Medical Policy

BlueCross BlueShield Kansas
An Independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Title: Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Select Intra-Abdominal and Pelvic Malignancies

Professional / Institutional
Original Effective Date: April 3, 2009
Latest Review Date: September 8, 2026
Current Effective Date: September 8, 2026

State and Federal mandates and health plan member contract language, including specific provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. To verify a member's benefits, contact Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Customer Service.

The BCBSKS Medical Policies contained herein are for informational purposes and apply only to members who have health insurance through BCBSKS or who are covered by a self-insured group plan administered by BCBSKS. Medical Policy for FEP members is subject to FEP medical policy which may differ from BCBSKS Medical Policy.

The medical policies do not constitute medical advice or medical care. Treating health care providers are independent contractors and are neither employees nor agents of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas and are solely responsible for diagnosis, treatment and medical advice.

If your patient is covered under a different Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan, please refer to the Medical Policies of that plan.

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With pseudomyxoma peritonei	Interventions of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy	Comparators of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery • Systemic chemotherapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin	Interventions of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy	Comparators of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery • Systemic chemotherapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
			• Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin	Interventions of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy	Comparators of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery • Systemic chemotherapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With peritoneal carcinomatosis of endometrial origin	Interventions of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy	Comparators of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery • Systemic chemotherapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With peritoneal mesothelioma	Interventions of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy	Comparators of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery • Systemic chemotherapy • Radiotherapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With newly diagnosed stage III ovarian cancer	Interventions of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy	Comparators of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery • Systemic chemotherapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With recurrent stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer	Interventions of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy	Comparators of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery • Systemic chemotherapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With appendiceal goblet cell tumors	Interventions of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy	Comparators of interest are: • Cytoreductive surgery • Systemic chemotherapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity

DESCRIPTION

Cytoreductive surgery (CRS) includes peritonectomy (ie, peritoneal stripping) procedures and multivisceral resections, depending on the extent of intra-abdominal tumor dissemination. Cytoreductive surgery may be followed by infusion of intraperitoneal chemotherapy with or without heating, which is intended to improve the tissue penetration of the chemotherapy. When heated, this is referred to as hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC). Cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC have been proposed for a number of intra-abdominal and pelvic malignancies such as pseudomyxoma peritonei and peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal, gastric, or endometrial cancer.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether the use of cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy improves the net health outcome in individuals with intra-abdominal and pelvic malignancies.

BACKGROUND

Pseudomyxoma Peritonei

Pseudomyxoma peritonei is a clinicopathologic disease characterized by the production of mucinous ascites and mostly originates from epithelial neoplasms of the appendix. Appendix cancer is diagnosed in fewer than 1000 Americans each year; less than half are epithelial neoplasms.[1,]The incidence of pseudomyxoma peritonei is estimated at 2 cases per 1 million individuals.[2,] As mucin-producing cells of the tumor proliferate, the narrow lumen of the appendix becomes obstructed and subsequently leads to appendiceal perforation. Neoplastic cells progressively colonize the peritoneal cavity and produce copious mucin, which collects in the peritoneal cavity. Pseudomyxoma peritonei ranges from benign (disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis) to malignant (peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis), with some intermediate pathologic grades. Clinically, this syndrome ranges from early pseudomyxoma peritonei, usually discovered during imaging or laparotomy performed for another reason, to advanced cases with a distended abdomen, bowel obstruction, and starvation.

Treatment

The conventional treatment of pseudomyxoma peritonei is surgical debulking, repeated as necessary to alleviate pressure effects. However, repeated debulking surgeries become more difficult due to progressively thickened intra-abdominal adhesions, and this treatment is palliative, leaving visible or occult disease in the peritoneal cavity.[3,]

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Peritoneal Carcinomatosis of Colorectal Origin
Peritoneal dissemination develops in 10% to 15% of patients with colon cancer.

Treatment
Despite the use of increasingly effective regimens of chemotherapy and biologic agents to treat advanced disease, peritoneal metastases are associated with a median survival of 6 to 7 months.

