Autologous Cell Therapy for Cardiac and Peripheral Arterial Disease
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INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

The following Coverage Policy applies to health benefit plans administered by Cigna Companies. Certain Cigna Companies and/or lines of business only provide utilization review services to clients and do not make coverage determinations. References to standard benefit plan language and coverage determinations do not apply to those clients. Coverage Policies are intended to provide guidance in interpreting certain standard benefit plans administered by Cigna Companies. Please note, the terms of a customer’s particular benefit plan document [Group Service Agreement, Evidence of Coverage, Certificate of Coverage, Summary Plan Description (SPD) or similar plan document] may differ significantly from the standard benefit plans upon which these Coverage Policies are based. For example, a customer’s benefit plan document may contain a specific exclusion related to a topic addressed in a Coverage Policy. In the event of a conflict, a customer’s benefit plan document always supersedes the information in the Coverage Policies. In the absence of a controlling federal or state coverage mandate, benefits are ultimately determined by the terms of the applicable benefit plan document. Coverage determinations in each specific instance require consideration of 1) the terms of the applicable benefit plan document in effect on the date of service; 2) any applicable laws/regulations; 3) any relevant collateral source materials including Coverage Policies and; 4) the specific facts of the particular situation. Coverage Policies relate exclusively to the administration of health benefit plans. Coverage Policies are not recommendations for treatment and should never be used as treatment guidelines. In certain markets, delegated vendor guidelines may be used to support medical necessity and other coverage determinations.

Coverage Policy

Transplantation of cells into the myocardium is considered experimental, investigational or unproven for ANY indication.

Autologous intra-arterial or intra-muscular bone marrow cell transplantation is considered experimental, investigational or unproven for peripheral arterial disease and other occlusive conditions.

Overview

This Coverage Policy addresses autologous cell therapy using several cell types, proposed as a method to treat heart damage or peripheral arterial disease.

General Background

Autologous Cell Therapy for Treatment of Damaged Myocardium

Autologous cell therapy has been proposed for the treatment of damaged myocardium associated with cardiovascular disease, including acute myocardial infarction (MI), cardiomyopathy, and heart failure. The use of
several cell types, including skeletal myoblasts, mesenchymal stem cells (also referred to as bone marrow stromal cells), and hematopoietic stem cells, has been explored for myocardial repair. Skeletal myoblasts are tissue-specific stem cells. Immature myoblasts contained in skeletal muscle can fuse with surrounding myoblasts or with damaged muscle fibers to regenerate functional skeletal muscle. Mesenchymal stem cells and hematopoietic stem cells have the capacity to differentiate into any type of cell, depending on their microenvironment. As they mature, they can acquire all the characteristics of the target tissue, such as myocardium and cardiac vessels. Cells may be delivered systemically or locally, and must then proliferate to provide adequate new tissue prior to differentiating into functional cardiomyocytes that couple with the myocardium. Some cells may require significant manipulation prior to implantation. Stem cells may be delivered via infusion into the coronary arteries or injection into the ventricular wall. The mechanism of action of cell therapy for damaged myocardium is not entirely clear and is likely multifactorial. Stem cells may improve cardiac function by increasing vascularity in the area of ischemia, and may also acquire phenotypic properties of the neighboring cardiac myocytes. In the case of acute MI, improved microvascular function may result in improved regional and global left ventricular function.

Although cell therapy for damaged myocardium is a promising treatment option, randomized controlled trials with long-term follow-up are necessary to establish the efficacy of these procedures and address a number of unresolved, technical issues, including optimum cell type, ideal number of cells, factors that promote engraftment, surgical delivery method and patient selection criteria.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates cells that are processed in commercial laboratories, as well as the surgical devices used to inject the cells into the myocardium. The FDA has not yet issued approvals for any technology associated with the transplantation of autologous cells for the treatment of damaged myocardium. MyoCell™ and MyoCath™ (BioHeart, Fort Lauderdale, FL) are currently undergoing studies for investigation for FDA approval. MyoCell, which consists of expanded autologous skeletal myoblast, is delivered by the MyoCath, a transendocardial injection catheter. The system is being evaluated for feasibility as well as safety and efficacy in the treatment of post-infarct deterioration of cardiac function in subjects with congestive heart failure.

Literature Review: Autologous Cell Therapy for Treatment of Damaged Myocardium
Nicolaou et al (2018) performed a multicenter, double-blind randomized controlled trial (RCT) that evaluated whether autologous bone marrow–derived mononuclear cell (BMMC) therapy affects left ventricular (LV) function in patients with ST elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) who were successfully reperfused with either primary percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) or a fibrinolytic. This study included patients 30–80 years old with a left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤ 50%, a successful angioplasty of infarct-related artery and regional dysfunction in the infarct-related area analyzed before cell injection. The patients (n=121) were randomized into two groups. Group one (n=66) received BMMC and group two (n=55) received placebo. The primary endpoint was mean improvement in LVEF at six months, analyzed by MRI. Secondary endpoints included other LV remodeling. The primary endpoint, mean LVEF, was not clinically significant between both groups at baseline and at six months (p=0.21, p=0.59, respectively). Parameters of left ventricular remodeling, such as systolic and diastolic volumes, as well as infarct size, were also similar between groups. Author noted limitations of the study included the lack of a core cell-processing laboratory, the unbalanced enrollment by the centers, and the use of the LVEF improvement may not be the ideal endpoint to investigate cell-infusion efficacy due to its dynamic changes in the acute phase. The study concluded that intracoronary delivery of autologous BM-MC to patients with STEMI did not improve LV function or decrease scar size.

