



FEP Medical Policy Manual

FEP 2.02.32 Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Effective Policy Date: October 1, 2021

Original Policy Date: December 2019

Related Policies:

None

Leadless Cardiac Pacemakers

Description

Description

Pacemakers are intended to be used as a substitute for the heart's intrinsic pacing system to correct cardiac rhythm disorders. Conventional pacemakers consist of 2 components: a pulse generator and electrodes (or leads). Pacemakers are considered life-sustaining, life-supporting class III devices for patients with a variety of bradyarrhythmias. Even though the efficacy and safety profile of conventional pacemakers are excellent, in a small proportion of patients, they may result in lead complications and the requirement for a surgical pocket. Further, some patients are medically ineligible for conventional pacemakers due to lack of venous access and recurrent infection. Leadless pacemakers are single-unit devices that are implanted in the heart via femoral access, thereby eliminating the potential for complications as a result of leads and surgical pocket. The Micra transcatheter pacing system is the only commercially available leadless pacemaker in the U.S. approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether the use of the Micra transcatheter pacing system in patients with a guidelines-based indication for a single-chamber ventricular pacing system improves the net health outcome.

POLICY STATEMENT

The Micra transcatheter pacing system may be considered **medically necessary** in patients when both conditions below are met:

1. The patient has symptomatic paroxysmal or permanent high-grade arteriovenous block or symptomatic bradycardia-tachycardia syndrome or sinus node dysfunction (sinus bradycardia or sinus pauses);
2. The patient has a significant contraindication precluding placement of conventional single-chamber ventricular pacemaker leads such as any of the following:
 - o History of an endovascular or cardiovascular implantable electronic device (CIED) infection or who are at high risk for infection
 - o Limited access for transvenous pacing given venous anomaly, occlusion of axillary veins or planned use of such veins for a semi-permanent catheter or current or planned use of an AV fistula for hemodialysis
 - o Presence of a bioprosthetic tricuspid valve.

The Micra transcatheter pacing system is considered **investigational** in all other situations in which the above criteria are not met.

POLICY GUIDELINES

As per the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) label, the Micra Model MC1VR01 pacemaker is contraindicated for patients who have the following types of devices implanted:

- An implanted device that would interfere with the implant of the Micra device in the judgment of the implanting physician
- An implanted inferior vena cava filter
- A mechanical tricuspid valve
- An implanted cardiac device providing active cardiac therapy which may interfere with the sensing performance of the Micra device

As per the FDA label, the Micra Model MC1VR01 pacemaker is also contraindicated for patients who have the following conditions:

- Femoral venous anatomy unable to accommodate a 7.8 mm (23 French) introducer sheath or implant on the right side of the heart (for example, due to obstructions or severe tortuosity)
- Morbid obesity that prevents the implanted device to obtain telemetry communication within <12.5 cm (4.9 in)
- Known intolerance to titanium, titanium nitride, parylene C, primer for parylene C, polyether ether ketone, siloxane, nitinol, platinum, iridium, liquid silicone rubber, silicone medical adhesive, and heparin or sensitivity to contrast medical which cannot be adequately premedicated

As per the FDA label, the Micra Model MC1VR01 pacemaker should not be used in patients for whom a single dose of 1.0 mg dexamethasone acetate cannot be tolerated because the device contains a molded and cured mixture of dexamethasone acetate with the target dosage of 272 µg dexamethasone acetate. It is intended to deliver the steroid to reduce inflammation and fibrosis.

For the MRI contraindications for patients with a Micra MRI device, refer to the Medtronic MRI Technical Manual.

For axillary transvenous pacemakers, there is a concern that leads or the generator could be impacted by the recoil of using a firearm (e.g., rifles or shotguns). Thus leadless cardiac pacemakers can provide an alternative for patients who suffer lead fracture or malfunction from mechanical stress and may be considered when axillary venous access is present only on a side of the body that would not allow use of equipment producing such mechanical stress (e.g., a firearm).

BENEFIT APPLICATION

Experimental or investigational procedures, treatments, drugs, or devices are not covered (See General Exclusion Section of brochure).

