of GES. The primary outcome was weight loss, with secondary outcomes of appetite or satiety changes and biochemical marker changes. Almost all studies in each device group achieved statistically significant weight loss during the first 12 months. Only a small percentage of studies had a follow-up longer than one year, and found significant weight loss maintenance. Findings were inconsistent for secondary outcomes. Gastric penetration was the most common device-related complication. In general, the level of evidence was found to be low with few studies having a large population and low loss to follow-up. Results of studies in this systematic review suggest that GES may be effective for short-term weight loss. However well-designed studies with larger patient population and long-term follow up are needed to determine safety and effectiveness of the technology for this indication. ¹³

Twenty-four-month outcomes from ReCharge were published by Apovian in 2016. Participants with body mass index (BMI) 40 to 45 kg/m², or 35 to 40 kg/m² with at least one comorbid condition were randomized to either vBloc therapy or sham intervention for 12 months. After 12 months, participants randomized to vBloc continued open-label vBloc therapy and are the focus of this report. Weight loss, adverse events, comorbid risk factors, and quality of life. The results showed at 24 months, 123 (76 %) vBloc participants remained in the trial. Participants who presented at 24 months (n = 103) had a mean excess weight loss (EWL) of 21 % (8 % total weight loss [TWL]); 58 % of participants had ≥5 % TWL and 34 % had ≥10 % TWL. Among the subset of participants with abnormal preoperative values, significant improvements were observed in mean LDL (-16 mg/dL) and HDL cholesterol (+4 mg/dL), triglycerides (-46 mg/dL), HbA1c (-0.3 %), and systolic (-11 mmHg) and diastolic blood pressures (-10 mmHg). QOL measures were significantly improved. Heartburn/dyspepsia and implant site pain were the most frequently reported adverse events. The primary related serious adverse event rate was 4.3 %. The authors concluded that vBloc therapy continues to result in medically meaningful weight loss with a favorable safety profile through 2 years. Of note the analysis lacked a blinded comparison group. ¹⁴

Professional Society Guidelines ¹⁸⁻²¹

The American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery published a position statement in 2016 that includes the following recommendations on vagus nerve blocking therapy for treatment of obesity:

- Reversible vagal nerve blockade has been shown to result in statistically significant EWL [excess weight loss] at 1 year compared with a control group in one of 2 prospective randomized trials.
- Reversible vagal nerve blockage has been shown to have a reasonable safety profile with a low incidence of severe adverse events and a low revisional rate in the short term. More studies are needed to determine long-term reoperation and explantation rates.
- The prospective collection of VBLOC outcomes as part of the national center of excellence databases is encouraged to establish the long-term efficacy of this new technology. ²⁰

CODING INFORMATION THE CODES LISTED IN THIS POLICY ARE FOR REFERENCE PURPOSES ONLY. LISTING OF A SERVICE OR DEVICE CODE IN THIS POLICY DOES NOT IMPLY THAT THE SERVICE DESCRIBED BY THIS CODE IS COVERED OR NON-COVERED. COVERAGE IS DETERMINED BY THE BENEFIT DOCUMENT. THIS LIST OF CODES MAY NOT BE ALL INCLUSIVE.

CPT	Description
-----	-------------

0312T	Vagus nerve blocking therapy (morbid obesity); laparoscopic implantation of neurostimulator electrode array, anterior and posterior vagal trunks adjacent to esophagogastric junction (EGJ), with implantation of pulse generator, includes programming
0313T	Vagus nerve blocking therapy (morbid obesity); laparoscopic revision or replacement of vagal trunk neurostimulator electrode array, including connection to existing pulse generator
0314T	Vagus nerve blocking therapy (morbid obesity); laparoscopic removal of vagal trunk neurostimulator electrode array and pulse generator
0315T	Vagus nerve blocking therapy (morbid obesity); removal of pulse generator
0316T	Vagus nerve blocking therapy (morbid obesity); replacement of pulse generator
0317T	Vagus nerve blocking therapy (morbid obesity); neurostimulator pulse generator electronic analysis, includes reprogramming when performed
43647	Laparoscopy, surgical; implantation or replacement of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum
43648	Laparoscopy, surgical; revision or removal of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum
43881	Implantation or replacement of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum, open
43882	Revision or removal of gastric neurostimulator electrodes, antrum, open
64590	Insertion or replacement of peripheral or gastric neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver, direct or inductive coupling
64595	Revision or removal of peripheral or gastric neurostimulator pulse generator or receiver

HCPCS	Description
L8679-80-85-86	Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator codes
C1767	Generator, neurostimulator (implantable), nonrechargeable

ICD-10	Description: [For dates of service on or after 10/01/2015]
E66-E66.09	Overweight and obesity code range

REFERENCES

Government Agencies

- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Medicare Coverage Database. National coverage determination (NCD) Search. Accessed at: <http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/>
- Food and Drug Administration. Obesity Treatment Devices. 2018. Accessed at: <https://www.fda.gov/medicaldevices/productsandmedicalprocedures/obesitydevices/default.htm>

Peer Reviewed Publications

- Ikramuddin S, Blackstone RP, Brancatisano et al. Effect of reversible intermittent intra-abdominal vagal nerve blockade on morbid obesity: the ReCharge randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2014 Sep 3;312(9):915-22. doi: 10.1001/jama.2014.10540.
- Sarr MG, Billington CJ, Brancatisano R, Brancatisano A et al. The EMPOWER study: randomized, prospective, double-blind, multicenter trial of vagal blockade to induce weight loss in morbid obesity. Obes Surg. 2012 Nov;22(11):1771-82. doi: 10.1007/s11695-012-0751-8.

