Medical Policy

BlueCross
BlueShield
of Kansas

An independent licensee of the
Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Title: Total Artificial Hearts and Ventricular Assist Devices

Professional
Original Effective Date: July 18, 2016
Revision Date(s): July 18, 2016;
October 1, 2016; March 29, 2017;
October 1, 2017; January 1, 2018;
October 1, 2018; October 24, 2018;
January 1, 2019
Current Effective Date: March 29, 2017

Institutional
Original Effective Date: July 18, 2016
Revision Date(s): July 18, 2016;
October 1, 2016; March 29, 2017;
October 1, 2017; January 1, 2018;
October 1, 2018; October 24, 2018;
January 1, 2019
Current Effective Date: March 29, 2017

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With end-stage heart failure	Interventions of interest are: • Ventricular assist device as a bridge to heart transplant	Comparators of interest are: • Optimal medical therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With end-stage heart failure	Interventions of interest are: • Ventricular assist device as destination therapy	Comparators of interest are: • Optimal medical therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With end-stage heart failure	Interventions of interest are: • Total artificial heart as a bridge to transplant	Comparators of interest are: • Optimal medical therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With end-stage heart failure	Interventions of interest are: • Total artificial heart as destination therapy	Comparators of interest are: • Optimal medical therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With cardiogenic shock	Interventions of interest are: • Percutaneous ventricular assist device	Comparators of interest are: • Intra-aortic balloon pump	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Morbid events • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • Who undergo high-risk cardiac procedures	Interventions of interest are: • Percutaneous ventricular assist device	Comparators of interest are: • Intra-aortic balloon pump	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Morbid events • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With cardiogenic shock refractory to intra-aortic balloon pump	Interventions of interest are: • Percutaneous ventricular assist device	Comparators of interest are: • Optimal medical therapy • Other mechanical circulatory support	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Change in disease status • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity

DESCRIPTION

A ventricular assist device (VAD) is a mechanical support attached to the native heart and vessels to augment cardiac output. The total artificial heart (TAH) replaces the native ventricles and is attached to the pulmonary artery and aorta; the native heart is typically removed. Both the VAD and TAH may be used as a bridge to heart transplantation or as destination therapy in those who are not candidates for transplantation. The VAD has also been used as a bridge to recovery in patients with reversible conditions affecting cardiac output.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this policy is to determine whether ventricular assist devices and total artificial hearts improve the net health outcome in individuals with end-stage heart failure or cardiogenic shock.

BACKGROUND

Heart Failure

Heart failure may be the consequence of a number of differing etiologies, including ischemic heart disease, cardiomyopathy, congenital heart defects, or rejection of a heart transplant. The reduction of cardiac output is considered to be severe when systemic circulation cannot meet the body's needs under minimal exertion. Heart transplantation improves quality of life and has survival rates at 1, 3, and 5 years of about 91%, 85%, and 78%, respectively.[1] The supply of donor organs has leveled off, while candidates for transplants are increasing, compelling the development of mechanical devices.

Treatment
Ventricular Assist Devices
Implantable VADs are attached to the native heart, which may have enough residual activity to withstand a device failure in the short term. In reversible conditions of heart failure, the native heart may regain some function, and weaning and explanting of the mechanical support system after months of use has been described. VADs can be classified as internal or external, electrically or pneumatically powered, and pulsatile or continuous flow. Initial devices were pulsatile, mimicking the action of a beating heart. More recent devices may use a pump, which provides continuous flow. Continuous devices may move blood in rotary or axial flow.

At least 1 VAD system developed is miniaturized and generates an artificial pulse, the HeartMate 3 Left Ventricular Assist System.[2]

Surgically implanted VADs represent a method of providing mechanical circulatory support for patients not expected to survive until a donor heart becomes available for transplant or for whom transplantation is otherwise contraindicated or unavailable. VADs are most commonly used to support the left ventricle, but right ventricular and biventricular devices may be used. The device is larger than most native hearts, and therefore the size of the patient is an important consideration: the pump may be implanted in the thorax or abdomen or remain external to the body. Inflow to the device is attached to the apex of the failed ventricle, while outflow is attached to the corresponding great artery (aorta for left ventricle, pulmonary artery for right ventricle). A small portion of ventricular wall is removed for insertion of the outflow tube; extensive cardiotomy affecting the ventricular wall may preclude VAD use.

Total Artificial Hearts
Initial research into mechanical assistance for the heart focused on the total artificial heart (TAH), a biventricular device which completely replaces the function of the

diseased heart. An internal battery required frequent recharging from an external power source. Many systems use a percutaneous power line, but a transcutaneous power-transfer coil allows for a system without lines traversing the skin, possibly reducing the risk of infection. Because the native heart must be removed, failure of the device is synonymous with cardiac death.

A fully bioprosthetic TAH, which is fully implanted in the pericardial sac and is electrohydrolically actuated, has been developed and tested in 2 patients, but is currently experimental.[3]

Percutaneous Ventricular Assist Devices

Devices in which most of the system's components are external to the body are for short-term use (6 hours to 14 days) only, due to the increased risk of infection and need for careful, in-hospital monitoring. Some circulatory assist devices are placed percutaneously (ie, are not implanted). These may be referred to as pVADs. pVADs are placed through the femoral artery. Two different pVADs have been developed, the TandemHeart and the Impella device. In the TandemHeart system, a catheter is introduced through the femoral vein and passed into the left atrium via transseptal puncture. Oxygenated blood is then pumped from the left atrium into the arterial system via the femoral artery. The Impella device is introduced through a femoral artery catheter. In this device, a small pump is contained within the catheter that is placed into the left ventricle. Blood is pumped from the left ventricle, through the device, and into the ascending aorta. Adverse events associated with pVAD include access site complications such as bleeding, aneurysms, or leg ischemia. Cardiovascular complications can also occur, such as perforation, myocardial infarction, stroke, and arrhythmias.

REGULATORY STATUS

A number of mechanical circulatory support devices have received approval or clearance for marketing by FDA. These devices are summarized in Table 1, and described further in following sections.

Table 1. Available Mechanical Circulatory Support Devices

Device	Manufacturer	Approval Date	FDA Clearance	PMA, HDE, or 510(k) No.	Indication
Thoratec® IVAD	Thoratec	Aug 2004	PMA supp	P870072	Bridge to transplant and postcardiotomy
DeBakey VAD® Child	MicroMed	Feb 2004	HDE	H030003	Bridge to transplant in children 5-16 y
HeartMate II®	Thoratec	Apr 2008	PMA	P060040	Bridge to transplant and destination
Centrimag®	Levitronix (now Thoratec)	Oct 2008	HDE	H070004	Postcardiotomy
Berlin Heart EXCOR® Pediatric VAD	Berlin	Dec 2011	HDE	H100004	Bridge to transplant

Device	Manufacturer	Approval Date	FDA Clearance	PMA, HDE, or 510(k) No.	Indication
HeartWare® Ventricular Assist System	HeartWare	Dec 2012	PMA	P100047	Bridge to transplant
HeartMate 3™ Left Ventricular Assist System	Thoratec	Aug 2017	PMA	P160054	Bridge to transplant and destination

FDA: U.S. Food and Drug Administration; HDE: humanitarian device exemption; PMA: premarket approval;

Ventricular Assist Devices

In December 1995, the Thoratec® Ventricular Assist Device System (Thoratec Corp., Pleasanton, CA) was approved by FDA through the PMA process for use as a bridge to transplantation in patients suffering from end stage heart failure. The patient should meet all of the following criteria:
- candidate for cardiac transplantation,
- imminent risk of dying before donor heart procurement, and
- dependence on, or incomplete response to, continuous vasopressor support.

In May 1998, supplemental approval for this device was given for the indication for postcardiotomy patients who are unable to be weaned from cardiopulmonary bypass. In June 2001, supplemental approval was given for a portable external driver to permit excursions within a 2-hour travel radius of the hospital in the company of a trained caregiver. In November 2003, supplemental approval was given to market the device as Thoratec® Paracorporeal VAD. In August 2004, supplemental approval was given to a modified device to be marketed as the Thoratec® Implantable VAD for the same indications. In January 2008, supplemental approval was given to delete Paracorporeal VAD use.

In August 2016, HeartWare® recalled its VAD Pumps due to a design flaw that was deemed by FDA as potentially causing serious injuries or death (class I recall). The devices affected were manufactured and distributed from March 2006 and May 2018. FDA product codes 204 and 017.

A class I recall was issued for the HeartMate 3™ in April 2018 affecting all manufacturing dates.

FDA product code: DSQ.

Total Artificial Heart

In October 2004, device CardioWest™ Temporary Total Artificial Heart (SynCardia Systems, Tucson, AZ) was approved by FDA through the premarket approval process (PMA) for use as a bridge to transplant in cardiac transplant-eligible candidates at risk of imminent death from biventricular failure. Also, the temporary CardioWest™ Total Artificial Heart (TAH-t) is intended for use inside the hospital. In April 2010, FDA approved a name change to SynCardia Temporary Total Artificial Heart.

FDA product code: LOZ.

In September 2006, the AbioCor® Implantable Replacement Heart System (AbioMed, Danvers MA) was approved by FDA through the HDE process for use in severe biventricular end stage heart disease patients who are not cardiac transplant candidates and who:
- are younger than 75 years of age;
- require multiple inotropic support;
- are not treatable by left ventricular assist device (LVAD) destination therapy; and
- are not weanable from biventricular support if on such support.

In addition to meeting other criteria, patients who are candidates for the AbioCor® TAH must undergo a screening process to determine if their chest volume is large enough to hold the device. The device is too large for approximately 90% of women and for many men.

FDA HDE: H040006.

Percutaneous Ventricular Assist Devices (Circulatory Assist Devices)
Table 2. Available Mechanical Circulatory Support Devices

Device	Manufacturer	Approval Date	FDA Clearance	PMA, 510(k) No.	Indication
TandemHeart®	Cardiac Assist	Sep 2005	510(k)	K110493	Temporary left ventricular bypass of ≤6 h
Impella® Recover LP 2.5	Abiomed	May 2008	510(k)	K063723	Partial circulatory support using extracorporeal bypass control unit for ≤6 h
Impella 2.5 System	Abiomed	Mar 2015	PMA	P140003	Temporary ventricular support for ≤6 h

FDA: U.S. Food and Drug Administration; PMA: premarket approval.

Comparative Efficacy of Left VAD Devices
The mechanism of operation of left VADs has changed since their introduction. The earliest devices were pulsatile positive displacement pumps. These pumps have been largely replaced by axial continuous-flow pumps. More recently centrifugal continuous-flow pumps have also been introduced.

The evidence of the comparative efficacy of centrifugal continuous-flow vs axial continuous-flow devices consists of 2 randomized controlled trials of 2 different centrifugal continuous-flow devices.[4,5] The MOMENTUM 3 trial compared HeartMate 3 centrifugal continuous-flow device with the HeartMate II axial continuous-flow device in patients indicated for circulatory support as a bridge to transplant or destination therapy. HeartMate 3 received PMA approval in August 2017 but was recalled in April 2018. The ENDURANCE trial compared HeartWare centrifugal continuous-flow device with the HeartMate II axial continuous-flow device in patients indicated for circulatory support as

destination therapy. HeartWare is FDA-approved as a bridge to transplantation device. Both trials found the centrifugal device to be noninferior to the axial device for the primary, composite outcome including measures of survival, freedom from disabling stroke, and freedom from device failure. While there are fewer device failures with the centrifugal devices without a significant increase in disabling stroke, the HeartWare device was associated with increased risk of any stroke over a period of 2 years.

The evidence on the comparative efficacy of continuous-flow vs pulsatile-flow devices consists of a randomized controlled trial and several nonrandomized comparative studies.[6-10] The randomized controlled trial reported fairly large differences in a composite outcome measure favoring the continuous-flow devices, with increases in revision and reoperation rates for the pulsatile device group being the largest factor driving the difference in outcomes. Other nonrandomized comparative studies, including a database study with large numbers of patients, have not reported important differences in clinical outcomes between devices.

POLICY
A.   Postcardiotomy Setting/Bridge to Recovery
   1.   Implantable ventricular assist devices with U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval or clearance may be considered **medically necessary** in the postcardiotomy setting in patients who are unable to be weaned off cardiopulmonary bypass.