FDA REGULATORY STATUS

In April 2016, the Micra™ transcatheter pacing system (Medtronic) was approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the premarket approval process (PMA number: P150033) for use in patients who have experienced one or more of the following conditions:

- symptomatic paroxysmal or permanent high-grade arteriovenous block in the presence of atrial fibrillation
- paroxysmal or permanent high-grade arteriovenous block in the absence of atrial fibrillation, as an alternative to dual-chamber pacing, when atrial lead placement is considered difficult, high-risk, or not deemed necessary for effective therapy
- symptomatic bradycardia-tachycardia syndrome or sinus node dysfunction (sinus bradycardia or sinus pauses), as an alternative to atrial or dual-chamber pacing, when atrial lead placement is considered difficult, high-risk, or not deemed necessary for effective therapy.

In January 2020, the Micra AV Transcatheter Pacing System Model MC1AVR1 and Application Software Model SW044 were approved as a PMA supplement (S061) to the Micra system described above. The Micra AV includes an enhanced algorithm to provide AV synchronous pacing.

RATIONALE

Summary of Evidence

For individuals with a guidelines-based indication for a ventricular pacing system who are medically eligible for a conventional pacing system who receive a Micra transcatheter pacing system, the evidence includes a pivotal prospective cohort study and a post-approval prospective cohort study. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Results at 6 months and 1 year for the pivotal study reported high procedural success (>99%) and device effectiveness (pacing capture threshold met in 98% patients). Most of the system- or procedural-related complications occurred within 30 days. At 1 year, the incidence of major complication did not increase substantially from 6 months (3.5% at 6 months vs 4% at 1 year). Results of the post-approval study were consistent with a pivotal study and showed a lower incidence of major complications up to 30 days post-implantation as well as 1 year (1.5% and 2.7%, respectively). In both studies, the point estimates of major complications were lower than the pooled estimates from 6 studies of conventional pacemakers used as a historical comparator. While Micra device eliminates lead- and surgical pocket-related complications, its use can result in potentially more serious complications related to implantation and release of the device (traumatic cardiac injury) and less serious complications related to the femoral access site (groin hematomas, access site bleeding). Considerable uncertainties and unknowns remain in terms of the durability of device and device end-of-life issues. Early and limited experience has suggested that retrieval of these devices is unlikely because in due course, the devices will be encapsulated. There are limited data on device-device interactions (both electrical and mechanical), which may occur when there is a deactivated Micra device alongside another leadless pacemaker or when a leadless pacemaker and transvenous device are both present. While the current evidence is encouraging, overall benefit with the broad use of Micra transcatheter pacing system compared with conventional pacemakers has not been shown. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with a guidelines-based indication for a ventricular pacing system who are medically ineligible for a conventional pacing system who receive a Micra transcatheter pacing system, the evidence includes subgroup analysis of a pivotal prospective cohort study and a post-approval prospective cohort study. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Information on the outcomes in the subgroup of patients from the post-approval study showed that the Micra device was successfully implanted in 98% of cases and safety outcomes were similar to the original cohort. Even though the evidence is limited and long-term effectiveness and safety are unknown, the short-term benefits outweigh the risks because the complex trade-off of adverse events for these devices needs to be assessed in the context of the life-saving potential of pacing systems for patients, ineligible for conventional pacing systems. There are little data available regarding outcomes associated with other alternatives to conventional pacemaker systems such as epicardial leads or transiliac placement. Epicardial leads are most relevant for the patient who is already going to have a thoracotomy for treatment of their underlying condition (e.g., congenital heart disease). Epicardial leads are associated with a longer intensive care unit stay, more blood loss, and longer ventilation times compared to conventional pacemaker systems. The evidence for transiliac placement is limited to small case series and the incidence of atrial lead dislodgement using this

approach in the literature ranged from 7 to 21%. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in 'Supplemental Information' if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

In 2018, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) issued evidence-based recommendations on leadless cardiac pacemaker implantation for adults with bradyarrhythmias.³³ The guidance states that the evidence "on the safety of leadless cardiac pacemaker implantation for bradyarrhythmias shows that there are serious but well-recognized complications. The evidence on efficacy is inadequate in quantity and quality:

- For people who can have conventional cardiac pacemaker implantation, leadless pacemakers should only be used in the context of research;
- For people in whom a conventional cardiac pacemaker implantation is contraindicated following a careful risk assessment by a multidisciplinary team, leadless cardiac pacemakers should only be used with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent and audit or research."