5. Shikora SA, Bergenstal R, Bessler M. et al. Implantable gastric stimulation for the treatment of clinically severe obesity: results of the SHAPE trial. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2009 Jan-Feb;5(1):31-7. doi: 10.1016/j.soard.2008.09.012. Epub 2008 Oct 1.
6. Shikora SA, Storch K; Investigational team; 2004 ABS Consensus Conference. Implantable gastric stimulation for the treatment of severe obesity: the American experience. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2005;1(3):334-342.
7. Miller K, Hoeller E, Aigner F. The implantable gastric stimulator for obesity: An update of the European experience in the LOSS (Laparoscopic Obesity Stimulation Survey) study. *Treat Endocrinol.* 2006;5(1):53-58.
8. Champion JK, Williams M, Champion S, et al. Implantable gastric stimulation to achieve weight loss in patients with a low body mass index: early clinical trial results. *Surg Endosc.* 2006;20(3):444-447.
9. Wolff S, Pross M, Knippig C, et al. Gastric pacing. A new method in obesity surgery. *Chirurg.* 2002;73(7):700-703.
10. Camilleri M, Toouli J, Herrera MF et al. Selection of electrical algorithms to treat obesity with intermittent vagal block using an implantable medical device. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2009 Mar-Apr;5(2):224-9; discussion 229-30. Epub 2008 Sep 12.
11. De Luca, M, Segato, G, Busetto, L, et al. Progress in implantable gastric stimulation: summary of results of the European multi-center study. *Obes Surg.* 2004 Sep;14 Suppl 1:S33-9. PMID: 15479588
12. Favretti, F, De Luca, M, Segato, G, et al. Treatment of morbid obesity with the Transcend Implantable Gastric Stimulator (IGS): a prospective survey. *Obes Surg.* 2004 May;14(5):666-70. PMID: 15186636
13. Cha R, Marescaux J, Diana M. Updates on gastric electrical stimulation to treat obesity: Systematic review and future perspectives. *World J Gastrointest Endosc.* 2014 Sep 16;6(9):419-31. doi: 10.4253/wjge.v6.i9.419.
14. Apovian CM, Shah SN et al. Two-Year Outcomes of Vagal Nerve Blocking (vBloc) for the Treatment of Obesity in the ReCharge Trial. *Obes Surg.* 2017 Jan;27(1):169-176. doi: 10.1007/s11695-016-2325-7.
15. Morton JM, Shah SN et al. Effect of Vagal Nerve Blockade on Moderate Obesity with an Obesity-Related Comorbid Condition: the ReCharge Study. *Obes Surg.* 2016 May;26(5):983-9. doi: 10.1007/s11695-016-2143-y.
16. Shikora SA, Toouli J et al. Intermittent Vagal Nerve Block for Improvements in Obesity, Cardiovascular Risk Factors, and Glycemic Control in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: 2-Year Results of the VBLOC DM2 Study. *Obes Surg.* 2016 May;26(5):1021-8. doi: 10.1007/s11695-015-1914-1.
17. Horbach T, et al. Closed loop gastric electrical stimulation versus laparoscopic adjustable gastric band for the treatment of obesity: a randomized 12-month multicenter study. *Int J Obes* 2016 Dec;40(12):1891-1898.

Professional Society

18. American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists and American College of Endocrinology Comprehensive Clinical Practice Guidelines for Medical Care of Patients with Obesity. Garvey WT et al. *Endocrine Practice* Vol 22 (Suppl 3) July 2016 1
19. American Heart Association (AHA) / American College of Cardiology (ACC) / The Obesity Society (TOS): Guideline for the Management of Overweight and Obesity: a Report of the American College of

Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and The Obesity Society. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2014;63(25 Pt B):3029-3030]

20. American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery position statement on vagal blocking therapy for obesity. Surgery for obesity and related diseases. Official journal of the American Society for Bariatric Surgery. 2016 MarApr;12(3):460-1. PMID: 26948945
21. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Clinical guideline [CG189]. Obesity: Identification, Assessment, and Management. Nov, 2014.

Other Resources

22. Hayes a Division of TractManager. Winifred Hayes, Inc. Lansdale, PA.:
 - Health Technology Assessment. Maestro Rechargeable System for Vagal Blocking for Obesity Control (VBLOC). Jan 2015. Updated Feb, 2018. Archived Feb 2019.
 - Health Technology Assessment. Gastric Electrical Stimulation with an Implantable Gastric Stimulator (IGS) for the Treatment of Obesity. Updated July, 2009. Archived 2010.
23. UpToDate. [website]: Waltham, MA: Walters Kluwer Health; 2020:
 - Pererault L. Obesity in adults: Overview of management.
24. AMR: Policy peer reviewed by AMR practicing physician board certified in Internal Medicine, Gastroenterology. 9/11/18

Review/Revision History:

7/8/15: Policy created

12/16/15, 12/14/16, 6/22/17: Policy reviewed, no changes

12/19/18: Policy reviewed and there were no changes to the criteria. The following sections were updated: Description of devices, summary of medical evidence, professional society guidelines, and references.

9/18/19 & 9/16/20: Policy reviewed, no changes. Added TOC.