B.   Bridge to Transplantation
   1.   Implantable ventricular assist devices with FDA approval or clearance may be considered **medically necessary** as a bridge to heart transplantation for patients who are currently listed as heart transplantation candidates and not expected to survive until a donor heart can be obtained, or are undergoing evaluation to determine candidacy for heart transplantation.

   2.   Implantable ventricular assist devices with FDA approval or clearance, including humanitarian device exemptions, may be considered **medically necessary** as a bridge to heart transplantation in children 16 years old or younger who are currently listed as heart transplantation candidates and not expected to survive until a donor heart can be obtained, or are undergoing evaluation to determine candidacy for heart transplantation.

   3.   Total artificial hearts with FDA-approved devices may be considered **medically necessary** as a bridge to heart transplantation for patients with biventricular failure who have no other reasonable medical or surgical treatment options, who are ineligible for other univentricular or biventricular support devices, and are currently listed as heart transplantation candidates or are undergoing

evaluation to determine candidacy for heart transplantation, and not expected to survive until a donor heart can be obtained.

C.   Destination Therapy
1.   Implantable ventricular assist devices with FDA approval or clearance may be considered **medically necessary** as destination therapy with end-stage heart failure patients who are ineligible for human heart transplant and who meet the following REMATCH Study criteria:
a)   New York Heart Association (NYHA) class IV heart failure for $\geq$60 days, OR
b)   patients in NYHA class III/IV for 28 days, received $\geq$14 days' support with intra-aortic balloon pump or dependent on IV inotropic agents, with 2 failed weaning attempts.

2.   In addition, patients must not be candidates for human heart transplant for 1 or more of the following reasons:
a)   Age >65 years; OR
b)   Insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus with end-organ damage; OR
c)   Chronic renal failure (serum creatinine >2.5 mg/dL for $\geq$90 days); OR
d)   Presence of other clinically significant condition.

D.   Percutaneous ventricular assist devices are intended for partial circulatory support for a limited time period. The use of an FDA-approved percutaneous ventricular assist device may be considered **medically necessary** for short-term stabilization of patients with ANY of the following indications:

1.   Cardiogenic shock that is refractory to medications and intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP); OR

2.   Cardiogenic shock, as an alternative to IABP; OR

3.   High-risk patients undergoing invasive cardiac / electrophysiological procedures who need circulatory support (see Policy Guidelines #6).

E.   Percutaneous ventricular assist devices are considered **experimental / investigational** for all other indications.

F.   Other Indications
1.   Other applications of implantable ventricular devices or total artificial hearts are considered **experimental / investigational**, including, but not limited to, the use of total artificial hearts as destination therapy.

2. The use of non-FDA approved or cleared implantable ventricular assist devices or total artificial hearts is considered **experimental / investigational**.

Policy Guidelines

1. Only 2 VADs have approval from FDA for the pediatric population. The DeBakey VAD Child device and the Berlin Heart EXCOR Pediatric VAD have FDA approval through the HDE process. The DeBakey VAD is indicated for use in children ages 5 to 16 years who are awaiting a heart transplant, ie, as a bridge to transplant while the Berlin Heart EXCOR VAD is indicated for children with severe isolated left ventricular or biventricular dysfunction who are candidates for cardiac transplant and require circulatory support.
2. In general, candidates for bridge-to-transplant implantable VADs are those who are considered appropriate heart transplant candidates but who are unlikely to survive the waiting period until a human heart donor is available. Some studies have included the following hemodynamic selection criteria: either a left atrial pressure of 20 mm Hg or a cardiac index of less than 2.0 L/min/m^2 while receiving maximal medical support. Patients with VADs are classified by the United Network for Organ Sharing as status I, that is, persons who are most ill and are considered the highest priority for transplant.
3. The median duration for time on the device is between 20 and 120 days.
4. Contraindications for bridge to transplant VADs and TAH include conditions that would generally exclude patients for heart transplant. Such conditions are chronic irreversible hepatic, renal, or respiratory failure; systemic infection; coagulation disorders, and inadequate psychosocial support. Due to potential problems with adequate function of the VAD or TAH, implantation is also contraindicated in patients with uncorrected valvular disease.
5. In addition, patients must have sufficient space in the thorax and/or abdominal cavity for the device. In the case of the CardioWest™ temporary Total Artificial Heart, this excludes patients with body surface areas less than 1.7 m^2 or who have a distance between the sternum and 10th anterior rib of less than 10 cm, as measured by computed tomography scan.
6. High risk patients are defined as patients with a combination of left ventricular dysfunction with an ejection fraction <35% combined with high risk coronary anatomy (severe left main stenosis OR extensive triple vessel coronary disease OR target vessel supplying >40% of the viable myocardium).

RATIONALE

This policy is regularly updated with searches of the MEDLINE database. The most recent literature review was performed for the period up to June 21, 2018.

Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of a technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are length of life, quality of life, and ability to function⸺including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific

outcomes that are important to patients and to managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of a technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance and the quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent one or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. RCTs are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

This literature review assesses 3 devices: (1) ventricular assist devices (VADs), (2) total artificial hearts (TAHs), and (3) percutaneous VADs (pVADs). This review addresses the short-term use of the devices as a bridge to recovery or transplantation. Left VADs (LVADs) and TAHs are also evaluated as longer term destination therapies for patients who are not transplant candidates.

Ventricular Assist Devices as a Bridge to Heart Transplant for End-Stage Heart Failure
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of VADs as a bridge to heart transplant in patients who have end-stage heart failure is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of a VAD as a bridge to heart transplant improve the net health outcome in individuals with end-stage heart failure?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is individuals with end-stage heart failure. A subset of patients who receive a VAD as a bridge to transplantation have demonstrated improvements in their cardiac function, sometimes to the point that they no longer require the VAD. This results in the use of VAD as a bridge to recovery.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is a VAD as a bridge to heart transplant.

Comparators
The following therapy is currently being used to make decisions about individuals with end-stage heart failure: optimal medical therapy without VADs.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are overall survival, device malfunction, heart failure, respiratory dysfunction, arrhythmias, and infection.

Timing

Time-to-transplant is of interest, as is the short-term outcome ranging from 30 days to 1 year.

Setting

Implantation of a VAD is performed in a hospital setting with specialized staff who are equipped to perform the surgical procedure and manage postsurgical intensive care.

VADs as Bridge to Recovery

Prospective Studies

VADs may have a role in bridging patients to recovery, particularly if there is reverse remodeling of the left ventricle. Several studies have investigated the role of VADs in bridging patients to decision for transplant eligibility. One clearly defined population in which the potential for myocardial recovery exists is in the postcardiotomy setting.

Acharya et al (2016) reported on patients who underwent VAD placement for acute myocardial infarction (AMI) who were enrolled in the Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support (INTERMACS) registry, a prospective national registry of Food and Drug Administration (FDA)–approved durable mechanical circulatory support (MCS) devices.[11] Patients who had an AMI as the admitting diagnosis or a major myocardial infarction (MI) as a hospital complication that resulted in VAD implantation (n=502) were compared with patients who underwent VAD implantation for non-AMI indications (n=9727). Patients in the AMI group were generally sicker at baseline, with higher rates of smoking, severe diabetes, and peripheral vascular disease, but had fewer cardiac surgeries and recent cardiovascular hospitalizations. Most AMI patients (53.8%) were implanted with a "bridge to candidacy" strategy. At 1 month post-VAD, 91.8% of the AMI group were alive with the device in place. At 1 year post-VAD, 52% of the AMI group were alive with the device in place, 25.7% had received a transplant, 1.6% had their VAD explanted for recovery, and 20.7% died with the device in place.

Two additional 2016 publications from the INTERMACS registry reported on cardiac recovery in patients implanted with LVADs. Wever-Pinzon et al (2016) included adults registered between March 2006 and June 2015 excluding those who had a right VAD only, TAH, or prior heart transplant (n=15,631). One hundred twenty-five of these patients had an a priori bridge to recovery LVAD strategy. Cardiac recovery occurred in 192 (1.3%) of the LVAD patients overall and in 14 (11.2%) of the bridge to recovery patients. Topkara et al (2016) reported a similar analysis of 13,454 INTERMACS adults with implants between June 2006 and June 2015 without TAH or pulsatile-flow LVAD or heart transplant. Device explant rates for cardiac recovery were 0.9% at 1-year, 1.9% at 2-year, and 3.1% at 3-year follow-up. An additional 9% of patients demonstrated partial cardiac recovery.

In a prospective multicenter study to assess myocardial recovery in patients with LVAD implantation as a bridge to transplant, Maybaum et al (2007) evaluated 67 patients with heart failure who had LVAD implantation for severe heart failure.[12] After 30 days, patients demonstrated significant improvements compared with their pre-LVAD state in left ventricular ejection fraction (17.1% vs 34.12%, p<0.001), left ventricular end-diastolic diameter (7.1 cm vs 5.1 cm, p<0.001), and left ventricular mass (320 g vs 194 g, p<0.001), respectively. However, only 9% of patients recovered sufficiently to have their LVAD explanted.

<u>Retrospective Studies</u>
Agrawal et al (2018) conducted a retrospective cohort study evaluating the 30-day readmissions of 2510 patients undergoing LVAD implantation.[13] Of the patients who met the inclusion criteria, 788 (31%) were readmitted within 30 days after surviving initial index hospitalization. Cardiac causes accounted for 23.8% of readmissions, 13.4% due to heart failure, and 8.1% to arrhythmias. Infection (30.2%), bleeding (17.6%), and device-related causes (8.2%) comprised the 76.2% of noncardiovascular causes for readmission.

Takayama et al (2014) reported outcomes for a retrospectively defined cohort of 143 patients who received a CentriMag Right Ventricular Assist Device as a "bridge to decision" for refractory cardiogenic shock due to a variety of causes.[14] Patients were managed with a bridge to decision algorithm. Causes of cardiogenic shock included failure of medical management (n=71), postcardiotomy shock (n=37), graft failure after heart transplantation (n=2), and right ventricular failure postimplantable LVAD (n=13). The device configuration was biventricular in 67%, isolated right VAD in 26%, and isolated LVAD in 8%. After a mean duration of support of 14 days (interquartile range, 8-26 days), 30% of patients had myocardial recovery, 15% had device exchange to an implantable VAD, and 18% had a heart transplant.

<u>VADs as Bridge to Heart Transplant</u>
The insertion of a VAD will categorize its recipient as a high-priority heart transplant candidate. The available evidence on the efficacy of VADs in bridging patients with refractory heart failure to transplant includes single-arm series, which generally have reported high success rates in bridging to transplant.

<u>Adult Patients</u>
Systematic Reviews: Several older systematic reviews have that VADs can provide an effective bridge to transplantation.[15,16]

Prospective Studies: Slaughter et al (2013) reported combined outcomes for patients included in the HeartWare bridge to transplant study previously described and a continued-access protocol granted by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).[17] The study included 322 patients with heart failure, eligible for heart transplant, who received the HeartWare (140 patients from the original study; 190 patients in the continue-access protocol who were monitored to the outcome or had completed 180-day follow-up at the time of analysis). Survival rates at 60, 180, and 360 days were 97%, 91%, and 84%, respectively. The most common adverse events were respiratory dysfunction, arrhythmias, sepsis, and driveline exit-site infections. Patients generally had improvements in quality of life measures.

Case Series: Strueber et al (2011) published a case series of 50 patients awaiting heart transplantation treated with HeartWare Ventricular Assist System, which is a smaller, continuous-flow centrifugal device implanted in the pericardial space.[18] Patients were followed until transplantation, myocardial recovery, device explant, or death. The median duration of time on the VAD was 322 days. Nine patients died: 3 from sepsis, 3 from multiple organ failure, and 3 from hemorrhagic stroke. At the end of follow-up, 20 (40%) patients had undergone transplant, 4 (8%) had had the pump explanted, and the remaining 17 (34%) continued on pump support. The most common complications were infection and bleeding: 21 (42%) patients had infections,

5 (10%) had sepsis, while 15 (30%) patients had bleeding complications, 10 (20%) of whom required surgery.

Aaronson et al (2012) reported on results of a multicenter, prospective study of a newer generation LVAD, the HeartWare. The study enrolled 140 patients awaiting heart transplantation who underwent HeartWare implantation. A control group of 499 subjects comprised patients drawn from the INTERMACS database, which collects data on patients who receive FDA-approved durable MCS devices. The study's primary outcome was defined as survival on the originally implanted device, transplantation, or explantation for ventricular recovery at 180 days. Secondary outcomes were comparisons of survival between groups and functional, quality of life (QOL), and adverse event outcomes in the HeartWare group. Success on the primary outcome occurred in 90.7% of the HeartWare group and 90.1% of controls (p<0.001, noninferiority with a 15% margin). Serious adverse events in the HeartWare group included, most commonly, bleeding, infections, and perioperative right heart failure.