This guidance is scheduled for review in August 2021.

Heart Rhythm Society

In 2020, the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS), along with the International Society for Cardiovascular Infectious Diseases (ISCVID) and several other Asian, European and Latin American societies, endorsed the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) international consensus document on how to prevent, diagnose, and treat cardiac implantable electronic device infections.³⁴ The consensus states that for patients at high risk of device-related infections, avoiding a transvenous system, and implanting an epicardial system, may be preferential. It makes the following statements regarding leadless pacemakers:

- 'There is hope that 'leadless" pacemakers will be less prone to infection and can be used in a similar manner [as epicardial systems] in high-risk patients.'
- 'In selected high-risk patients, the risk of infection with leadless pacemakers appears low. The device also seems safe and feasible in patients with pre-existing [cardiovascular implantable electronic device] infection and after extraction of infected leads.'

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid (CMS) cover leadless pacemakers under coverage with evidence development criteria when procedures are performed in prospective longitudinal studies approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) using "leadless pacemakers...in accordance with the FDA approved label for devices that have either:...

- An associated ongoing FDA approved post-approval study; or
- Completed an FDA post-approval study.

Each study must be approved by CMS and as a fully-described, written part of its protocol, must address the following research questions:

- What are the peri-procedural and post-procedural complications of leadless pacemakers?
- What are the long term outcomes of leadless pacemakers?
- What are the effects of patient characteristics (age, gender, comorbidities) on the use and health effects of leadless pacemakers?"³⁵.

The following 4 studies are currently approved by CMS:³⁶

1. The LEADLESS II IDE Study (Phase II): A Safety and Effectiveness Trial for a Leadless Pacemaker System (NCT04559945); CMS approval date: 3/16/21;
2. Longitudinal Coverage with Evidence Development Study on Micra AV Leadless Pacemakers (Micra AV CED) (NCT04235491); CMS approval date: 2/5/2020;
3. The Micra CED Study (NCT03039712); CMS approval date: 03/09/17; and
4. Micra Transcatheter Pacing System Post-Approval Registry (NCT02536118); CMS approval date: 02/09/17.