Naseri et al. (2018) reported the results of a phase II/III, double blind, randomized controlled trial (COMPARE CPM-RMI) which assessed the safety and efficacy of autologous bone marrow-derived cell therapy (CD133+ and mononuclear cells [MNCs]) compared to placebo in patients with recent myocardial infarction (RMI) status post coronary artery bypass graft. Patients were included if they were age 18 to 75 years, 10 days to three months following first ST elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) of 20–45%, target lesion located in the left anterior descending (LAD) section, candidate for coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) and at least four akinetic segments. Patients (n=77) were randomly assigned to receive CD133+ (n=21), MNC (n=30) or placebo (n=26). The primary outcome was the improvement of myocardial perfusion and left ventricular (LV) function in STEMI patients after injections of bone marrow derived cells into the infarcted
myocardium compared to the placebo group. In addition, different effects of CD133+ and MNC cells at determined endpoints were evaluated. The primary outcome was assessed by changes in global left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) at rest by gated single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT). Secondary outcomes were: adverse cardiac events that included death, reinfarction, implantable cardioverter defibrillator (ICD) placement, infection, and arrhythmia. Changes in wall motion score (WMS), decreased systolic wall thickening of the myocardium, non-viable (NV) segments, and perfusion defect score (PDS) were assessed by gated SPECT, and NYHA classification. Nine patients were lost to follow-up. There were no related serious adverse events reported. The intramyocardial transplantation of both cell types indicated a clinically significant increase in left ventricular ejection fraction by 9% (p=0.01) and improved decreased systolic wall thickening by –3.7 (p=0.03). The CD133+ group showed a clinically significant decrease in non-viable segments by 75% (p=0.001) compared to the placebo and 60% (p=0.01) compared to the MNC group. We observed this improvement at both the six and 18 month time points. Author noted limitations included the small patient size and due to limited access, the patients did not undergo MRI imaging which is the gold standard for cardiac function. The study concluded that intramyocardial injections of CD133+ cells or MNCs appeared to be safe and efficient with superiority of CD133+ cells for patients with RMI. Larger studies are needed to validate the outcomes of this study.

Bartunek et al. (2017) conducted a double-blind, sham-randomized controlled trial (CHART-1) which evaluated the therapeutic efficacy and safety of cardiopoietic cells delivered endomyocardially in patients with symptomatic ischemic heart failure on guideline-directed therapy. The study included patients between 18 and 79 years old, left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) ≥ 35%, ischemic heart failure without the need for revascularization, heart failure hospitalization, or outpatient vasoactive heart failure therapy (e.g. vasodilators, positive inotropic agents, vasopressors or diuretics) within 12 months. Patients were in New York Heart Association (NYHA) class II or greater at screening, and within 12 months were NYHA class III or IV or Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support (INTERMACS) class four. Required inclusion criteria was guideline-directed medical therapy, a six minute walk distance > 100 to ≤ 400 meters and Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHFQ) score > 30. Patients (n=271) were randomly assigned to receive a cardiopoietic cell injection (n=120) or a sham control procedure (n=151). The outcome efficacy was assessed at 39 weeks measuring all-cause mortality, worsening heart failure events, MLHFQ score, 6-min walk distance, left ventricular end-systolic volume (LVESV) and LVEF. The safety assessment through week 39 included all-cause mortality, rehospitalization, cardiac transplantation, myocardial infarction, stroke, aborted sudden death (resuscitated sudden death or appropriate implantable cardioverter defibrillator [ICD] shocks), along with serious and non-serious adverse events. The primary endpoint across the total study cohort was neutral (p=0.27). There was no significant between-group differences noted for individual components of the primary outcome, but there was a clinically significant improvement in the six minute walk distance (p=0.07) in the cardiopoietic cell injection group compared to the sham control group. Fourteen patients experienced catheter-procedure related serious adverse events which included the following: ventricular tachyarrhythmia, left bundle branch block, dissection of the ascending aorta requiring surgery, transient ischemic attack, femoral artery stenosis, and pericardial effusion. No difference was observed in serious adverse events between groups. Limitations noted by the authors included the short-term follow-up and the study population was Caucasian and predominantly male. The authors concluded that further evaluation of cardiopoietic cell therapy in patients with elevated end-diastolic volume is warranted.