Peritoneal Carcinomatosis of Gastric Origin
Peritoneal carcinomatosis is detected in more than 30% of patients with advanced gastric cancer and is a poor prognostic indicator. The median survival is 3 months, and 5-year survival is less than 1%.[4,] Sixty percent of deaths from gastric cancer are attributed to peritoneal carcinomatosis.[5,]

Treatment
Current chemotherapy regimens are nonstandard, and peritoneal seeding is considered unresectable for a cure.[6,]

Peritoneal Mesothelioma
Malignant mesothelioma is a relatively uncommon malignancy that may arise from the mesothelial cells lining the pleura, peritoneum, pericardium, and tunica vaginalis testis. In the United States, 200 to 400 new cases of diffuse malignant peritoneal mesothelioma are registered every year, accounting for 10% to 30% of all-type mesothelioma.[7,] Diffuse malignant peritoneal mesothelioma has traditionally been considered a rapidly lethal malignancy with limited and ineffective therapeutic options. The disease is usually diagnosed at an advanced stage and is characterized by multiple variably sized nodules throughout the abdominal cavity. As the disease progresses, the nodules become confluent to form plaques, masses, or uniformly cover peritoneal surfaces. In most patients, death eventually results from locoregional progression within the abdominal cavity. In historical case series, treatment by palliative surgery, systemic or intraperitoneal chemotherapy, and abdominal irradiation has resulted in median survival of 12 months.

Treatment
Surgical cytoreduction (resection of visible disease) in conjunction with hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) is designed to remove visible tumor deposits and residual microscopic disease. By delivering chemotherapy intraperitoneally, drug exposure to the peritoneal surface is increased some 20-fold compared with systemic exposure. In addition, previous animal and in vitro studies have suggested that the cytotoxicity of mitomycin C is enhanced at temperatures greater than 39°C (102.2°F).

Ovarian Cancer
Several different types of malignancies can arise in the ovaries; epithelial carcinoma is the most common, accounting for 90% of malignant ovarian tumors. Epithelial ovarian cancer is the fifth most common cause of cancer death in women in the United States. Most ovarian cancer patients (>70%) present with widespread disease, and annual mortality is 65% of the incidence rate. In addition, African American women reportedly have a higher prevalence of presenting with more advanced tumors, being undertreated or untreated, and having shorter disease-free survival compared to other racial groups.[8,]

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Treatment
Current management of advanced epithelial ovarian cancer is cytoreductive surgery (CRS) followed by combination chemotherapy. Tumor recurrences are common, and the prognosis for recurrent disease is poor.

Cytoreductive surgery plus HIPEC in combination with systemic chemotherapy is being studied for primary and recurrent disease. Because HIPEC is administered at the time of surgery, treatment-related morbidity may be reduced compared with intraperitoneal chemotherapy administered postoperatively.

REGULATORY STATUS

Mitomycin, oxaliplatin, carboplatin, and other drugs used for HIPEC have not been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for this indication.

Several peritoneal lavage systems (FDA product code: LGZ) have been cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process to provide "warmed, physiologically compatible sterile solution" (examples provided in Table 1). None have received marketing approval or clearance to administer chemotherapy. The FDA has issued warnings to manufacturers of devices that are FDA-cleared for peritoneal lavage using sterile saline solutions when these devices are marketed for off-label use in HIPEC.

Table 1. Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Lavage Devices Cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration

Device	Manufacturer	Date Cleared	510(k) No.	Indication
FluidSmart	THERMEDX LLC	9/5/2017	K172048	For irrigation, distention, fluid warming, and fluid volume/deficit measurements in endoscopic procedures within gynecology, urology, and orthopedic disciplines.
Hang&Go PAC	RanD S.r.l.	12/28/2016	K161613	To recirculate, filtrate, and perfuse physiologically compatible sterile solution (ie saline solution) in the thoracic or abdominal cavity.
The Belmont Hyperthermia Pump	BELMONT INSTRUMENT CORPORATION	9/2/2015	K152208	To raise the temperature of the thoracic or peritoneal cavity to the desired target temperature by continuously lavaging the cavity with circulating warmed sterile solution.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

POLICY

A. Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) at the time of surgery may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of:

1. pseudomyxoma peritonei;
   OR
2. diffuse malignant peritoneal mesothelioma.

B. The use of HIPEC may be considered **medically necessary** in newly diagnosed epithelial ovarian or fallopian tube cancer at the time of interval cytoreductive surgery when **ALL** of the following criteria are met:

1. The individual has stage III disease (see Policy Guidelines); **AND**
2. The individual is not eligible for primary cytoreductive surgery or surgery had been performed but was incomplete and will receive neoadjuvant chemotherapy and subsequent interval debulking surgery (see Policy Guidelines); **AND**
3. It is expected that complete or optimal cytoreduction can be achieved at time of the interval debulking surgery (see Policy Guidelines).

C. The use of HIPEC in all other settings to treat ovarian cancer, including, but not limited to, stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer, is considered **experimental / investigational**.

D. Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) is considered **experimental / investigational** for:

1. peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer, gastric cancer, or endometrial cancer; **AND**
2. all other indications, including goblet cell tumors of the appendix.

POLICY GUIDELINES:

A. Ovarian cancer staging is as follows:

Stage I	The cancer is confined to the ovary or fallopian tube
Stage II	The cancer involves 1 or both ovaries with pelvic extension
Stage III	The cancer has spread within the abdomen
Stage IV	The cancer is widely spread throughout the body

B. Eligibility for neoadjuvant chemotherapy and interval debulking surgery is based on a high perioperative risk profile (i.e., the individual is a poor candidate to withstand an aggressive initial cytoreductive procedure) or a low likelihood of achieving cytoreduction to less than 1 cm (i.e., the individual has extensive disease that precludes upfront optimal cytoreduction) or surgery has been performed but was incomplete (i.e., after surgery, one or more residual tumors measuring >1 cm in diameter were present).

C. Complete cytoreduction is defined as no visible disease and optimal cytoreduction as one or more residual tumors measuring 10 mm or less in diameter remaining.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

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.

RATIONALE

This evidence review was created using searches of the PubMed database. The most recent literature update was performed through May 19, 2026.

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 (QOL), 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 1 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. Randomized controlled trials 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.

PSEUDOMYXOMA PERITONEI

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of cytoreductive surgery (CRS) plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in individuals with pseudomyxoma peritonei is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations

The relevant population(s) of interest are individuals with pseudomyxoma peritonei.

Interventions

The combination therapy being considered is CRS plus HIPEC.

Cytoreductive surgery includes peritonectomy (ie, peritoneal stripping) procedures and multivisceral resections, depending on the extent of intra-abdominal tumor dissemination.[9,] It may be followed by the infusion of intraperitoneal chemotherapy, most commonly mitomycin C or a platinum agent. The intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be heated, which is intended to improve the tissue penetration, and this is referred to as HIPEC. Inflow and outflow catheters are

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

placed in the abdominal cavity, along with probes to monitor the temperature. The skin is then temporarily closed during the chemotherapy perfusion, which typically runs for 1 to 2 hours.

Comparators
The following therapies are currently being used to treat pseudomyxoma peritonei: CRS alone and systemic chemotherapy.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are overall survival (OS), disease-specific survival (eg, progression-free survival [PFS]), QOL, treatment-related mortality, and treatment-related morbidity.

Morbidity and mortality from the procedure are measured in the early postoperative period. Survival outcomes (PFS and OS) should be measured out to 5 years.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:
- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Consistent with a 'best available evidence approach,' within each category of study design, studies with larger sample sizes and longer durations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

Review of Evidence
Discussion for this indication is divided into primary treatment and treatment for recurrence. Table 2 summarizes relevant studies on CRS plus HIPEC in pseudomyxoma peritonei.

Primary Treatment
Studies describing CRS plus HIPEC as primary treatment in pseudomyxoma peritonei are summarized in Table 2; studies that included at least 60 patients are discussed further in the text below.

Jimenez et al (2014) retrospectively reviewed a prospective database of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis maintained by a U.S. medical center.[10,] Two hundred two patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis from appendiceal cancer who underwent CRS plus HIPEC were included; 125 (62%) patients had high-grade tumors (peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis), and 77 (38%) patients had low-grade tumors (disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis). Results for the entire cohort and for subgroups defined by tumor histology are shown in Table 2. In the high-grade peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis group, Peritoneal Cancer Index (PCI) score (scale range, 0 to 39), completeness of cytoreduction, and lymph node status were significantly associated with survival; in the low-grade disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis group, completeness of cytoreduction was significantly associated with survival.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Glehen et al (2010) published a retrospective, multicenter cohort study that evaluated toxicity and prognostic factors after CRS plus HIPEC and/or unheated intraperitoneal chemotherapy for 5 days postoperatively.[11,] Patients had diffuse peritoneal disease from malignancies of multiple different histologic origins. Exclusion criteria were perioperative chemotherapy performed more than 7 days after surgery and the presence of extra-abdominal metastases. The study included 1290 patients from 25 institutions who underwent 1344 procedures between 1989 and 2007. In 1154 procedures, HIPEC was performed. Postoperative mortality was 4.1%. The principal origin of peritoneal carcinomatosis was pseudomyxoma peritonei in 301 patients. Median OS for patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei was not reached (the median OS for all patients was 34 months).