In 5 reports published from 2007 to 2008, with sample sizes ranging from 32 to 279 patients, most participants received the continuous-flow device as a bridge to transplantation.[19-23] Survival rates at 6 months ranged between 67% and 87%, and between 50% and 80% at 1 year. These rates were similar to those reported from the INTERMACS registry.[24] A study by Patel et al (2008) compared HeartMate I with HeartMate II recipients at a single center, finding similar rates of 1-year survival and subsequent development of right heart failure.[22] Serious adverse events occurring after HeartMate II implantation include bleeding episodes requiring reoperation, stroke, infection, and device failure.

Aissaoui et al (2018) published an observational study comparing 224 patients in Germany and France with end-stage heart failure who received VAD (group I, n=83) or heart transplantation or medical therapy as first treatment options (group II, n=141).[25] The estimated 2-year survival was 44% for group I and 70% for group II (p<0.001).

Pediatric Patients
The FDA-approved EXCOR Pediatric VAD is available for use as a bridge to cardiac transplant in children. FDA approval was based on data from children who were part of the initial clinical studies of this device.[26] Publications have reported positive outcomes for children using VADs as a bridge to transplantation.

Registry Studies: Bulic et al (2017) identified all U.S. children between 1 and 21 years of age at heart transplant between 2006 and 2015 who had dilated cardiomyopathy and were supported with an LVAD or vasoactive infusions alone at the time of transplant from the Organ Procurement and Transplant Network registry (n=701).[27] Functional status as measured by the median Karnofsky Performance Scale score at heart transplant was higher for children receiving LVAD (6) compared with vasoactive infusion (5; p<0.001) and children receiving LVAD were more likely to be discharged from the hospital at the time of transplant. The percentage of children having a stroke at the time of transplant was higher in those receiving LVAD (3% vs 1%, p=0.04).

Wehman et al (2016) reported on posttransplant survival outcomes for pediatric patients who received a VAD, ECMO, or no mechanical circulatory support (MCS), in the pretransplant period.[28] The study included 2777 pediatric patients who underwent heart transplant from 2005 to 2012 who were identified through the United Network for Organ Sharing database, of whom 428 were

bridged with VADs and 189 were bridged with ECMO. In unadjusted analysis, the actuarial 5-year survival rate was highest in the direct-to-transplant group (77%), followed by the VAD group (49%) and then the ECMO group (35%). In a proportional hazards model to predict time to death, restricted to the first 4 months posttransplant, ECMO bridging was significantly associated with higher risk of death (adjusted hazard ratio, 2.77 vs direct-to-transplant; 95% confidence interval [CI], 2.12 to 3.61; $p<0.001$). However, a model to predict time to death excluding deaths in the first 4 months posttransplant, the bridging group was not significantly associated with risk of death.

Fraser et al (2012) evaluated the EXCOR device among 48 children, ages 16 or younger, with 2-ventricle circulation who had severe heart failure, despite optimized treatment, and were listed for heart transplant.[29] Patients were divided into 2 groups based on body surface area; a historical control group of children, receiving circulatory support with ECMO from the Extracorporeal Life Support Organization registry, were matched in a 2:1 fashion with study participants based on propensity-score matching. For participants in cohort 1 (body surface area <0.7 m^2), the median survival time had not been reached at 174 days, while in the matched ECMO comparison group, the median survival was 13 days ($p<0.001$). For participants in cohort 2 (body surface area range, 0.7 to <1.5 m^2), the median survival was 144 days compared with 10 days in the matched ECMO group ($p<0.001$). Rates of adverse events were high in both EXCOR device cohorts, including major bleeding (cohort 1, 42%; cohort 2, 50%), infection (cohort 1, 63%; cohort 2, 50%), and stroke (29% of both cohorts).

Noncomparative Studies: Blume et al (2016) published the first analysis of the Pediatric Interagency Registry for Mechanical Circulatory Support, which is a prospective, multicenter registry that collects data on patients who are under age 19 at the time of implant, and includes those implanted with either durable or temporary VADs.[30] At analysis, the registry included 241 patients; of them, 41 were implanted with a temporary device only, leaving 200 patients implanted with VADs for this study. Most patients (73%) had an underlying diagnosis of cardiomyopathy. At the time of implantation, 64% were listed for transplant, while 29% were implanted with a "bridge to candidacy" strategy. A total of 7% were implanted with a destination therapy strategy. Actuarial survival at both 6 months and 1 year was 81%. By 6 months, 58% of patients had received transplants.

Almond et al (2013) reported results from a prospective, multicenter registry to evaluate outcomes in children who received the EXCOR device as a bridge to transplant.[31] This study included a broader patient population than the Fraser et al (2012) study (discussed above). All patients were followed from the time of EXCOR implantation until transplantation, death, or recovery. The study included 204 children, 67% of whom received the device under compassionate use. Survival at 12 months on EXCOR support was 75%, including 64% who survived to transplantation, 6% who recovered (device explanted and the patient survived 30 days), and 5% who were alive with the device in place. In a follow-up study that evaluated 204 children from the same registry, Jordan et al (2015) reported relatively high rates of neurologic events in pediatric patients treated with the EXCOR device (29% of patients), typically early in the course of device use.[32]

Chen et al (2016) reported on a retrospective, single-center series of pediatric patients with continuous-flow VADs, with a focus on outpatient experiences.[33] The series included 17 children implanted with an intracorporeal device from 2010 to 2014. Eight (47%) patients were

discharged after a median postimplant hospitalization duration of 49 days. Adverse events were common in outpatients, most frequently major device malfunction (31% [5/16] events) and cardiac arrhythmias (31% [5/16] events). At the time of analysis, 4 patients had received an orthotopic heart transplant, two were on ongoing support, and one each had been transferred or died.

Another retrospective, single-center series of pediatric patients, conducted by Conway et al (2016), reported on outcomes with short-term continuous-flow VADs, including the Thoratec PediMag or CentriMag, or the Maquet RotaFlow.[34] From 2015 to 2014, 27 children were supported with one of these devices, most commonly for congenital heart disease (42%). The median duration of support was 12 days, and 67% of all short-term continuous-flow VAD runs (19 of 28 runs) led to hospital discharge.

Effects of Pretransplant VADs on Transplant Outcomes
Published studies continue to report that the use of a VAD does not compromise the success of a subsequent heart transplant and, in fact, may improve posttransplant survival, thus improving the use of donor hearts.[35-38] A systematic review by Alba et al (2011) examined the evidence on the effect of VADs on posttransplant outcomes.[39] Reviewers included 31 observational studies that compared transplant outcomes in patients who did and did not have pretransplant VAD. Survival at 1 year was more likely in patients who had VAD treatment, but this benefit was specific to patients who received an intracorporeal device (relative risk [RR], 1.8; 95% CI, 1.53 to 2.13). For patients treated with an extracorporeal device, the likelihood of survival did not differ from patients not treated with a VAD (RR=1.08; 95% CI, 0.95 to 1.22). There was no difference in the risk of rejection rates between patients who did and did not receive LVAD treatment.

Deo et al (2014) reported no significant differences in outcomes for 37 bridge to transplant patients with a VAD and 70 patients who underwent a heart transplant directly.[40] Data from the United Network for Organ Sharing Network, reported by Grimm et al (2016), suggested that patients bridged to transplant with an LVAD have better outcomes than those bridged with TAHs or biventricular assist devices.[41] Using the United Network for Organ Sharing database, Davies et al (2008) reported on the use of VADs in pediatric patients undergoing heart transplantation.[42] Their analysis concluded that pediatric patients requiring a pretransplantation VAD have long-term survival similar to those not receiving MCS.

Section Summary: Ventricular Assist Devices as a Bridge to Heart Transplant for End-Stage Heart Failure
Questions remain about defining and identifying the population most likely to experience cardiac recovery with VAD placement. One clearly defined population in which the potential for myocardial recovery exists is in the postcardiotomy setting. The current evidence is insufficient to identify other heart failure patient populations that might benefit from the use of an LVAD as a specific bridge to recovery treatment strategy.

In adults, the evidence on the efficacy of VADs as a bridge to transplant consists of uncontrolled trials, registry studies, and case series. In children, the evidence consists of several uncontrolled trials and a trial with historical controls. Collectively, these studies have reported that substantial numbers of patients have survived to transplant in situations in which survival is historically low. Despite the lack of high-quality controlled trials, this evidence supports a finding that outcomes are improved in patients because they have no other treatment options.

VADS as Destination Therapy for End-Stage Heart Failure
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of VADs as destination therapy in patients who have end-stage heart failure is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of a VAD as destination therapy improve the net health outcome in individuals with end-stage heart failure?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is individuals with end-stage heart failure.
Interventions
The therapy being considered is a VAD as destination therapy.

Comparators
The following therapy is currently being used to make decisions about managing individuals with end-stage heart failure: optimal medical therapy without VADs.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are overall survival, device malfunction, heart failure, respiratory dysfunction, arrhythmias, and infection.

Timing
Time of interest ranges from 6 months to 2 years following implantation of VAD as destination therapy.

Setting
Implantation of a VAD is performed in a hospital setting with specialized staff who are equipped to perform the surgical procedure and manage postsurgical intensive care.

Systematic Reviews
The evaluation of VADs as destination therapy was informed by a TEC Assessment (2002) that offered the following observations and conclusions[43]:
- The available evidence comes from a single, well-designed and rigorously conducted randomized trial, known as the REMATCH study.[44] The trial was a cooperative effort of Thoratec, Columbia University, and the National Institutes of Health.
- The trial found that patients with end-stage heart failure who are not candidates for cardiac transplantation had significantly better survival on a VAD compared with treatment by optimal medical therapy. Median survival was improved by approximately 8.5 months. Serious adverse events were more common in the VAD group, but they appear to be outweighed by this group's better outcomes on function; New York Heart Association functional class was significantly improved, as was the quality of life among those living to 12 months.
- VAD patients spent a greater relative proportion of time inside the hospital than medical management patients do, but the survival advantage would mean a longer absolute time outside the hospital.

Park et al (2005) published reports on extended 2-year follow-up of patients from the REMATCH trial, which found that survival and quality of life benefits were still apparent.[45,46] In addition, their reports and other case series have suggested continuing improvement in outcomes related to ongoing improvements in the device and in patient management. However, the durability of the HeartMate device used in the REMATCH trial was a concern (eg, at a participating institution, all 6 long-term survivors required device change-outs).

Nonrandomized Comparative Studies
A prospective observational study called the Risk Assessment and Comparative Effectiveness of Left Ventricular Assist Device and Medical Management in Ambulatory Heart Failure Patients study, reported by Estep et al (2015), compared LVAD support (n=97) with optimal medical therapy (n=103) for patients with heart failure not requiring inotropes also found superior survival and health-related quality of life in LVAD-treated patients.[47] Twelve-month, as-treated, event-free actuarial survival was 80% in the LVAD group and 63% in the best medical therapy group (p=0.022). Two-year results were reported by Starling et al (2017).[48] At the end of 2 years, 35 (34%) medical therapy patients and 60 (62%) LVAD patients were alive on their original therapy; 23 medical management patients received LVADs during the 2 years. The LVAD-treated patients continued to have higher as-treated, event-free actuarial survival (70% vs 41%, p<0.001), although there was no statistical difference in intention-to-treat survival (70% vs 63%, p=0.31).

In an FDA-required postapproval study of the HeartMate II device for destination therapy,[49] which included the first 247 HeartMate II patients identified as eligible for the device as destination therapy, Jorde et al (2014) found that outcomes and adverse events did not differ significantly from those of the original trial, which compared patients who received the HeartMate II with earlier generation devices Survival rates in the postapproval cohort were 82% and 69% at 1 and 2 years postoperatively, respectively.

After the release of the REMATCH trial results, Rogers et al (2007) published results from a prospective, nonrandomized trial comparing LVAD as destination therapy with optimal medical therapy for patients with heart failure who were not candidates for heart transplant.[50] Fifty-five patients who had New York Heart Association functional class IV symptoms and who failed weaning from inotropic support were offered a Novacor LVAD; 18 did not receive a device due to preference or device unavailability and served as a control group. The LVAD-treated patients had superior survival rates at 6 months (46% vs 22%; p=0.03) and 12 months (27% vs 11%; p=0.02), along with fewer adverse events.