Xiao et al. (2017) performed an RCT (n=52) to compare efficacy of intracoronary administration of bone marrow mononuclear cells (BMMC) or mesenchymal stem cells (BMSC) in patients with dilated cardiomyopathy (DCM). Patients were randomized to receive intracoronary infusion of BMMC (n=16), BMSC (n=17) or equal volume normal saline (n=20/control group). Inclusion criteria were age 18–75 years with normal coronary arteries, LVEF < 40%, New York Heart Association (NYHA) functional class II-IV, and a proportion of fixed defects < 40%. Patients were excluded who had coronary artery disease based on coronary angiography prior to cell delivery, ventricular arrhythmias, and any comorbidity with an impact on survival. All patients received optimal medical therapy as recommended by current guidelines. The primary endpoints of the study were changes in NYHA class, LVEF, left ventricular end-diastolic diameter (LVEDd), and the proportion of fixed defects. Major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) included procedural complications, any new-onset arrhythmia, hemodynamic instability, death by any cause. At three months of follow-up, LVEF, NYHA class, and myocardial perfusion had improved significantly in the BMSC group (p=0.004, 0.020, and 0.019, respectively) and there were significant changes in LVEF and NYHA class in the BMMC group compared with control patients (p=0.042 and 0.047,
improves global and regional LV function when delivered two to three weeks following first MI. The authors noted percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). The study examined if intracoronary delivery of autologous BMCs patients with significant LV dysfunction (LV ejection fraction \(\text{LVEF} \leq\) the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute–sponsored Cardiovascular Cell Therapy Research Network of 87 Traverse et al. (2011) reported on results of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial (LateTIME) of further evaluation of efficacy and safety needs to be validated in future phase II/III studies.

Traverse et al., for the Cardiovascular Cell Therapy Research Network (CCTRN) (2012) conducted a randomized, double-blind placebo controlled trial to determine the effect of intracoronary autologous bone marrow mononuclear cell (BMC) delivery after ST elevated myocardial infarction (STEMI). The primary end points were change in global (left ventricular ejection fraction \(\text{LVEF}\)) and regional (wall motion) LV function in infarct and border zones at six months, and change in LV function as affected by timing of treatment on day three vs. day seven. At six months, there was no significant increase in LVEF for the BMC group vs. the placebo group (\(p=0.96\)). There was no significant treatment effect on regional LV function observed in either infarct or border zones, and there were no significant differences in change in global LV function for patients treated at day three or day seven (\(p=0.70\)). Treatment timing had no significant effect on regional LV function recovery.

Duckers et al. (2011) reported on a Phase II, randomized trial that evaluated the percutaneous intramyocardial transplantation of autologous skeletal myoblasts in congestive heart failure patients (SEISMIC trial). The patients were randomized 2:1 to autologous skeletal myoblast therapy vs. optimal medical treatment. The primary safety end-point was identified as the incidence of procedural and device related serious adverse events, whereas the efficacy endpoints were defined as the change in global left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) by multigated acquisition (MUGA) scan, change in New York Heart Association (NYHA) classification of heart failure and in the distance achieved during a six minute walk test (6MW) at six month follow-up. Forty subjects were randomized to the treatment arm (n=26), or to the control arm (n=14). There were 12 sustained arrhythmic events and one death after episodes of ventricular tachycardia (VT) in the treatment group and 14 events in the control group (\(p=\)ns). At six month follow-up, 6MW distance improved by 60.3\pm54.1 meters in the treated group as compared to no improvement in the control group (0.4\pm185.7 meters; \(p=\)ns). In the control group, 28.6% experienced worsening of heart failure status (4/14), while 14.3% experienced an improvement in NYHA classification (2/14). In the myoblast-treatment arm, one patient experienced a deterioration in NYHA classification (8.0%), whereas five patients improved one or two classes (20.0%; \(p=0.06\)). However, therapy did not improve the global LVEF as measured by MUGA at the six month follow-up. This study is preliminary and further evaluation of efficacy and safety needs to be validated in future phase II/III studies.

Traverse et al. (2011) reported on results of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial (LateTIME) of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute–sponsored Cardiovascular Cell Therapy Research Network of 87 patients with significant LV dysfunction (LV ejection fraction \(\text{LVEF} \leq 45\%\)) following successful primary percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). The study examined if intracoronary delivery of autologous BMCs improves global and regional LV function when delivered two to three weeks following first MI, the authors noted
that clinical trials suggest that intracoronary delivery of autologous bone marrow mononuclear cells (BMCs) may improve left ventricular (LV) function when administered within the first week following myocardial infarction (MI). Since a substantial number of patients may not present for early cell delivery, the efficacy of autologous BMC delivery two to three weeks post-MI warrants investigation. Intracoronary infusion of autologous BMCs (total nucleated cells) or placebo (BMC: placebo, 2:1) was performed. The main outcomes were changes in global (LVEF) and regional (wall motion) LV function in the infarct and border zone between baseline and six months, measured by cardiac magnetic resonance imaging. Secondary end points included changes in LV volumes and infarct size. Change between baseline and six months in the BMC group vs. placebo for mean LVEF (48.7% to 49.2% vs. 45.3% to 48.8%; between-group mean difference, −3.00; 95% CI, −7.05 to 0.95), wall motion in the infarct zone (6.2 to 6.5 mm vs. 4.9 to 5.9 mm; between-group mean difference, −0.70; 95% CI, −2.78 to 1.34), and wall motion in the border zone (16.0 to 16.6 mm vs. 16.1 to 19.3 mm; between-group mean difference, −2.60; 95% CI, −6.03 to 0.77) were not statistically significant. No significant change in LV volumes and infarct volumes was observed; both groups decreased by a similar amount at six months vs. baseline. The authors concluded that among patients with MI and LV dysfunction following reperfusion with PCI, intracoronary infusion of autologous BMCs vs. intracoronary placebo infusion, two to three weeks after PCI, did not improve global or regional function at six months.