REFERENCES

1. Reddy VY, Exner DV, Cantillon DJ, et al. Percutaneous Implantation of an Entirely Intracardiac Leadless Pacemaker. *N Engl J Med*. Sep 17 2015; 373(12): 1125-35. PMID 26321198
2. Udo EO, Zuithoff NP, van Hemel NM, et al. Incidence and predictors of short- and long-term complications in pacemaker therapy: the FOLLOWPACE study. *Heart Rhythm*. May 2012; 9(5): 728-35. PMID 22182495
3. Haight PJ, Stewart RE, Saarel EV, et al. Lateral thoracotomy for epicardial pacemaker placement in patients with congenital heart disease. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg*. May 01 2018; 26(5): 845-851. PMID 29300890
4. Cohen MI, Bush DM, Vetter VL, et al. Permanent epicardial pacing in pediatric patients: seventeen years of experience and 1200 outpatient visits. *Circulation*. May 29 2001; 103(21): 2585-90. PMID 11382728
5. Doll N, Piorkowski C, Czesla M, et al. Epicardial versus transvenous left ventricular lead placement in patients receiving cardiac resynchronization therapy: results from a randomized prospective study. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Aug 2008; 56(5): 256-61. PMID 18615370
6. Harake DE, Shannon KM, Aboulhosn JA, et al. Transvenous pacemaker implantation after the bidirectional Glenn operation for patients with complex congenital disease. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Mar 2018; 29(3): 497-503. PMID 29240293
7. Tsutsumi, K. , Hashizume, K. , Kimura, N. , Taguchi, S. , Inoue, Y. , Kashima, I. and Takahashi, R. (2010), Permanent Pacemaker Implantation via the Iliac Vein: An Alternative in 4 Cases with Contraindications to the Pectoral Approach. *Journal of Arrhythmia*, 26: 55-61. doi:10.1016/S1880-4276(10)80037-7
8. Healey JS, Toff WD, Lamas GA, et al. Cardiovascular outcomes with atrial-based pacing compared with ventricular pacing: meta-analysis of randomized trials, using individual patient data. *Circulation*. Jul 04 2006; 114(1): 11-7. PMID 16801463
9. Kirkfeldt RE, Johansen JB, Nohr EA, et al. Risk factors for lead complications in cardiac pacing: a population-based cohort study of 28,860 Danish patients. *Heart Rhythm*. Oct 2011; 8(10): 1622-8. PMID 21699827
10. Kirkfeldt RE, Johansen JB, Nohr EA, et al. Complications after cardiac implantable electronic device implantations: an analysis of a complete, nationwide cohort in Denmark. *Eur Heart J*. May 2014; 35(18): 1186-94. PMID 24347317
11. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FDA Executive Summary Memorandum. General Issues: Leadless Pacemaker Devices Prepared for the February 18, 2016 meeting of the Circulatory System Devices Advisory Panel Gaithersburg Hilton; Gaithersburg, MD. 2016; <https://www.fda.gov/media/95842/download>. Accessed April 2, 2021.
12. American Heart Association. Statement of the American Heart Association to the Food and Drug Administration Circulatory System Devices Panel February 18, 2016: Leadless Cardiac Pacemaker Devices. 2016; <https://www.fda.gov/media/95586/download>. Accessed April 2, 2021.
13. Reddy VY, Miller MA, Knops RE, et al. Retrieval of the Leadless Cardiac Pacemaker: A Multicenter Experience. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. Dec 2016; 9(12). PMID 27932427
14. Reddy VY, Knops RE, Sperzel J, et al. Permanent leadless cardiac pacing: results of the LEADLESS trial. *Circulation*. Apr 08 2014; 129(14): 1466-71. PMID 24664277
15. Knops RE, Tjong FV, Neuzil P, et al. Chronic performance of a leadless cardiac pacemaker: 1-year follow-up of the LEADLESS trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Apr 21 2015; 65(15): 1497-504. PMID 25881930
16. Lakkireddy D, Knops R, Atwater B, et al. A worldwide experience of the management of battery failures and chronic device retrieval of the Nanostim leadless pacemaker. *Heart Rhythm*. Dec 2017; 14(12): 1756-1763. PMID 28705736
17. Sperzel J, Defaye P, Delnoy PP, et al. Primary safety results from the LEADLESS Observational Study. *Europace*. Sep 01 2018; 20(9): 1491-1497. PMID 29365073
18. Zuckerman B, Shein M, Paulsen J, et al. Circulatory System Devices Panel Meeting: Leadless Pacemakers. FDA Presentation. February 18, 2016;