Arnold et al (2016) analyzed 1638 patients receiving LVADs as destination therapy between May 2012 and September 2013. Results were selected from the INTERMACS registry and assessed for poor outcomes. Poor outcome was defined as death or mean Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire overall score less than 45 throughout the year after implantation. Analyses included inverse probability weighting to adjust for missing data. About 22.4% of patients died within the first year after implantation, and an additional 7.3% had persistently poor QOL; 29.7% met the definition of poor outcome. Poor outcomes were more common in those patients having higher body mass indices, lower hemoglobin levels, previous cardiac surgery, history of cancer, severe diabetes, and poorer QOL preimplant.

Section Summary: VADs as Destination Therapy for End-Stage Heart Failure
The highest quality evidence on the efficacy of LVADs as destination therapy in patients who are not transplant candidates is the REMATCH trial. This multicenter RCT reported that the use of LVADs led to improvements in survival, quality of life, and functional status. This evidence supports a finding that health outcomes are improved with LVADs in this patient population.

Total Artificial Heart as a Bridge to Transplant for End-Stage Heart Failure
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of a total artificial heart (TAH) as a bridge to heart transplant in patients who have end-stage heart failure is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of a TAH as a bridge to heart transplant improve the net health outcome in individuals with end-stage heart failure?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is individuals with end-stage heart failure.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is a TAH as a bridge to heart transplant.

Comparators
The following therapy is currently being used to make decisions about managing individuals with end-stage heart failure: optimal medical therapy without a TAH.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are overall survival, device malfunction, heart failure, respiratory dysfunction, arrhythmias, and infection.

Timing
Time-to-transplant is of interest, as are short-term outcomes ranging from 30 days to 1 year.

Setting
Implantation of a TAH as a bridge to transplant is performed in a hospital setting with specialized staff who are equipped to perform the surgical procedure and manage postsurgical intensive care.

Nonrandomized Trials
FDA approval of the CardioWest TAH was based on the results of a nonrandomized, prospective study of 81 patients.[51] Patients had failed inotropic therapy, had biventricular failure, and thus were not considered appropriate candidates for an LVAD. The rate of survival to transplant was 79%, which was considered comparable with the experience with LVAD in patients with left ventricular failure. The mean time from entry into the study until transplantation or death was 79.1 days.

Case Series
Case series have been reported on outcomes for the TAH as a bridge to transplant. For example, Copeland et al (2012) reported on 101 patients treated with the SynCardia artificial heart as a bridge to transplant.[52] All patients either met established criteria for MCS or were failing medical therapy on multiple inotropic drugs. Mean support time was 87 days (range, 1-441 days). The rate of survival to transplant was 68.3% (69/101). Of the 32 deaths before the transplant, 13 were due to multiorgan failure, 6 were due to pulmonary failure, and 4 were due to neurologic injury. Survival rates after transplant at 1, 5, and 10 years, respectively, were 76.8%, 60.5%, and 41.2%.

Section Summary: Total Artificial Heart as a Bridge to Transplant for End-Stage Heart Failure
There is less evidence on the use of TAH as a bridge to transplant compared with the use of LVADs. The type of evidence on a bridge to transplant is similar to that for LVADs (ie, case series reporting substantial survival rates in patients without other alternatives). Therefore, similar to LVADs, this evidence is sufficient to conclude that TAH improves outcomes for these patients and TAH is a reasonable alternative for patients who require a bridge to transplantation but who are ineligible for other types of life-prolonging support devices.

TAH as Destination Therapy for End-Stage Heart Failure
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of a TAH as destination therapy in patients who have end-stage heart failure is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of a TAH as destination therapy improve the net health outcome in individuals with end-stage heart failure?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is individuals with end-stage heart failure.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is a TAH as destination therapy.

Comparators
The following therapy is currently being used to make decisions about managing individuals with end-stage heart failure: optimal medical therapy without TAHs.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are overall survival, device malfunction, heart failure, respiratory dysfunction, arrhythmias, and infection.

Timing
Time of interest ranges from 6 months to 2 years following implantation of a TAH as destination therapy.

Setting
Implantation of a TAH as destination therapy is performed in a hospital setting with specialized staff who are equipped to perform the surgical procedure and manage postsurgical intensive care.

Case Series
Data on the artificial heart are available from FDA approval information[53] and from a published article describing results for the first 7 patients.[54] FDA indicated that its decision on the AbioCor implantable heart was based on the manufacturer's (Abiomed) laboratory and animal testing and on a small clinical study of 14 patients conducted by Abiomed. Study participants had a 1-month survival prognosis of not more than 30%, were ineligible for cardiac transplants and were not projected to benefit from VAD therapy. The study showed that the device was safe and likely to benefit for people with severe heart failure whose death was imminent and for whom no alternative treatments were available. Of the 14 patients studied, 12 survived the surgery. Mean duration of support for the patients was 5.3 months. In some cases, the device extended survival by several months (survival was 17 months in 1 patient). Six patients were ambulatory; 1 patient was discharged home. Complications included postoperative bleeding and neurologic events. No device-related infections were reported.

Torregrossa et al (2014) reported on 47 patients who received a TAH at 10 worldwide centers and had the device implanted for more than 1 year.[55] Patients were implanted for dilated cardiomyopathy (n=23), ischemic cardiomyopathy (n=15), and "other" reasons (n=9). Over a median support time of 554 days (range, 365-1373 days), 34 (72%) patients were successfully transplanted, 12 (24%) patients died while on device support, and 1 (2%) patient was still supported. Device failure occurred in 5 (10%) patients. Major complications were common, including systemic infection in 25 (53%) patients, driveline infections in 13 (27%) patients, thromboembolic events in 9 (19%) patients, and hemorrhagic events in 7 (14%) patients. Two of the deaths occurred secondary to device failure.

Section Summary: TAH as Destination Therapy for End-Stage Heart Failure
There is a less evidence on the use of TAH as destination therapy compared with the use of LVADs. Although TAHs show promise as destination therapy in patients who have no other treatment options, the available data on their use is extremely limited. Currently, the evidence base is insufficient to support conclusions about TAH efficacy in this setting.

Percutaneous VADS for Cardiogenic Shock
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of pVADs in patients who have cardiogenic shock is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of a pVAD as a bridge to heart transplant improve the net health outcome in individuals with end-stage heart failure?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is individuals with cardiogenic shock.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is a pVADs.

Comparators
The following therapy is currently being used to make decisions about managing individuals with cardiogenic shock: intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP).

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are overall survival, device malfunction, heart failure, respiratory dysfunction, arrhythmias, and infection.

Timing
Timing of interest ranges from perioperative events to 30-day mortality outcomes.

Setting
Implantation of a pVAD is performed in a hospital setting with specialized staff equipped to perform the surgical procedure and manage postsurgical intensive care.

Systematic Reviews
Romeo et al (2016) reported on a systematic review and meta-analysis that evaluated various percutaneous mechanical support methods, including pVADs, for patients with cardiogenic shock due to acute myocardial infarction (AMI) who were undergoing revascularization.[56] Reviewers included the three RCTs (described below) comparing pVADs with IABPs, along with three observational studies. In the comparison of pVADs with IABP, reviewers found that in-hospital mortality (the primary outcome of the analysis) was nonsignificantly increased in the pVAD group.

A meta-analysis by Cheng et al (2009)[57] included the same 3 trials as Romeo (2016). None of the 3 trials reported a reduction in mortality associated with pVAD use. The combined analysis estimated the RR for death in pVAD patients as 1.06 (95% CI, 0.68 to 1.66; p=0.80). All 3 trials reported an improvement in left ventricle hemodynamics in the pVAD group. On combined analysis, there was a mean increase in cardiac index of 0.35 L/min/m^2 for the pVAD group, an increase in mean arterial pressure of 12.8 mm Hg (95% CI, 3.6 to 22.0 mm Hg; p<0.001), and a decrease in pulmonary capillary wedge pressure of 5.3 mm Hg (95% CI, 1.2 to 9.4 mm Hg; p<0.05). Complications were more common in the pVAD group. In combined analysis, patients in the pVAD group had a significantly increased likelihood of bleeding events (RR=2.35; 95% CI, 1.40 to 3.93). While leg ischemia was more common in the pVAD group, this difference was not statistically significant (RR=2.59; 95% CI, 0.75 to 8.97; p=0.13).

Table 3 provides a crosswalk of studies in the systematic reviews. Tables 4 and 5 summarize the characteristics and results of the systematic reviews.

Table 3. Comparison of Systematic Reviews Evaluating pVADs and IABPs for Cardiogenic Shock

Studies	Romeo et al (2016)[56]	Cheng et al (2016)[57]
Burkhoff et al (2006)[58]	●	●
Seyfarth et al (2008)[59]	●	●
Thiele et al (2005)[60]	●	●
Schwartz et al (2012)	●	
Shah et al (2012)	●	

Studies	Romeo et al (2016)[56]	Cheng et al (2016)[57]
Manzo-Silberman (2013)	•	

IABP: intra-aortic balloon pump; pVAD: percutaneous ventricular assist device.

Table 4. Characteristics of Systematic Reviews Evaluating pVADs and IABPs for Cardiogenic Shock

Study	Dates	Trials	Participants	N	Design
Romeo et al (2016)[56]	2000-2010	6	Patients receiving IABP or pVADs	271	RCT and observational
Cheng et al (2016)[57]	2000-2015	3	Patients receiving IABP or pVADs	100	RCT

IABP: intra-aortic balloon pump; pVAD: percutaneous ventricular assist device.

Table 5. Results of Systematic Reviews Evaluating pVADs and IABPs for Cardiogenic Shock

Study	Overall In-Hospital Mortality Events		Incidence of Bleeding Events	Incidence of Leg Ischemia
	RCTs	OBS Studies		
Romeo et al (2016)[56]				
pVAD	24	42		
IABP	20	53		
p	0.80	0.20		
Cheng et al (2016)[57]				
pVAD	24		Increased likelihood	Increased likelihood
IABP	20			
RR (95% CI)	1.06 (0.68 to 1.66)		2.35 (1.40 to 3.93)	2.59 (0.75 to 8.97)

CI: confidence interval; IABP: intra-aortic balloon pump; OBS: observational; pVAD: percutaneous ventricular assist device; RR: relative risk.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Four RCTs have compared pVADs with IABPs for patients who had cardiogenic shock; three were included in both systematic reviews described above[58-60] and one was published after the reviews.[61] The 4 RCTs enrolled a total of 148 patients, 77 treated with a pVAD and 71 treated with an IABP. All 4 trial populations included patients with AMI and cardiovascular shock; 1 trial restricted its population to patients who were postrevascularization in the AMI setting. The primary outcomes reported were 30-day mortality, hemodynamic measures of left ventricle pump function, and adverse events. The trials are summarized in Tables 6 and 7. Some trials reported improvements in hemodynamic and metabolic parameters, but none found any reductions in 30-day mortality. The IMPRESS trial reported 6-month mortality outcomes and also found no difference between groups. Bleeding events and leg ischemia were more common in the pVAD groups.

Table 6. Characteristics of RCTs Evaluating pVADs and IABPs for Cardiogenic Shock

Study	Trial (Registration)	Countries	Sites	Dates	pVAD	Key Eligibility Criteria
Ouweneel et al (2017)[61]	IMPRESS (NTR3450)	Netherlands, Norway	2	2012-2015	Impella CP	AMI and severe CS in the setting of immediate PCI; receiving mechanical ventilation
Seyfarth et al (2008)[59]	ISAR-SHOCK (NCT00417378)	Germany	2	2004-2007	Impella LP 2.5	AMI <48 h and CS
Burkhoff et al (2006)[58]	TandemHeart (NR)	U.S.	12	2002-2004	TandemHeart	CS <24 h due to MI or heart failure

Study	Trial (Registration)	Countries	Sites	Dates	pVAD	Key Eligibility Criteria
Thiele et al (2005)[60]	NR	Germany	1	2000-2003	TandemHeart	AMI with CS and intent to revascularize with PCI

AMI: acute myocardial infarction; CS: cardiogenic shock; IABP: intra-aortic balloon counterpulsation; IMPRESS: IMPella versus IABP Reduces mortality in STEMI patients treated with primary PCI in Severe cardiogenic SHOCK; ISAR-SHOCK: Efficacy Study of LV Assist Device to Treat Patients With Cardiogenic Shock; MI: myocardial infarction; NR: not reported; PCI: percutaneous coronary intervention; pVAD: percutaneous ventricular assist device; RCT; randomized controlled trial.