Menasche et al. (2008) reported on results of a Phase II study of skeletal myoblast transplantation referred to as the myoblast autologous grafting in ischemic cardiomyopathy or MAGIC trial (Menasche, et al., 2004; Menasche, et al., 2008). The randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial involved 97 patients in 30 clinical centers in several European countries and Canada. Patients received either cells grown from a skeletal muscle biopsy or a placebo solution injected in and around the scar. An implantable cardioverter-defibrillator was placed in all patients. The primary outcomes were the six-month changes in global and regional LV function as assessed by echocardiography. The safety end-points included a composite index of major cardiac adverse events and ventricular arrhythmias. Patients were randomized to receive myoblasts (400 [n=33] or 800 [n=34] million) or the placebo (n=30). The myoblast transfer did not improve regional or global LV function beyond that seen in the control group. The absolute change in ejection fraction (median [interquartile range]) between six months and baseline was 4.4% (0.2; 7.3), 3.4% (−0.3; 12.4), and 5.2% (−4.4; 11.0) in the placebo, low-dose, and high-dose groups, respectively (p=0.95). There were a higher number of arrhythmic events in the myoblast-treated patients, but six-month rates of major cardiac adverse events and of ventricular arrhythmias did not differ significantly between the groups.

The REPAIR-AMI trial (Reinfusion of Enriched Progenitor Cells and Infarct Remodeling in Acute Myocardial Infarction), a double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter trial, included 204 patients and examined whether intracoronary infusion of enriched BMC is associated with improved global LV function in patients with MI treated with state-of-the-art methods (Schachinger, et al., 2006). At four months, it was noted that the absolute improvement in the global LVEF was significantly greater in the BMC group than in the placebo group. Patients with baseline LVEF at or below the median value of 48.9% appeared to derive the most benefit. At one year, intracoronary infusion of BMC was associated with a reduction in the prespecified combined clinical end point of death, recurrence of MI, and any revascularization procedure. Assmus, et al. (2010) reported on two-year outcomes from the REPAIR-AMI trial. At two years, the cumulative end point of death, myocardial infarction, or necessity for revascularization was noted to be reduced in the BMC group compared with placebo group (hazard ratio, 0.58; 95% CI, 0.36–0.94; p=0.025). In addition, the combined end point death and recurrence of myocardial infarction and rehospitalization for heart failure, reflecting progression toward heart failure, was reduced in the BMC group (hazard ratio, 0.26; 95% CI, 0.085–0.77; p=0.015). The authors note that larger studies focusing on clinical event rates are warranted to confirm the effects of BMC administration on mortality and progression of heart failure in patients with AMIs.

Lalu et al. (2018) conducted a systematic review of randomized controlled trials, nonrandomized controlled trials and observational studies that evaluated the safety and efficacy of mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) for acute myocardial infarction (AMI) and ischemic heart failure (IHF). A total of 23 studies (1167 patients) met the inclusion criteria. Of these, 11 studies evaluated AMI (n=528) and 12 studies evaluated IHF (639 patients). There was no association between MSCs and acute adverse events. The primary outcome was safety, which was assessed by adverse events. The secondary outcome was efficacy, which was assessed by mortality and left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF). No significant difference in mortality was noted. There was a significant improvement in overall LVEF in patients who received MSCs. In a post hoc analysis using weighted mean
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difference, patients treated with MSCs had a 4% increase in ejection fraction compared to control. Results of the study indicated that MSC therapy for ischemic heart disease appears to be safe. The authors concluded that there is a need for well-designed randomized control trials with rigorous adverse event reporting and comprehensive assessment of cardiac function to further establish a clear risk-benefit profile and efficacy of MSCs.

Clifford et al. (2012) conducted a Cochrane systematic review to evaluate the effectiveness of adult bone marrow-derived stem cells to treat acute myocardial infarction (AMI). The trial included 33 randomized controlled trials (1765 participants) that compared autologous stem/progenitor cells with no autologous stem/progenitor cells in patients with AMI. Stem/progenitor cells were not associated with statistically significant changes in the incidence of mortality or morbidity. In short term follow-up, stem cell treatment was observed to improve LVEF significantly (weighted mean difference [WMD] 2.87, 95% CI 2.00 to 3.73). The improvement in LVEF was maintained over long-term follow-up of 12-61 months (WMD 3.75, 95% CI 2.57-4.93). The authors concluded that the results of systematic review suggest that moderate improvement in global heart function is significant and sustained long-term. However, because mortality rates after successful revascularization of the culprit arteries are very low, larger number of participants would be required to assess the full clinical effect of this treatment. Standardization of methodology, cell dosing and cell product formulation, timing of cell transplantation and patient selection may also be required to reduce the substantial heterogeneity observed among the included studies.