- <https://www.fda.gov/downloads/AdvisoryCommittees/CommitteesMeetingMaterials/MedicalDevices/MedicalDevicesAdvisoryCommittee/CirculatorySystemDevicesPanel/UCM486733.pdf>. Accessed April 2, 2021.
19. Ritter P, Duray GZ, Zhang S, et al. The rationale and design of the Micra Transcatheter Pacing Study: safety and efficacy of a novel miniaturized pacemaker. *Europace*. May 2015; 17(5): 807-13. PMID 25855677
 20. Ritter P, Duray GZ, Steinwender C, et al. Early performance of a miniaturized leadless cardiac pacemaker: the Micra Transcatheter Pacing Study. *Eur Heart J*. Oct 01 2015; 36(37): 2510-9. PMID 26045305
 21. Tjong FVY, Beurskens NEG, de Groot JR, et al. Health-related quality of life impact of a transcatheter pacing system. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Dec 2018; 29(12): 1697-1704. PMID 30168233
 22. Reynolds D, Duray GZ, Omar R, et al. A Leadless Intracardiac Transcatheter Pacing System. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 11 2016; 374(6): 533-41. PMID 26551877
 23. Lloyd M, Reynolds D, Sheldon T, et al. Rate adaptive pacing in an intracardiac pacemaker. *Heart Rhythm*. Feb 2017; 14(2): 200-205. PMID 27871854
 24. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data (SSED): Micra Transcatheter Pacing System (PMS P150033). 2016; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf15/P150033B.pdf. Accessed April 2, 2021.
 25. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). Circulatory System Devices Panel Meeting (transcript). February 18, 2016. <https://wayback.archive-it.org/7993/20190426232640/https://www.fda.gov/downloads/AdvisoryCommittees/CommitteesMeetingMaterials/MedicalDevices/MedicalDevicesAdvisoryCommittee/CirculatorySystemDevicesPanel/UCM489547.pdf>. Accessed April 2, 2021.
 26. Medtronic. Meet Micra (brochure). 2018; http://www.medtronic.com/content/dam/medtronic-com/01_crhf/brady/pdfs/medtronic-micra-transcatheter-pacing-system-hcp-brochure.pdf. Accessed April 2, 2021.
 27. Grubman E, Ritter P, Ellis CR, et al. To retrieve, or not to retrieve: System revisions with the Micra transcatheter pacemaker. *Heart Rhythm*. Dec 2017; 14(12): 1801-1806. PMID 28713024
 28. Roberts PR, Clementy N, Al Samadi F, et al. A leadless pacemaker in the real-world setting: The Micra Transcatheter Pacing System Post-Approval Registry. *Heart Rhythm*. Sep 2017; 14(9): 1375-1379. PMID 28502871
 29. El-Chami MF, Brock Johansen J, Zaidi A, et al. Leadless Pacemaker Implant in Patients with Pre-Existing Infections: Results from the Micra Post-Approval Registry. Paper presented at: Heart Rhythm Scientific Sessions. 2018 May 10; Boston, MA.
 30. El-Chami MF, Al-Samadi F, Clementy N, et al. Updated performance of the Micra transcatheter pacemaker in the real-world setting: A comparison to the investigational study and a transvenous historical control. *Heart Rhythm*. Dec 2018; 15(12): 1800-1807. PMID 30103071
 31. Duray GZ, Ritter P, El-Chami M, et al. Long-term performance of a transcatheter pacing system: 12-Month results from the Micra Transcatheter Pacing Study. *Heart Rhythm*. May 2017; 14(5): 702-709. PMID 28192207
 32. El-Chami MF, Johansen JB, Zaidi A, et al. Leadless pacemaker implant in patients with pre-existing infections: Results from the Micra postapproval registry. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Apr 2019; 30(4): 569-574. PMID 30661279
 33. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Leadless cardiac pacemaker implantation for bradyarrhythmias [IPG626]. August 29, 2018; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg626>. Accessed April 2, 2021.
 34. Blomstrom-Lundqvist C, Traykov V, Erba PA, et al. European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) international consensus document on how to prevent, diagnose, and treat cardiac implantable electronic device infections-endorsed by the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS), the Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS), the Latin American Heart Rhythm Society (LAHRS), International Society for Cardiovascular Infectious Diseases (ISCVID) and the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ESCMID) in collaboration with the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Europace*. Apr 01 2020; 22(4): 515-549. PMID 31702000
 35. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Decision Memo for Leadless Pacemakers (CAG-00448N). 2017; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-decision-memo.aspx?NCAId=285>. Accessed April 2, 2021.
 36. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Coverage with Evidence Development: Leadless Pacemakers. 2017; <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Coverage/Coverage-with-Evidence-Development/Leadless-Pacemakers>. Updated March 30, 2021. Accessed April 2, 2021.

POLICY HISTORY - THIS POLICY WAS APPROVED BY THE FEP® PHARMACY AND MEDICAL POLICY COMMITTEE ACCORDING TO THE HISTORY BELOW:

Date	Action	Description
September 2019	New Policy	Policy created with literature review through May 15, 2019. The Micra transcatheter pacing system may be considered medically necessary as a second line treatment in patients who not eligible for conventional pacemakers when all of the specified conditions are met.
September 2020	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through May 29, 2020; references added. Policy statements unchanged.
September 2021	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through April 2, 2021; no references added. Policy statements unchanged.