Table 7. Results of RCTs Evaluating pVADs and IABPs for Cardiogenic Shock

Study	Numbers Randomized		pVAD vs IABP			Other Outcomes
	pVAD	IABP	30-Day Mortality	Bleeding	Leg Ischemia	
IMPRESS[61]	24	24	• 46% vs 50% • HR=0.96 (0.42 to 2.18)[a] 60-day: • 50% vs 50% HR=1.04 (0.47 to 2.32)[a]	33% vs 8%[b]	NR	Rehospitalization: 21% vs 4%
ISAR-SHOCK[59]	13	13	46% vs 46%	NR	8% vs 0%	Increase in cardiac index (L/min/m^2): 0.49 vs 0.11
TandemHeart[58]	19	14	47% vs 36%	42% vs 14%	21% vs 14%	At least 1 adverse event: 95% vs 71%
Thiele et al (2005)[60]	21	20	43% vs 45%	90% vs 40%	33% vs 0%	Final cardiac index (W/m^2): 0.37 vs 0.28

AMI: acute myocardial infarction; HR: hazard ratio; IABP: intra-aortic balloon counterpulsation; IMPRESS: IMPella versus IABP Reduces mortality in STEMI patients treated with primary PCI in Severe cardiogenic SHOCK; ISAR-SHOCK: Efficacy Study of LV Assist Device to Treat Patients With Cardiogenic Shock; NR: not reported; pVAD: percutaneous ventricular assist devices; RCT: randomized controlled trial.
[a] Values are hazard ratio (95% confidence interval).
[b] Major bleeding.

Registry Studies

O'Neill et al (2014) compared outcomes for patients who had AMI complicated by cardiogenic shock who received pVAD support before percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) with those who received pVAD support after PCI using data from 154 consecutive patients enrolled in a multicenter registry.[62] Patients who received pVAD support pre-PCI had a higher survival to discharge rate (65.1%) than those who received pVAD support post-PCI (40.7%; p=0.003). In multivariable analysis, receiving pVAD support pre-PCI was associated with in-hospital survival (odds ratio, 0.37; 95% CI, 0.17 to 0.79; p=0.01). However, the potential for underlying differences in patient groups other than the use of pVAD support makes the study's implications uncertain.

Basir et al (2017) compared survival in patients with AMI complicated by cardiogenic shock and undergoing PCI who received an Impella device.[63] Exactly 287 consecutive patients from the global cVAD Registry were analyzed. Impella implantation before and after PCI and before initiation of inotropes or vasopressors was independently associated with survival in multivariate analysis. Survival rates were 66% in patients who received the Impella device less than 1.25 hours from shock onset, 37% in those receiving the device within 1.25 to 4.25 hours, and 26% after 4.25 hours (p=0.017).

Case Series
Case series of patients treated with pVADs as an alternative to IABP in cardiogenic shock have reported high success rates as a bridge to alternative therapies.[64-66] However, given the availability of RCT evidence, these studies add little to the body of evidence on the efficacy of pVADs for the management of cardiogenic shock.

Section Summary: Percutaneous VADs for Cardiogenic Shock
Four RCTs comparing pVAD with IABP in patients with cardiogenic shock and meta-analyses evaluating three of these RCTs failed to demonstrate a mortality benefit for pVAD use and reported higher complication rates associated with pVAD use.

Percutaneous VADS for High-Risk Cardiac Procedures
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of pVADs in patients who undergo high-risk cardiac procedures is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of a pVAD improve the net health outcome in individuals who undergo high-risk cardiac procedures?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is individuals undergoing high-risk cardiac procedures.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is a pVAD.

Comparators
The following therapy is currently being used to make decisions about managing individuals who undergo high-risk cardiac procedures: IABP.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are overall survival, device malfunction, heart failure, respiratory dysfunction, arrhythmias, and infection.

Timing
Timing of interest ranges from perioperative events to 30-day mortality outcomes.

Setting
Implantation of a pVAD is performed in a hospital setting with specialized staff who are equipped to perform the surgical procedure and manage postsurgical intensive care.

Percutaneous VADs as Ancillary Support for High-Risk Percutaneous Coronary Intervention
Systematic Reviews
Briasoulis et al (2016) reported on a meta-analysis of pVAD devices as an adjunct to high-risk PCI.[67] Reviewers included RCTs and cohort studies, identifying 18 nonrandomized observational studies and a single RCT. The RCT identified was the PROTECT II trial detailed below. In the observational studies, the sample sizes ranged from 7 to 637 patients. In a pooled analysis of the

observational trial data, the 30-day mortality rate following Impella-assisted high-risk PCI was 3.5% (95% CI, 2.2% to 4.8%; I^2=20%), while that for TandemHeart-assisted high-risk PCI was 8% (95% CI, 2.9% to 13.1%; I^2=55%). The pooled vascular complication rates were 4.9% (95% CI, 2.3% to 7.6%) and 6.5% (95% CI, 3.2% to 9.9%) for the Impella and the TandemHeart, respectively.

Randomized Controlled Trials
The PROTECT II trial, planned as an RCT, compared the Impella system with IABP in patients undergoing high-risk PCI procedures. Enrollment was planned for 654 patients from 50 clinical centers. The primary end point was the composite of 10 different complications occurring within 30 days of the procedure, with the trialists hypothesizing a 10% absolute decrease in the complication rate for patients in the pVAD group. The trial was discontinued prematurely in late 2010 due to futility after an interim analysis of the first 327 patients enrolled revealed that the primary end point could not be reached. When stopped, 452 patients had been enrolled, three of whom withdrew consent and one of whom died. Results were published by O'Neill et al (2012).[68] The trial's primary analysis was intention-to-treat and included all 448 patients randomized to the Impella system (n=225) or IABP (n=223). The primary composite end point of major adverse events at 30 days occurred in 35.1% of Impella patients and in 40.1% of the IABP patients (p=0.277). There was no significant difference in the occurrence of in-hospital death, stroke, or myocardial infarction (MI) between groups.

In a prespecified subgroup analysis of the PROTECT II trial, Kovacic et al (2015) compared outcomes for the Impella system and IABP among 325 patients with 3-vessel disease with a left ventricular ejection fraction of 30% or less.[69] In the 3-vessel disease subgroup, 167 subjects were randomized to PCI with Impella support and 158 to PCI with IABP support. PCI characteristics differed in that rotational atherectomy was more aggressively used in the Impella support group, with more passes per patient (5.6 vs 2.8, p=0.002) and more passes per coronary lesion (3.4 vs 1.7, p=0.001). Acute procedural revascularization results did not differ between groups. At 30 days, the major adverse event rate did not differ significantly between groups (32.9% of Impella patients vs 42.4% of IABP patients, p=0.078). At 90 days, Impella patients (39.5%) had a significantly lower major adverse event rate than IABP patients (51.0%; p=0.039). The 90-day event rates for the individual components of the composite major adverse event score differed only for severe hypotension requiring treatment, which was more common in patients treated with IABP (7.6% vs 2.4%, p=0.029).

In a post hoc analysis, results of the PROTECT II trial were reanalyzed by Dangas et al (2014), using a revised definition of MI in the determination of patients with major adverse events and major adverse cardiac and cerebral events.[70] Unlike the original trial, which used a cutoff of 3 times the upper limit of normal for biomarker elevation to define periprocedural MI, the authors used a cutoff of 8 times the upper limit of normal for biomarker elevation or the presence of Q waves to define periprocedural MI. In multivariable analysis, compared with IABP, treatment with the Impella system was associated with freedom from 90-day major adverse events (odds ratio, 0.75; 95% CI, 0.61 to 0.92; p=0.007) and major adverse cardiac and cerebral events (odds ratio, 0.76; 95% CI, 0.61 to 0.96; p=0.020).

Nonrandomized Studies
Kovacic et al (2013) retrospectively compared outcomes for the TandemHeart and Impella devices in 68 patients undergoing high-risk PCI from 2005 to 2010 from a single-center

database.[71] There were no reported in-hospital deaths or strokes. There was 1 periprocedural MI in the TandemHeart group and 2 in the Impella group. For 63 patients with available intermediate- and long-term data, there was no statistically significant difference in time to death.

The PROTECT trial evaluated whether the Impella 2.5 system would improve outcomes for patients undergoing high-risk PCI procedures. PROTECT I was a feasibility study of 20 patients who had left main disease or last patent coronary conduit that required revascularization but who were not candidates for coronary artery bypass graft surgery.[72] High-risk PCI was performed using the Impella system for circulatory support. All procedures were successfully completed without any hemodynamic compromise in-procedure. Two (10%) patient died within 30 days, and 2 (10%) patients had a periprocedural MI. Two other patients had evidence of hemolysis, which was transient and resolved without sequelae.

Registry Studies
Schreiber et al (2017) reported outcomes for 127 consecutive patients from the USpella Registry not in cardiogenic shock who underwent unprotected left main PCI supported with an Impella LV device between 2008 and 2015.[73] The in-hospital and 30-day mortality rates were 1.6% and 2.4%, respectively. The 30-day major adverse cardiovascular event rate was 2.4%. One patient had vascular complications requiring surgery. Three (2.4%) patients had a hematoma, and 5 (3.9%) patients had bleeding requiring transfusion.

Maini et al (2012) retrospectively analyzed 175 patients with data in the USpella Registry undergoing high-risk PCI with pVAD support using the Impella 2.5 circulatory support system.[74] The primary safety end point was the incidence of major adverse cardiac events at 30 days. Secondary end points included device safety and efficacy and patient outcomes at 30 days and 12 months. Angiographic revascularization was successful in 99% of patients. At 30-day follow-up, the major adverse cardiac event rate was 8%; survival rates were 96%, 91%, and 88% at 30 days, 6 months, and 12 months, respectively. Secondary safety end points included acute renal dysfunction (2.8%), hypotension on support (3.4%), ventricular tachycardia (VT), or cardiopulmonary resuscitation (2.8%); other vascular complications included vessel dissection and arteriovenous fistula (3.4%), hematomas ipsi- or contralateral to the device insertion site (8.6%), infection (5.1%), and blood transfusion (9.7%).

Sjauw et al (2009) retrospectively analyzed 144 consecutive patients undergoing high-risk PCI with pVAD support (Impella) from a European registry.[75] End points included successful device function and incidence of adverse events at 30 days. The device was successfully implanted in all 144 patients. There were a periprocedural death and 8 deaths at 30 days for a mortality rate of 5.5%. Bleeding requiring transfusion or surgery occurred in 6.2% of patients, and vascular access site complications occurred in 4.0%. There was 1 (0.7%) stroke, and no MIs were reported.

Section Summary: Percutaneous VADs for High-Risk PCI
Percutaneous VADs have been assessed in 1 RCT (PROTECT II) and subsequent trial data analyses and in uncontrolled studies of high-risk patients undergoing high-risk cardiac interventions such as PCI. The RCT and other nonrandomized studies and accompanying post hoc analyses have not consistently reported a benefit for the use of pVADs. Registry studies have described pVAD use in high-risk patients undergoing an invasive cardiac procedure, but given

trial design lacking comparators, these studies add little to suggest the efficacy of pVAD use in this population.

Percutaneous VADs for High-Risk VT Ablation
Reddy et al (2014) reported on outcomes for a series of 66 patients enrolled in a prospective, multicenter registry who underwent VT ablation with a pVAD or IABP.[76] Twenty-two patients underwent ablation with IABP assistance, while 44 underwent ablation with the TandemHeart or Impella pVAD device (non-IABP group). Compared with patients who received support with an IABP, those who received support with a pVAD had more unstable VTs that could be mapped and ablated (1.05 vs 0.32, p<0.001), more VTs than could be terminated by ablation (1.59 vs 0.91, p=0.001), and fewer VTs terminated with rescue shocks (1.9 vs 3.0, p=0.049). More pVAD-supported patients could undergo entrainment/activation mapping (82% vs 59%, p=0.046). Mortality and VT recurrence did not differ over the study follow-up (average, 12 months).
In a retrospective study, Aryana et al (2014) reported procedural and clinical outcomes for 68 consecutive unstable patients with scar-mediated epicardial or endocardial VT who underwent ablation with or without pVAD support.[77] Thirty-four patients had hemodynamic support periprocedurally with a pVAD. Percutaneous VAD- and non-pVAD-supported patients had similar procedural success rates. Compared with non-pVAD-supported patients, patients in the pVAD group had a longer maximum time in unstable VT (27.4 minutes vs 5.3 minutes, p<0.001), more VT ablations per procedure (1.2 vs 0.4, p<0.001), shorter radiofrequency ablation time (53 seconds vs 68 seconds, p=0.022), and a shorter hospital length of stay (4.1 days vs 5.4 days, p=0.013). Over a follow-up of 19 months, rates of VT recurrence did not differ between groups.