Abdel-Latif et al. (2007) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and cohort studies of bone marrow derived cells (BMCs) transplantation to treat ischemic heart disease. Eighteen studies (12 randomized controlled studies and six cohort studies) with 999 patients were included in the review. The main outcomes for the review were change from baseline in mean LV ejection fraction, infarct scar size, LV end-systolic volume and LV end-diastolic volume. The adult BMCs used in the studies included BM mononuclear cells, BM mesenchymal stem cells, and BM-derived circulating progenitor cells. When BMC transplantation was compared to controls, the results included: improved left ventricular ejection fraction (pooled difference, 3.66%; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.93%–5.40%; p<0.001); reduced infarct scar size (~5.49%; 95% CI, −9.10% to −1.88%; p=0.003); and reduced left ventricular end-systolic volume (~4.80 ml; 95% CI, −8.20 to −1.41 ml; p=0.006). The authors note that the available evidence suggests that BMC transplantation is associated with modest improvements in physiologic and anatomic parameters in patients with both acute MI and chronic ischemic heart disease. The results support the conduction of large randomized trials to evaluate the long-term impact of BMC therapy as compared with standard of care on patient-important outcomes.

Lipinski et al. (2007) performed a meta-analysis of clinical trials on intracoronary cell therapy after acute MI to determine the impact of intracoronary cell therapy on post-infarction LV function. Ten controlled studies with 698 patients were included in the review, with a median follow-up of six months (range of three to 18 months). The primary end point in the studies was change in LVEF, with secondary end points including changes in infarct size, cardiac dimensions, and dichotomous clinical outcomes. Review of the studies indicated that subjects that received intracoronary cell therapy had a significant improvement in LVEF (3.0% increase; 95% CI 1.9 to 4.1; p<0.001), as well as a reduction in infarct size (~5.6%; 95% CI -8.7 to -2.5; p<0.001) and end-systolic volume (~7.4 ml; 95% CI -12.2 to -2.7; p=0.002), and a trend toward reduced end-diastolic volume (~4.6 ml; 95% CI -10.4 to 1.1; p=0.11). It was also noted that intracoronary cell therapy was associated with a minimally significant reduction in recurrent acute MI (p=0.04) and with trends toward reduced death, rehospitalization for heart failure and repeat revascularization. Meta-regression suggested the possibility of an existence of a dose-response association between injected cell volume and LVEF change (p=0.066). The authors concluded that the data confirms the beneficial impact of this therapy, and further multicenter randomized trials are supported.

**Cell Therapy for Peripheral Arterial Disease**

Peripheral arterial (PAD) generally refers to a disorder that obstructs the blood supply to the lower or upper extremities. It is generally caused by atherosclerosis, but may result from thrombosis, embolism, vasculitis, fibromuscular dysplasia, or entrapment. PAD correlates strongly with risk of major cardiovascular events, and is frequently associated with coronary and cerebral atherosclerosis (Creager, et al., 2011). The main symptom of PAD is intermittent claudication. More severe symptoms include pain at rest, ulceration and gangrene. Worsening of the condition may lead to critical limb ischemia. The goal for treatment of PAD is reduction in cardiovascular morbidity and mortality, and improvement in quality of life by decreasing symptoms of
claudication, eliminating rest pain, and preserving limb viability. Treatment may include risk factor modification by lifestyle measures and pharmacologic therapy to reduce the risk of adverse cardiovascular events, such as MI, stroke, and death. The symptoms of claudication may be treated with pharmacotherapy or exercise rehabilitation. Management of critical limb ischemia often includes endovascular interventions or surgical reconstruction to improve blood supply and to maintain limb viability. Revascularization may be performed in some patients with disabling symptoms of claudication that persist despite exercise therapy and pharmacotherapy (Creager, et al., 2011).

To treat the symptoms of severe forms of PAD where revascularization procedures are not possible, research has been focusing on the use of bone marrow (BM)-derived stem and progenitor cells, which have been utilized in a potential new therapeutic option to induce therapeutic angiogenesis. The goal with this treatment is to improve the vascularization of the ischemic leg so that perfusion increases sufficiently for wound healing to occur, and to resolve pain at rest. Intramuscular and intra-arterial injection or a combination of both has been investigated in treatment of PAD. The underlying principle of intramuscular injection is the creation of a cell depot with paracrine activity in the ischemic area, although the mechanisms by which transplanted cells improve the patients’ clinical status are unclear (Lawall, et al., 2011). Intramuscular injection is generally administered into the gastrocnemius muscle along a symmetric grid with a fixed number of injections (between 20 and 60) in most trials. There is no apparent direct comparison between different intramuscular injection sites and numbers of injections. Issues to be resolved include selection of optimal cell type, isolation method, cell number, and the role of colony stimulating factors, route of administration, and paracrine stimulation mechanisms (Lawall, et al., 2011).

Autologous intra-arterial or intra-muscular bone marrow cell transplantation for peripheral arterial disease and other occlusive conditions is an emerging technology. Studies evaluating this treatment approach are limited. Additional well designed randomized controlled trials are needed to evaluate the safety, efficacy, and long-term outcomes of this procedure.