Section Summary: Percutaneous VADs for High-Risk VT Ablation
Two nonrandomized studies have compared VT ablation with pVAD or IABP. In both studies, patients who had pVAD support spent less time in unstable VT than patients without pVAD support. Rates of recurrence of VT was comparable between groups for both studies. The current evidence based does not support conclusions about the use of pVAD for VT ablation.

Percutaneous VADS for Cardiogenic Shock Refractory to IABP Therapy
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of pVADs in patients who have cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP therapy is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of a pVAD improve the net health outcome in individuals with cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is individuals with cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP therapy.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is the use of a pVAD.

Comparators
The following therapies are currently being used to make decisions about managing individuals with cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP: optimal medical therapy without IABP and other MCS.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are overall survival, device malfunction, heart failure, respiratory dysfunction, arrhythmias, and infection.

Timing
Timing of interest ranges from perioperative events to 30-day mortality outcomes.

Setting
Implantation of a pVAD is performed in a hospital setting with specialized staff who are equipped to perform the surgical procedure and manage postsurgical intensive care.

Case Series
Case series of patients with cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP therapy who were treated with pVAD have been published. In a large series, Kar et al (2011) treated 117 patients who had severe, refractory cardiogenic shock with the TandemHeart System.[78] Eighty patients had ischemic cardiomyopathy and 37 had nonischemic cardiomyopathy. There were significant improvements in all hemodynamic measures following LVAD placement. For example, the cardiac index increased from 0.52 L/min/m^2 to 3.0 L/min/m^2 (p<0.001), and systolic blood pressure increased from 75 mm Hg to 100 mm Hg (p<0.001). Complications were common after LVAD implantation. Thirty-four (29.1%) patients had bleeding around the cannula site, and 35 (29.9%) developed sepsis during hospitalization. Groin hematoma occurred in 6 (5.1%) patients; limb ischemia in 4 (3.4%) patients; femoral artery dissection or perforation in 2 (1.7%) patients; stroke in 8 (6.8%) patients; and coagulopathy in 13 (11.0%) patients.

Section Summary: Percutaneous VADs for Cardiogenic Shock Refractory to IABP Therapy
Percutaneous VADs have been assessed in uncontrolled studies of patients with cardiogenic shock including those refractory to IABP therapy. The case series have reported high rates of adverse events that may outweigh any potential benefits. As a result, the evidence on pVADs does not demonstrate that the use of pVADs is associated with improvements in health outcomes for patients with cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP therapy.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE
Ventricular Assist Device
For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a VAD as a bridge to transplant, the evidence includes single-arm trials and observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. There is a substantial body of evidence from clinical trials and observational studies supporting implantable VADs as a bridge to transplant in patients with end-stage heart failure, possibly reducing mortality as well as improving quality of life. These studies have reported that substantial numbers of patients have survived to transplant in situations in which survival would not be otherwise expected. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a VAD as destination therapy, the evidence includes a trial and multiple single-arm studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. A well-designed trial, with 2 years of follow-up data, has demonstrated an advantage of implantable VADs as destination therapy for patients ineligible for heart transplant. Despite an increase in adverse events, both mortality and quality of life appear to be improved for these patients. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Total Artificial Heart
For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a TAH as a bridge to transplant, the evidence includes case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Compared with VADs, the evidence for TAHs in these settings is less robust. However, given the lack of medical or surgical options for these patients and the evidence case series provide, TAH is likely to improve outcomes for a carefully selected population with end-stage biventricular heart failure awaiting transplant who are not appropriate candidates for a left VAD. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a TAH as destination therapy, the evidence includes 2 case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The body of evidence for TAHs as destination therapy is too limited to draw conclusions. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Percutaneous Ventricular Assist Device
For individuals with cardiogenic shock or who undergo high-risk cardiac procedures who receive a pVAD, the evidence includes randomized controlled trials. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Four randomized controlled trials of pVAD vs IABP for patients in cardiogenic shock failed to demonstrate a mortality benefit and reported higher complication rates with pVAD use. Another randomized controlled trial comparing pVAD with IABP as an adjunct to high-risk percutaneous coronary interventions was terminated early due to futility; analysis of enrolled subjects did not demonstrate significant improvements in the pVAD group. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals with cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP therapy who receive a pVAD, the evidence includes case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Case series of patients with cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP have reported improved hemodynamic parameters following pVAD placement. However, these uncontrolled series do not provide evidence that pVADs improve mortality, and high rates of complications have been reported with pVAD use. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

CLINICAL INPUT FROM PHYSICIAN SPECIALTY SOCIETIES AND ACADEMIC MEDICAL CENTERS

While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process, through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted.

In response to requests, input was received through 2 physician specialty societies and 5 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2014. Vetting focused on the use of percutaneous VADs in accordance with the American Heart Association/American College of Cardiology guidelines (2013) and the use of TAH as destination therapy. All providing input supported the use of implantable VADs as destination therapy subject to the guidelines in the policy statements. Most providing input considered TAHs to be investigational for destination therapy; reviewers noted that there are limited clinical trial data to support the use of TAHs as destination therapy.

Most of those providing input considered pVADs to be investigational as a "bridge to recovery" or "bridge to decision" and for all other indications. Some reviewers noted that pVADs may improve patients' hemodynamics better than other alternatives, such as an IABP but are associated with more complications. Some reviewers noted that, despite a lack of evidence to indicate that pVADs improve overall outcomes, there may be cases when pVADs may be considered to support an intervention or treatment for a life-threatening condition.

PRACTICE GUIDELINES AND POSITION STATEMENTS

Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions et al

In 2015, the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, the Heart Failure Society of America (HFSA), the Society of Thoracic Surgeons, and the American College of Cardiology published a clinical expert consensus statement on the use of percutaneous mechanical circulatory support (MCS) devices in cardiovascular care.[79] This statement addressed IABPs, left atrial-to-aorta assist device (eg, TandemHeart), left ventricle-to-aorta assist devices (eg, Impella), extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO), and methods of right-sided support. Specific recommendations are not made, but the statement reviews the use of MCS in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous intervention (PCI), those with cardiogenic shock, and those with acute decompensated heart failure.

American College of Cardiology Foundation et al

The 2017 update focused on changes in sections regarding biomarkers, comorbidities, and prevention of heart failure, while many of the previous recommendations remained unchanged. The American College of Cardiology Foundation and AHA (2013) released guidelines for the management of heart failure that included recommendations related to the use of MCS, including both durable and nondurable MCS devices.[81] The guidelines categorized percutaneous ventricular assist devices (pVADs) and extracorporeal VADs as nondurable MCS devices. Table 8 provides class IIA guidelines on MCS devices.

Table 8. 2013 Guidelines on MCS

Recommendation	COE	LOE
"MCS is beneficial in carefully selected patients with stage D HF𝑟EF in whom definitive management (eg, cardiac transplantation) or cardiac recovery is anticipated or planned."	IIA	B

Recommendation	COE	LOE
"Nondurable MCS, including the use of percutaneous and extracorporeal ventricular assist devices (VADs), is reasonable as a "bridge to recovery" or "bridge to decision" for carefully selected patients with HFɾEF with acute, profound hemodynamic compromise."	IIA	B
"Durable MCS is reasonable to prolong survival for carefully selected patients with stage D HFɾEF."	IIA	B

COE: class of evidence; HFɾEF: heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; LOE: level of evidence; MCS: mechanical circulatory support.

These 2003 guidelines also noted:

> "Although optimal patient selection for MCS remains an active area of investigation, general indications for referral for MCS therapy include patients with LVEF [left ventricular ejection fraction] <25% and NYHA [New York Heart Association] class III-IV functional status despite GDMT [guideline-directed medical therapy], including, when indicated, CRT [cardiac resynchronization therapy], with either high predicted 1- to 2-year mortality (eg, as suggested by markedly reduced peak oxygen consumption and clinical prognostic scores) or dependence on continuous parenteral inotropic support. Patient selection requires a multidisciplinary team of experienced advanced HF [heart failure] and transplantation cardiologists, cardiothoracic surgeons, nurses, and ideally, social workers and palliative care clinicians."

In 2012, AHA published recommendations for the use of MCS.[82] These guidelines defined nondurable MCS as intraballoon pumps, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, extracorporeal VADs, and pVADs. Table 9 lists recommendations made on indications for the use of MCS, including durable and nondurable devices.

Table 9. 2012 Guidelines on MCS

Recommendation	COE	LOE
"MCS for BTT indication should be considered for transplant-eligible patients with end-stage HF who are failing optimal medical, surgical, and/or device therapies and at high risk of dying before receiving a heart transplantation."	I	B
"Implantation of MCS in patients before the development of advanced HF … is associated with better outcomes. Therefore, early referral of HF patients is reasonable."	IIA	B
"MCS with a durable, implantable device for permanent therapy or DT is beneficial for patients with advanced HF, high 1-year mortality resulting from HF, and the absence of other life-limiting organ dysfunction; who are failing medical, surgical, and/or device therapies; and who are ineligible for heart transplantation."	I	B
"Elective rather than urgent implantation of DT can be beneficial when performed after optimization of medical therapy in advanced HF patients who are failing medical, surgical, and/or device therapies."	IIA	C
"Urgent nondurable MCS is reasonable in hemodynamically compromised HF patients with end-organ dysfunction and/or relative contraindications to heart transplantation/durable MCS that are expected to improve with time and restoration of an improved hemodynamic profile."	IIA	C
"These patients should be referred to a center with expertise in the management of durable MCS and patients with advanced HF."	I	C
"Patients who are ineligible for heart transplantation because of pulmonary hypertension related to HF alone should be considered for bridge to potential transplant eligibility with durable, long-term MCS."	IIA	B

BTT: bridge to transplant; COE: class of evidence; DT: destination therapy; HF: heart failure; LOE: level of evidence; MCS: mechanical circulatory support.

Heart Failure Society of America
Heart Failure Society of America published guidelines in 2010 on surgical approaches to the treatment of heart failure.[83] Table 10 lists recommendations on left VADs.

Table 10. Guidelines on Left Ventricular Assist Devices

Recommendation	SOE
Patients awaiting heart transplantation who have become refractory to all means of medical circulatory support should be considered for a mechanical support device as a bridge to transplant."	B
"Permanent mechanical assistance using an implantable assist device may be considered in highly selected patients with severe HF refractory to conventional therapy who are not candidates for heart transplantation, particularly those who cannot be weaned from intravenous inotropic support at an experienced HF center."	B
"Patients with refractory HF and hemodynamic instability, and/or compromised end-organ function, with relative contraindications to cardiac transplantation or permanent mechanical circulatory assistance expected to improve with time or restoration of an improved hemodynamic profile should be considered for urgent mechanical circulatory support as a 'bridge to decision.' These patients should be referred to a center with expertise in the management of patients with advanced HF."	C

HF: heart failure; SOE: strength of evidence.

U.S. PREVENTIVE SERVICES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Not applicable.

ONGOING AND UNPUBLISHED CLINICAL TRIALS

Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this policy are listed in Table 11.