### Literature Review: Stem-Cell Transplantation for Peripheral Arterial Disease

Xie et al. (2018) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 23 randomized controlled trials (n=962 patients) to review evidence for the safety and efficacy of autologous stem cell therapy in critical limb ischemia (CLI). The included patients were ineligible for surgical or percutaneous revascularization. The studies included the following types of stem cells: bone marrow mononuclear cells, bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells, bone marrow stem cells, peripheral blood mononuclear cells, peripheral blood stem cells, CD34+, or CD133+ stem cells. The transplantation method of stem cell was intramuscular or intra-arterial. The mean follow-ups of the studies were three months, six months and 12 months. Meta-analysis showed that cell therapy significantly increased the probability of ulcer healing, angiogenesis and reduced the amputation rates (p<0.00001, p<0.0001, and p<0.0001, respectively) compared to the control group. Ankle-brachial index (ABI) and pain-free walking distance were significantly better in the cell therapy group than in the control group (p<0.01). The authors concluded that autologous stem cell therapy is safe and effective in CLI. However, higher quality and larger RCTs are required for further investigation to support clinical application of stem cell transplantation.

Rigato et al. (2017) performed a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of autologous cell therapy for intractable peripheral arterial disease (PAD)/critical limb ischemia (CLI). RCTs (19 studies/837 patients), non-randomized trials (n=7 studies/338 patients), and non-controlled studies (n=41 studies/1177 patients) were included in the analysis. Patients selected in studies were ineligible for surgical or percutaneous revascularization. The cell products used in studies included BMMNCs, BMMSCs, or PBMNCs. The primary outcome was the rate of major amputation (defined as the removal of the limb of a part of it above the ankle) in the cell therapy versus control group. Secondary outcomes included amputation free survival and complete wound healing. Follow-up timeframes ranged from six to ten months. A primary meta-analysis was performed on all RCTs (n=19 studies). For the primary outcome, cell therapy was associated with a statistically significant reduction in amputation rate (p=0.0004) and increased probability of amputation-free survival (p=0.01). Mortality was not significantly improved (p=0.39). Cell therapy increased the probability of complete wound healing by 59%. In a sub-analysis of only randomized placebo-controlled trials (n=11 studies), cell therapy was associated with non-significant improvements in amputation rate (p=0.12), amputation-free survival (p=0.36), and wound healing (p=0.07). When the analysis was further limited to RCTs with a low risk of bias (n≤3 studies depending on the outcome), cell therapy appeared to confer no benefit for all endpoints. In general cell
therapy was found to be associated with mild and primarily transient adverse events. The secondary analysis (i.e., all controlled trials; n=1175 patients) showed that approximately one amputation per year could potentially be avoided for every two patients successfully treated with cell therapy. Although the overall results of this analysis suggest that cell therapy may be safe and effective in treating this subset of patients with PAD/CLI, the validity is challenged by limitations of low-moderate quality and high heterogeneity of studies. Additional well-designed RCTs with long-term follow-up are needed to confirm these findings.

Perin et al. (2017) published results of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial (n=82) to evaluate the effect of administration of autologous bone marrow-derived aldehyde dehydrogenase bright (ALDHbr) cells (n=41 subjects) versus cell-free placebo (n=41 subjects) in individuals with PAD and intermittent claudication. Patients aged 40 years and older with a diagnosis of atherosclerotic lower extremity PAD and symptom-limiting intermittent claudication were recruited for the Patients with Intermittent Claudication Injected with ALDH Bright Cells (PACE) trial. Subjects had to exhibit greater claudication symptoms in one leg (the index leg), with documentation of no aorto-iliac (inflow) stenosis and with a significant (≥50%) stenosis or occlusion of at least one infra-inguinal arterial segment (e.g., the superficial femoral artery, popliteal artery, and/or infra-popliteal arteries). Patients with prior index leg bypass grafts were included only when the bypass graft was occluded. The primary endpoints included change from baseline to six months in peak walking time (PWT), capillary perfusion measured by magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and safety. The treated study cohort included 38 participants in the ALDHbr group and 40 participants in the placebo group. At six-month follow-up, no statistically significant changes were found for any of the four primary efficacy endpoints in response to the administration of ALDHbr cells. Between onset of study procedures and the six month follow-up visit, one serious adverse event (limb ischemia requiring revascularization) occurred in the ALDHbr group. There were five serious adverse events in five participants in the placebo group, including a diagnosis of bladder cancer, limb ischemia requiring revascularization, a coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) procedure, one percutaneous intervention (PCI), and one hospitalization for anemia. In terms of safety, all reported events were determined to be unrelated to therapy, however ALDHbr cell administration was not found to be effective in changing the stated outcome measures.

Teraa et al. (2015) conducted the double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled Rejuvenating Endothelial Progenitor Cells via Transcutaneous Intra-arterial Supplementation (JUVENTAS) trial (n=160) to examine the effectiveness of repetitive intra-arterial infusion of bone marrow mononuclear cells (BMMNCs) (n=81) versus placebo (n=79) for the prevention of major amputation in patients with severe, non-revascularizable limb ischemia. Inclusion criteria were severe infra-popliteal PAD, or evident non-revascularizable severe atherosclerotic lesions confirmed by imaging studies. Patients were excluded if there was a history of neoplasm or malignancy in the past 10 years or concomitant disease with life expectancy of less than one year. A total of 15 patients, six in the BM-MNC and nine in the placebo group, did not complete the scheduled three infusions due to the occurrence of a major amputation or mortality. The primary outcome was major amputation at six months, with secondary outcomes of all-cause mortality, occurrence of malignancy, or hospitalization due to infection. No significant differences were observed for any outcome measures. Therefore it was concluded that repetitive intra-arterial infusion of autologous BMMNCs into the common femoral artery did not reduce major amputation rates in patients with severe, non-revascularizable limb ischemia in comparison with placebo.