Table 11. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
NCT02326402	THEME Registry: TandemHeart Experiences and Methods	200	Dec 2020
NCT01774656[a]	Remission From Stage D Heart Failure (RESTAGE-HF)	40	Dec 2017 (ongoing)
NCT01627821[a]	Evaluation of the Jarvik 2000 Left Ventricular Assist System With Post-Auricular Connector--Destination Therapy Study	350	Dec 2018
NCT01369407	REVIVE-IT Registry (REVIVAL: Registry Evaluation of Vital Information For VADs in Ambulatory Life)	400	Jun 2019
NCT02459054	SynCardia 50cc Temporary Total Artificial Heart (TAH-t) as a Bridge to Transplant	72	Jun 2024
NCT02232659	SynCardia 70cc Temporary Total Artificial Heart (TAH-t) for Destination Therapy (DT)	38	Dec 2020
NCT02387112	Early Versus Emergency Left Ventricular Assist Device Implantation in Patients Awaiting Cardiac Transplantation	500	Dec 2022
NCT01966458[a]	A Prospective, Randomized, Controlled, Unblinded, Multi-Center Clinical Trial to Evaluate the HeartWare® Ventricular Assist Device System for Destination Therapy of Advanced Heart Failure	494	Aug 2020
NCT01187368[a]	A Prospective Study to Evaluate the Safety and Efficacy of the EVAHEART LVAS for Use as a Bridge-to-Transplant	20	Jun 2021
Unpublished			
NCT02468778	Supporting Patients Undergoing HIgh-Risk PCI Using a High-Flow PErcutaneous Left Ventricular Support Device (SHIELD II)	425	Jan 2018 (suspended)

NCT: national clinical trial.
[a] Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

CODING

The following codes for treatment and procedures applicable to this policy are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.

CPT/HCPCS

33927	Implantation of a total replacement heart system (artificial heart) with recipient cardiectomy
33928	Removal and replacement of total replacement heart system (artificial heart)
33929	Removal of a total replacement heart system (artificial heart) for heart transplantation (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
33975	Insertion of ventricular assist device; extracorporeal, single ventricle
33976	Insertion of ventricular assist device; extracorporeal, biventricular
33977	Removal of ventricular assist device; extracorporeal, single ventricle
33978	Removal of ventricular assist device; extracorporeal, biventricular
33979	Insertion of ventricular assist device, implantable intracorporeal, single ventricle
33980	Removal of ventricular assist device, implantable intracorporeal, single ventricle
33990	Insertion of ventricular assist device, percutaneous including radiological supervision and interpretation; arterial access only
33991	Insertion of ventricular assist device, percutaneous including radiological supervision and interpretation; both arterial and venous access, with transseptal puncture
33992	Removal of percutaneous ventricular assist device at separate and distinct session from insertion
33993	Repositioning of percutaneous ventricular assist device with imaging guidance at separate and distinct session from insertion
L8698	Miscellaneous component, supply or accessory for use with total artificial heart system

ICD-10 Diagnoses

I09.81	Rheumatic heart failure
I11.0	Hypertensive heart disease with heart failure
I13.0	Hypertensive heart and chronic kidney disease with heart failure and stage 1 through stage 4 chronic kidney disease, or unspecified chronic kidney disease
I13.2	Hypertensive heart and chronic kidney disease with heart failure and with stage 5 chronic kidney disease, or end stage renal disease
I50.1	Left ventricular failure, unspecified
I50.20	Unspecified systolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.21	Acute systolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.22	Chronic systolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.23	Acute on chronic systolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.30	Unspecified diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.31	Acute diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.32	Chronic diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.33	Acute on chronic diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.40	Unspecified combined systolic (congestive) and diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.41	Acute combined systolic (congestive) and diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.42	Chronic combined systolic (congestive) and diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I50.43	Acute on chronic combined systolic (congestive) and diastolic (congestive) heart failure
I97.0	Postcardiotomy syndrome

REVISIONS

07-18-2016	Policy published 06-08-2016. Policy effective 07-18-2016.
10-01-2016	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
03-29-2017	Title revised from "Total Artificial Hearts and Implantable Ventricular Assist Devices".
	In Policy section: ▪ Added new Item D, "Percutaneous ventricular assist devices are intended for partial circulatory support for a limited period of time. The use of an FDA-approved percutaneous ventricular assist device may be considered medically necessary for short-term stabilization of patients with ANY of the following indications: 1. Cardiogenic shock that is refractory to medications and intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP); OR 2. Cardiogenic shock, as an alternative to IABP; OR 3. High-risk patients undergoing invasive cardiac / electrophysiological procedures who need circulatory support." ▪ In Item E, add "other" to read, "Percutaneous ventricular assist devices are considered experimental / investigational for all other indications." ▪ Previous Item D is now Item F. ▪ In Policy Guidelines, added new Item 6.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
10-01-2017	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: ▪ Revised nomenclature to ICD-10 code: I50.1.
	Updated References section.
01-01-2018	In Coding section: ▪ Added CPT codes: 33927, 33928, 33929. ▪ Added HCPCS code: Q0477. ▪ Removed CPT codes: 0051T, 0052T, 0053T.
10-01-2018	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: ▪ Removed HCPCS code: Q0477.
	Updated References section.
10-24-2018	In Policy section: ▪ In Item D 3, added "#6" to read, "High-risk patients undergoing invasive cardiac/electrophysiological procedures who need circulatory support (see Policy Guidelines #6)."
01-01-2019	In Coding section: ▪ Added new HCPCS code: L8698.

REFERENCES

1. Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network. Heart Kaplan-Meier Patient Survival Rates For Transplants Performed : 2008 - 2015. 2018; https://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/data/view-data-reports/national-data/#. Accessed August 7, 2018.
2. Netuka I, Sood P, Pya Y, et al. Fully magnetically levitated left ventricular assist system for treating advanced HF: a multicenter study. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Dec 15 2015;66(23):2579-2589. PMID 26670056

3.   Carpentier A, Latremouille C, Cholley B, et al. First clinical use of a bioprosthetic total artificial heart: report of two cases. *Lancet.* Oct 17 2015;386(10003):1556-1563. PMID 26231456
4.   Mehra MR, Naka Y, Uriel N, et al. A fully magnetically levitated circulatory pump for advanced heart failure. *N Engl J Med.* Feb 02 2017;376(5):440-450. PMID 27959709
5.   Rogers JG, Pagani FD, Tatooles AJ, et al. Intrapericardial left ventricular assist device for advanced heart failure. *N Engl J Med.* Feb 02 2017;376(5):451-460. PMID 28146651
6.   Pruijsten RV, Lok SI, Kirkels HH, et al. Functional and haemodynamic recovery after implantation of continuous-flow left ventricular assist devices in comparison with pulsatile left ventricular assist devices in patients with end-stage heart failure. *Eur J Heart Fail.* Mar 2012;14(3):319-325. PMID 22294758
7.   Lim KM, Constantino J, Gurev V, et al. Comparison of the effects of continuous and pulsatile left ventricular-assist devices on ventricular unloading using a cardiac electromechanics model. *J Physiol Sci.* Jan 2012;62(1):11-19. PMID 22076841
8.   Kato TS, Chokshi A, Singh P, et al. Effects of continuous-flow versus pulsatile-flow left ventricular assist devices on myocardial unloading and remodeling. *Circ Heart Fail.* Sep 2011;4(5):546-553. PMID 21765125
9.   Ventura PA, Alharethi R, Budge D, et al. Differential impact on post-transplant outcomes between pulsatile- and continuous-flow left ventricular assist devices. *Clin Transplant.* Jul-Aug 2011;25(4):E390-395. PMID 21401721
10. Al-Sarie M, Rauf A, Kfoury AG, et al. Myocardial structural and functional response after long-term mechanical unloading with continuous flow left ventricular assist device: axial versus centrifugal flow. *JACC Heart Fail.* Jul 2016;4(7):570-576. PMID 27179831
11. Acharya D, Loyaga-Rendon RY, Pamboukian SV, et al. Ventricular assist device in acute myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Apr 26 2016;67(16):1871-1880. PMID 27102502
12. Maybaum S, Mancini D, Xydas S, et al. Cardiac improvement during mechanical circulatory support: a prospective multicenter study of the LVAD Working Group. *Circulation.* May 15 2007;115(19):2497-2505. PMID 17485581
13. Agrawal S, Garg L, Shah M, et al. Thirty-Day Readmissions After Left Ventricular Assist Device Implantation in the United States: Insights From the Nationwide Readmissions Database. *Circ Heart Fail* 2018 11(3):e004628. PMID 29519902
14. Takayama H, Soni L, Kalesan B, et al. Bridge-to-decision therapy with a continuous-flow external ventricular assist device in refractory cardiogenic shock of various causes. *Circ Heart Fail.* Sep 2014;7(5):799-806. PMID 25027874
15. TEC Assessment Program. Ventricular assist devices in bridging to heart transplantation. 1996;Volume 11;Tab 26.
16. Goldstein DJ, Oz MC, Rose EA. Implantable left ventricular assist devices. *N Engl J Med.* Nov 19 1998;339(21):1522-1533. PMID 9819452
17. Slaughter MS, Pagani FD, McGee EC, et al. HeartWare ventricular assist system for bridge to transplant: combined results of the bridge to transplant and continued access protocol trial. *J Heart Lung Transplant.* Jul 2013;32(7):675-683. PMID 23796152
18. Strueber M, O'Driscoll G, Jansz P, et al. Multicenter evaluation of an intrapericardial left ventricular assist system. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Mar 22 2011;57(12):1375-1382. PMID 21414534
19. Frazier OH, Gemmato C, Myers TJ, et al. Initial clinical experience with the HeartMate II axial-flow left ventricular assist device. *Tex Heart Inst J.* Oct 2007;34(3):275-281. PMID 17948075
20. John R, Kamdar F, Liao K, et al. Improved survival and decreasing incidence of adverse events with the HeartMate II left ventricular assist device as bridge-to-transplant therapy. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Oct 2008;86(4):1227-1234; discussion 1234-1225. PMID 18805167
21. Miller LW, Pagani FD, Russell SD, et al. Use of a continuous-flow device in patients awaiting heart transplantation. *N Engl J Med.* Aug 30 2007;357(9):885-896. PMID 17761592
22. Patel ND, Weiss ES, Schaffer J, et al. Right heart dysfunction after left ventricular assist device implantation: a comparison of the pulsatile HeartMate I and axial-flow HeartMate II devices. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Sep 2008;86(3):832-840; discussion 832-840. PMID 18721570

23.   Struber M, Sander K, Lahpor J, et al. HeartMate II left ventricular assist device; early European experience. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* Aug 2008;34(2):289-294. PMID 18571932
24.   Kirklin JK, Naftel DC, Stevenson LW, et al. INTERMACS database for durable devices for circulatory support: first annual report. *J Heart Lung Transplant.* Oct 2008;27(10):1065-1072. PMID 18926395
25.   Aissaoui N, Morshuis M, Maoulida H, et al. Management of end-stage heart failure patients with or without ventricular assist device: an observational comparison of clinical and economic outcomes. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2018 53(1). PMID 28950304
26.   Dickstein K, Cohen-Solal A, Filippatos G, et al. ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2008: the Task Force for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute and Chronic Heart Failure 2008 of the European Society of Cardiology. Developed in collaboration with the Heart Failure Association of the ESC (HFA) and endorsed by the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine (ESICM). *Eur Heart J.* Oct 2008;29(19):2388-2442. PMID 18799522
27.   Bulic A, Maeda K, Zhang Y, et al. Functional status of United States children supported with a left ventricular assist device at heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant.* Aug 2017;36(8):890-896. PMID 28363739
28.   Wehman B, Stafford KA, Bittle GJ, et al. Modern outcomes of mechanical circulatory support as a bridge to pediatric heart transplantation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Jun 2016;101(6):2321-2327. PMID 26912304
29.   Fraser CD, Jr., Jaquiss RD, Rosenthal DN, et al. Prospective trial of a pediatric ventricular assist device. *N Engl J Med.* Aug 09 2012;367(6):532-541. PMID 22873533
30.   Blume ED, Rosenthal DN, Rossano JW, et al. Outcomes of children implanted with ventricular assist devices in the United States: First analysis of the Pediatric Interagency Registry for Mechanical Circulatory Support (PediMACS). *J Heart Lung Transplant.* May 2016;35(5):578-584. PMID 27009673
31.   Almond CS, Morales DL, Blackstone EH, et al. Berlin Heart EXCOR pediatric ventricular assist device for bridge to heart transplantation in US children. *Circulation.* Apr 23 2013;127(16):1702-1711. PMID 23538380
32.   Jordan LC, Ichord RN, Reinhartz O, et al. Neurological complications and outcomes in the Berlin Heart EXCOR(R) pediatric investigational device exemption trial. *J Am Heart Assoc.* Jan 2015;4(1):e001429. PMID 25613996
33.   Chen S, Lin A, Liu E, et al. Outpatient outcomes of pediatric patients with left ventricular assist devices. *ASAIO J.* Mar-Apr 2016;62(2):163-168. PMID 26720740
34.   Conway J, Al-Aklabi M, Granoski D, et al. Supporting pediatric patients with short-term continuous-flow devices. *J Heart Lung Transplant.* May 2016;35(5):603-609. PMID 27009672
35.   Aaronson KD, Eppinger MJ, Dyke DB, et al. Left ventricular assist device therapy improves utilization of donor hearts. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Apr 17 2002;39(8):1247-1254. PMID 11955839
36.   Frazier OH, Rose EA, McCarthy P, et al. Improved mortality and rehabilitation of transplant candidates treated with a long-term implantable left ventricular assist system. *Ann Surg.* Sep 1995;222(3):327-336; discussion 336-328. PMID 7677462
37.   Bank AJ, Mir SH, Nguyen DQ, et al. Effects of left ventricular assist devices on outcomes in patients undergoing heart transplantation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* May 2000;69(5):1369-1374; discussion 1375. PMID 10881807
38.   Shuhaiber JH, Hur K, Gibbons R. The influence of preoperative use of ventricular assist devices on survival after heart transplantation: propensity score matched analysis. *BMJ.* Feb 10 2010;340:c392. PMID 20147346
39.   Alba AC, McDonald M, Rao V, et al. The effect of ventricular assist devices on long-term post-transplant outcomes: a systematic review of observational studies. *Eur J Heart Fail.* Jul 2011;13(7):785-795. PMID 21551162
40.   Deo SV, Sung K, Daly RC, et al. Cardiac transplantation after bridged therapy with continuous flow left ventricular assist devices. *Heart Lung Circ.* Mar 2014;23(3):224-228. PMID 23954004
41.   Grimm JC, Sciortino CM, Magruder JT, et al. Outcomes in patients bridged with univentricular and biventricular devices in the modern era of heart transplantation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Jul 2016;102(1):102-108. PMID 27068177