A Phase II double-blind placebo-controlled study was conducted by Poole et al. (2013) to investigate whether therapy with granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (GM-CSF) improves exercise capacity in patients with intermittent claudication (n=159). Patients were randomized to receive four weeks of subcutaneous injections of GM-CSF, 5000 ug/day three times per week (n=79), or placebo (n=80). There was no significant difference between groups in the primary outcome measure, peak treadmill walking time (PWT), at three months (mean difference in change in PWT, 53 seconds [95% CI, -6 to 112], p=0.08).

Walter et al. (2011) reported on a Phase II, double-blind, randomized-start trial (PROVASA). Forty patients with critical limb ischemia received either intra-arterial administration of BMMNC or placebo followed by active treatment with BMMNC (open label) after three months. Intra-arterial administration of BMMNC did not significantly increase ankle-brachial index and, therefore, the trial missed its primary end point. It was found that cell therapy was associated with significantly improved ulcer healing (ulcer area: 3.2 ±4.7 cm² to 1.89±3.5 cm² [p=0.014]) versus placebo, 2.92±3.5 cm² to 2.89±4.1 cm² [p=0.5]) and reduced rest pain (5.2±1.8 to 2.2±1.3 [p=0.009]) versus placebo, 4.5±2.4 to 3.9±2.6 [p=0.3]) within three months. Limb salvage and amputation-free
generally safe. The authors concluded that the meta-analysis indicates that intramuscular autologous bone administration and the use of mobilized peripheral blood cells. The procedures appeared to be well-tolerated and route of administration and the use of bone marrow cells appeared to be more effective than the intra-arterial angiitis obliterans demonstrated some larger benefits than those with atherosclerotic PAD. The intra-muscular monotherapy was not associated with significant improvement in the same endpoints. Patients with thrombo-ischemia, subjective symptoms and hard endpoints (i.e., ulcer healing and amputation). However, G-CSF analysis of 37 trials indicated that autologous cell therapy was effective in improving surrogate indexes of trials and combined intra-arterial plus intramuscular in one trial. The median follow-up was six months. A meta-analysis of 37 trials indicated that autologous bone marrow derived mononuclear cells (BMMNCs) in the ischemic lower limbs of patients with critical limb ischemia (CLI) were compared with control (standard conservative treatment). No significant difference was observed between the two groups for either pain (p=0.37) or the ankle brachial pressure index (ABI) parameter. However, the treatment group showed a significantly smaller proportion of participants undergoing amputation compared with the control group (p=0.026). In the other study, following subcutaneous injections of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor (G-CSF) for five days peripheral blood derived mononuclear cells were collected and then transplanted by intramuscular injections into ischemic lower limbs. The effects were compared with daily intravenous prostaglandin E1 injections (control group). Pain reduction was greater in the treatment group than in the control group (p<0.001) as was an increase in ABI (mean increase 0.13 vs. 0.02; p<0.01). The treatment group experienced a statistically significant increase in pain-free walking distance compared with the control group (mean increase 306.4m vs. 78.6m, p=0.007). A smaller proportion of participants underwent amputation in the treatment group as compared with the control group (0% versus 36%, p=0.007). The authors concluded ABMSC therapy results in 79% limb salvage in patients suffering from CLI and FU. Lymphopenia and thrombocytopenia were identified as potential causative factors in the remaining 21% that suggest that at least a partial correction with platelet supplementation may be of use. Further studies are needed to validate these findings.

Moazzami et al. (2011) reported on a Cochrane review of local intramuscular transplantation of autologous mononuclear cells for critical lower limb ischemia. Two small, randomized studies, with a combined total of 57 patients, met the inclusion criteria. In one study the effects of intramuscular injections of bone marrow derived mononuclear cells (BMMNCs) in the ischemic lower limbs of patients with critical limb ischemia (CLI) were compared with control (standard conservative treatment). No significant difference was observed between the two groups for either pain (p=0.37) or the ankle brachial pressure index (ABI) parameter. However, the treatment group showed a significantly smaller proportion of participants undergoing amputation compared with the control group (p=0.026). In the other study, following subcutaneous injections of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor (G-CSF) for five days peripheral blood derived mononuclear cells were collected and then transplanted by intramuscular injections into ischemic lower limbs. The effects were compared with daily intravenous prostaglandin E1 injections (control group). Pain reduction was greater in the treatment group than in the control group (p<0.001) as was an increase in ABI (mean increase 0.13 vs. 0.02; p<0.01). The treatment group experienced a statistically significant increase in pain-free walking distance compared with the control group (mean increase 306.4m vs. 78.6m, p=0.007). A smaller proportion of participants underwent amputation in the treatment group as compared with the control group (0% versus 36%, p=0.007). The author concluded that the data from the published trials suggest that there is insufficient evidence to support this treatment. These results were based on only two trials which had a very small number of participants. Therefore evidence from larger, randomized, controlled trials is needed in order to provide adequate statistical power to assess the role of intramuscular mononuclear cell implantation in patients with critical limb ischemia.

Fadini et al. (2010) conducted a meta-analysis and systematic review of the literature regarding autologous stem cell therapy for PAD. Most were pilot studies that assessed the safety and feasibility of cell therapy. There were six controlled trials (four randomized and two non-randomized), plus four trials in which the non-treated limbs served as internal controls. The route of cell administration was intramuscular in 33 studies, intra-arterial in four trials and combined intra-arterial plus intramuscular in one trial. The median follow-up was six months. A meta-analysis of 37 trials indicated that autologous cell therapy was effective in improving surrogate indexes of ischemia, subjective symptoms and hard endpoints (i.e., ulcer healing and amputation). However, G-CSF monotherapy was not associated with significant improvement in the same endpoints. Patients with thromboangiitis obliterans demonstrated some larger benefits than those with atherosclerotic PAD. The intra-muscular route of administration and the use of bone marrow cells appeared to be more effective than the intra-arterial administration and the use of mobilized peripheral blood cells. The procedures appeared to be well-tolerated and generally safe. The authors concluded that the meta-analysis indicates that intramuscular autologous bone
Marrow cell therapy is a feasible, relatively safe and potentially effective therapeutic strategy for PAD patients, who are not candidates for traditional revascularization. Larger, placebo-controlled, randomized multicenter trials need to be planned and conducted to confirm these findings.

**Professional Societies/Organizations**

**American College of Cardiology (ACC)/American Heart Association (AHA)/Heart Failure Society of America (HFSA):** The use of cell therapy is not mentioned in the 2017 ACC/AHA/HFSA focused update of the 2013 American College of Cardiology Foundation (ACCF)/AHA guidelines for the management of heart failure or in the 2016 AHA/ACC guidelines on the management of patients with lower peripheral artery disease.

**Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS)**

- National Coverage Determinations (NCDs): Cellular Therapy (30.8). This is a longstanding NCD; the effective date is not posted. It is broader in scope than the Coverage Policy. Refer to the CMS NCD table of contents link in the reference section.
- Local Coverage Determinations (LCDs): No LCDs found.

**Use Outside the U.S.**

A consensus statement issued by the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) provided recommendations regarding the clinical investigation of the use of autologous adult stem cells for the treatment of acute myocardial infarction (AMI) and heart failure (HF). According to the ESC, several systematic reviews/meta-analyses have suggested that cell therapy is beneficial, however these methods are controversial and large-scale, blinded clinical trials are necessary to determine efficacy of cell therapy (Mathur, et al., 2017).

The ESC in collaboration with the European Society for Vascular Surgery (ESVS) published guidelines on the diagnosis and treatment of peripheral arterial diseases. The guidelines stated that stem cell therapy is still being investigated with insufficient evidence in favor of this treatment (Aboyans, et al., 2017).

**Coding/Billing Information**

**Note:**

1) This list of codes may not be all-inclusive.
2) Deleted codes and codes which are not effective at the time the service is rendered may not be eligible for reimbursement.

**Considered Experimental/Investigational/Unproven:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT® Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33999</td>
<td>Unlisted procedure, cardiac surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37799</td>
<td>Unlisted procedure, vascular surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38206</td>
<td>Blood-derived hematopoietic progenitor cell harvesting for transplantation, per collection; autologous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38232</td>
<td>Bone marrow harvesting for transplantation; autologous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93799</td>
<td>Unlisted cardiovascular service or procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0263T</td>
<td>Intramuscular autologous bone marrow cell therapy, with preparation of harvested cells, multiple injections, one leg, including ultrasound guidance, if performed; complete procedure including unilateral or bilateral bone marrow harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0264T</td>
<td>Intramuscular autologous bone marrow cell therapy, with preparation of harvested cells, multiple injections, one leg, including ultrasound guidance, if performed; complete procedure excluding bone marrow harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0265T</td>
<td>Intramuscular autologous bone marrow cell therapy, with preparation of harvested cells, multiple injections, one leg, including ultrasound guidance, if performed; unilateral or bilateral bone marrow harvest only for intramuscular autologous bone marrow cell therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPCS Codes</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2150</td>
<td>Bone marrow or blood-derived stem cells (peripheral or umbilical), allogeneic or autologous, harvesting, transplantation, and related complications; including: pheresis and cell preparation/storage; marrow ablative therapy; drugs, supplies, hospitalization with outpatient follow-up; medical/surgical, diagnostic, emergency, and rehabilitative services; and the number of days of pre and post transplant care in the global definition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


References


14. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). National Coverage Determination (NCD) Cellular Therapy (30.8). Longstanding. Available at URL address: https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=6&ncdver=1&CoverageSelection=Both&ArticleType=All&PolicyType=Final&s=All&KeyWord=cellular+therapy%20&KeyWordLookUp=Title&KeyWordSearchType=And&bc=gAAAAACAAA&.


25. Duckers HJ, Houtgraaf J, Hehrlein C, Schofer J, Waltenberger J, Gershlick A, et al. Final results of a phase IIa, randomised, open-label trial to evaluate the percutaneous intramyocardial transplantation of