42. Davies RR, Russo MJ, Hong KN, et al. The use of mechanical circulatory support as a bridge to transplantation in pediatric patients: an analysis of the United Network for Organ Sharing database. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Feb 2008;135(2):421-427, 427 e421. PMID 18242279

43. TEC Assessment Program. Left ventricular assist devices as destination therapy for end-stage heart failure. 2002;Volume 17;Tab 19. PMID

44. Rose EA, Gelijns AC, Moskowitz AJ, et al. Long-term mechanical left ventricular assistance for end-stage heart failure. *N Engl J Med.* Nov 15 2001;345(20):1435-1443. PMID 11794191

45. Park SJ, Tector A, Piccioni W, et al. Left ventricular assist devices as destination therapy: a new look at survival. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Jan 2005;129(1):9-17. PMID 15632819

46. Long JW, Kfoury AG, Slaughter MS, et al. Long-term destination therapy with the HeartMate XVE left ventricular assist device: improved outcomes since the REMATCH study. *Congest Heart Fail.* May-Jun 2005;11(3):133-138. PMID 15947534

47. Estep JD, Starling RC, Horstmanshof DA, et al. Risk assessment and comparative effectiveness of left ventricular assist device and medical management in ambulatory heart failure patients: results from the ROADMAP Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Oct 20 2015;66(16):1747-1761. PMID 26483097

48. Starling RC, Estep JD, Horstmanshof DA, et al. Risk Assessment and comparative effectiveness of left ventricular assist device and medical management in ambulatory heart failure patients: The ROADMAP Study 2-year results. *JACC Heart Fail.* Jul 2017;5(7):518-527. PMID 28396040

49. Jorde UP, Kushwaha SS, Tatooles AJ, et al. Results of the destination therapy post-food and drug administration approval study with a continuous flow left ventricular assist device: a prospective study using the INTERMACS registry (Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support). *J Am Coll Cardiol.* May 6 2014;63(17):1751-1757. PMID 24613333

50. Rogers JG, Butler J, Lansman SL, et al. Chronic mechanical circulatory support for inotrope-dependent heart failure patients who are not transplant candidates: results of the INTrEPID Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Aug 21 2007;50(8):741-747. PMID 17707178

51. Copeland JG, Smith RG, Arabia FA, et al. Cardiac replacement with a total artificial heart as a bridge to transplantation. *N Engl J Med.* Aug 26 2004;351(9):859-867. PMID 15329423

52. Copeland JG, Copeland H, Gustafson M, et al. Experience with more than 100 total artificial heart implants. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Mar 2012;143(3):727-734. PMID 22245242

53. Food and Drug Administration. Summay of Safety and Probable Benefit - H040006: AbioCor Implantable Replacement Heart. 2006; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf4/H040006b.pdf. Accessed August 8, 2018.

54. Dowling RD, Gray LA, Jr., Etoch SW, et al. Initial experience with the AbioCor implantable replacement heart system. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Jan 2004;127(1):131-141. PMID 14752423

55. Torregrossa G, Morshuis M, Varghese R, et al. Results with SynCardia total artificial heart beyond 1 year. *ASAIO J.* Nov-Dec 2014;60(6):626-634. PMID 25158888

56. Romeo F, Acconcia MC, Sergi D, et al. Percutaneous assist devices in acute myocardial infarction with cardiogenic shock: Review, meta-analysis. *World J Cardiol.* Jan 26 2016;8(1):98-111. PMID 26839661

57. Cheng JM, den Uil CA, Hoeks SE, et al. Percutaneous left ventricular assist devices vs. intra-aortic balloon pump counterpulsation for treatment of cardiogenic shock: a meta-analysis of controlled trials. *Eur Heart J.* Sep 2009;30(17):2102-2108. PMID 19617601

58. Burkhoff D, Cohen H, Brunckhorst C, et al. A randomized multicenter clinical study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the TandemHeart percutaneous ventricular assist device versus conventional therapy with intraaortic balloon pumping for treatment of cardiogenic shock. *Am Heart J.* Sep 2006;152(3):469 e461-468. PMID 16923414

59. Seyfarth M, Sibbing D, Bauer I, et al. A randomized clinical trial to evaluate the safety and efficacy of a percutaneous left ventricular assist device versus intra-aortic balloon pumping for treatment of cardiogenic shock caused by myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Nov 4 2008;52(19):1584-1588. PMID 19007597

60. Thiele H, Sick P, Boudriot E, et al. Randomized comparison of intra-aortic balloon support with a percutaneous left ventricular assist device in patients with revascularized acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock. *Eur Heart J.* Jul 2005;26(13):1276-1283. PMID 15734771

61.   Ouweneel DM, Eriksen E, Sjauw KD, et al. Percutaneous mechanical circulatory support versus intra-aortic balloon pump in cardiogenic shock after acute myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Jan 24 2017;69(3):278-287. PMID 27810347

62.   O'Neill WW, Schreiber T, Wohns DH, et al. The current use of Impella 2.5 in acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock: results from the USpella Registry. *J Interv Cardiol.* Feb 2014;27(1):1-11. PMID 24329756

63.   Basir MB, Schreiber TL, Grines CL, et al. Effect of early initiation of mechanical circulatory support on survival in cardiogenic shocks. *Am J Cardiol.* Mar 15 2017;119(6):845-851. PMID 28040188

64.   Griffith BP, Anderson MB, Samuels LE, et al. The RECOVER I: a multicenter prospective study of Impella 5.0/LD for postcardiotomy circulatory support. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Feb 2013;145(2):548-554. PMID 22405676

65.   Lemaire A, Anderson MB, Lee LY, et al. The Impella device for acute mechanical circulatory support in patients in cardiogenic shock. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Jan 2014;97(1):133-138. PMID 24090575

66.   Lauten A, Engstrom AE, Jung C, et al. Percutaneous left-ventricular support with the Impella-2.5-assist device in acute cardiogenic shock: results of the Impella-EUROSHOCK-registry. *Circ Heart Fail.* Jan 2013;6(1):23-30. PMID 23212552

67.   Briasoulis A, Telila T, Palla M, et al. Meta-analysis of usefulness of percutaneous left ventricular assist devices for high-risk percutaneous coronary interventions. *Am J Cardiol.* Aug 1 2016;118(3):369-375. PMID 27265673

68.   O'Neill WW, Kleiman NS, Moses J, et al. A prospective, randomized clinical trial of hemodynamic support with Impella 2.5 versus intra-aortic balloon pump in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention: the PROTECT II study. *Circulation.* Oct 2 2012;126(14):1717-1727. PMID 22935569

69.   Kovacic JC, Kini A, Banerjee S, et al. Patients with 3-vessel coronary artery disease and impaired ventricular function undergoing PCI with Impella 2.5 hemodynamic support have improved 90-day outcomes compared to intra-aortic balloon pump: a sub-study of the PROTECT II trial. *J Interv Cardiol.* Feb 2015;28(1):32-40. PMID 25689546

70.   Dangas GD, Kini AS, Sharma SK, et al. Impact of hemodynamic support with Impella 2.5 versus intra-aortic balloon pump on prognostically important clinical outcomes in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention (from the PROTECT II randomized trial). *Am J Cardiol.* Jan 15 2014;113(2):222-228. PMID 24527505

71.   Kovacic JC, Nguyen HT, Karajgikar R, et al. The Impella Recover 2.5 and TandemHeart ventricular assist devices are safe and associated with equivalent clinical outcomes in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Jul 01 2013;82(1):E28-37. PMID 21234916

72.   Dixon SR, Henriques JP, Mauri L, et al. A prospective feasibility trial investigating the use of the Impella 2.5 system in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention (The PROTECT I Trial): initial U.S. experience. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Feb 2009;2(2):91-96. PMID 19463408

73.   Schreiber T, Wah Htun W, Blank N, et al. Real-world supported unprotected left main percutaneous coronary intervention with impella device; data from the USpella Registry. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Apr 18 2017;90(4):576-581. PMID 28417594

74.   Maini B, Naidu SS, Mulukutla S, et al. Real-world use of the Impella 2.5 circulatory support system in complex high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention: the USpella Registry. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Nov 1 2012;80(5):717-725. PMID 22105829

75.   Sjauw KD, Konorza T, Erbel R, et al. Supported high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention with the Impella 2.5 device the Europella registry. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Dec 15 2009;54(25):2430-2434. PMID 20082934

76.   Reddy YM, Chinitz L, Mansour M, et al. Percutaneous left ventricular assist devices in ventricular tachycardia ablation: multicenter experience. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* Apr 2014;7(2):244-250. PMID 24532564

77.   Aryana A, Gearoid O'Neill P, Gregory D, et al. Procedural and clinical outcomes after catheter ablation of unstable ventricular tachycardia supported by a percutaneous left ventricular assist device. *Heart Rhythm.* Jul 2014;11(7):1122-1130. PMID 24732372

78.   Kar B, Gregoric ID, Basra SS, et al. The percutaneous ventricular assist device in severe refractory cardiogenic shock. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Feb 8 2011;57(6):688-696. PMID 20950980

79.   Rihal CS, Naidu SS, Givertz MM, et al. 2015 SCAI/ACC/HFSA/STS clinical expert consensus statement on the use of percutaneous mechanical circulatory support devices in cardiovascular care: endorsed by the American Heart Assocation, the Cardiological Society of India, and Sociedad Latino Americana de Cardiologia Intervencion; Affirmation of Value by the Canadian Association of Interventional Cardiology-Association Canadienne de Cardiologie d'intervention. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* May 19 2015;65(19):e7-e26. PMID 25861963

80.   Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/HFSA Focused Update of the 2013 ACCF/AHA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Failure Society of America. *Circulation.* Apr 28 2017 136(6):e137-e161. PMID 28455343

81.   Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of heart failure: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Oct 15 2013;62(16):e147-239. PMID 23747642

82.   Peura JL, Colvin-Adams M, Francis GS, et al. Recommendations for the use of mechanical circulatory support: device strategies and patient selection: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation.* Nov 27 2012;126(22):2648-2667. PMID 23109468

83.   Heart Failure Society of America, Lindenfeld J, Albert NM, et al. HFSA 2010 Comprehensive Heart Failure Practice Guideline. *J Card Fail.* Jun 2010;16(6):e1-194. PMID 20610207

84.   Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Ventricular Assist Devices (20.9.1). 2013; https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=360&ver=1. Accessed August 8, 2018.

Other References
1.   Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Cardiology Liaison Committee, July 2016; January 2017; May 2018.

2.   Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Cardiology Liaison Committee Consent Ballot, February 2017.