Additional information about the subgroup of patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei was provided by Elias et al (2010).[12,] Cytoreductive surgery was conducted in 219 (73%) patients, and HIPEC was performed in 255 (85%). The primary tumor site was the appendix in 91% of patients, the ovary in 7%, and unknown in 2%. Tumor histology was disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis in 51%, peritoneal carcinomatosis with intermediate features in 27%, and peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis in 22%. The postoperative mortality was 4%, and the morbidity rate was 40%. Mean follow-up was 88 months. One-, 3-, and 5-year OS rates were 89.4%, 84.8%, and 72.6%, respectively. The 10-year OS rate was 54.8%. Median OS had not yet been reached but would exceed 100 months. Disease-free survival (DFS) was 56% at 5 years (the median duration of DFS was 78 months). A multivariate analysis identified 5 prognostic factors: extent of peritoneal seeding (p=.004), institution (p<.001), pathologic grade (p=.03), sex (p=.02), and use of HIPEC (p=.04). When only the 206 patients with complete CRS were considered, the extent of peritoneal seeding was the only significant prognostic factor (p=.004).

Chua et al (2009) reported on the long-term survival of 106 patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei treated between 1997 and 2008 with CRS plus HIPEC and/or unheated intraperitoneal chemotherapy for 5 days postoperatively.[13,] Sixty-nine percent of patients had complete cytoreduction. Eighty-three (78%) patients had HIPEC intraoperatively, 81 (76%) patients had unheated postoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy, and 67 (63%) patients had both. Seventy-three patients had disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis, 11 had peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis, and 22 had mixed tumors. The mortality rate was 3%, and the severe morbidity rate was 49%. The median follow-up was 23 months (range, 0 to 140 months). The median OS was 104 months with a 5-year OS rate of 75%. Median PFS was 40 months with 1-, 3-, and 5-year PFS rates of 71%, 51%, and 38%, respectively. Factors influencing OS included the histopathologic type of tumor (p=.002), with the best survival in patients with disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis and worst survival in patients with peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis. Other factors influencing survival were the use of both HIPEC and unheated postoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy, completeness of cytoreduction, and severe morbidity.

Vaira et al (2009) reported on a single institution's experience managing pseudomyxoma peritonei with CRS and HIPEC in 60 patients, 53 of whom had final follow-up data.[14,] The postoperative morbidity rate was 45%; no postoperative deaths were observed. The primary tumor was appendiceal adenocarcinoma in 72% of patients and appendiceal adenoma in 28%. Approximately half of the patients with adenocarcinoma had received previous systemic chemotherapy. Five- and 10-year OS rates were 94% and 85%, respectively; 5- and 10-year DFS rates were 80% and 70%, respectively. Significant differences in improved OS were observed in

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

patients who had complete CRS (p<.003) and in those with histologic type disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis compared with those with peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis (p<.014).

Elias et al (2008) reported on the results of 105 consecutive patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei treated between 1994 and 2006 with CRS plus HIPEC.[3,] The primary tumor was the appendix in 93 patients, ovary in 3, urachus in 1, pancreas in 1, and indeterminate in 7. Tumor histology was disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis in 48% of patients, intermediate in 35%, and peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis in 17%. At the end of the surgery, 72% of patients had no visible residual peritoneal lesions. The postoperative mortality rate was 7.6% and the morbidity rate was 67.6%. The median follow-up was 48 months, and 5-year OS and PFS rates were 80% (95% confidence interval [CI], 68% to 88%) and 68% (95% CI, 55% to 79%), respectively. On multivariate analysis, 2 factors had a negative influence on DFS: serum carbohydrate antigen 19-9 level (a marker of biliopancreatic malignancy) greater than 300 units/mL and nondisseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis tumor histology.

Table 2. Primary and Recurrence Study Results for CRS Plus HIPEC in Pseudomyxoma Peritonei

Study	N	Postoperative Mortality/Morbidity, %	Median OS, mo	5-Year OS, %	Median PFS, mo	5-Year PFS, %
Primary treatment						
Jimenez et al (2014)[10,]	202	0/16	90	56	40	44
High-grade tumor (peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis)	125	NR	47	41	26	34
Low-grade tumor (disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis)	77	NR	Not reached[a]	83	NR	58
Marcotte et al (2014)[15,]	58	2/40	NR	77	NR	50[b]
Glehen et al (2010)[11,]	301	4/40	34	73	78	56
Chua et al (2009)[13,]	106	3/49	104	75	40	38

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Study	N	Postoperative Mortality/Morbidity, %	Median OS, mo	5-Year OS, %	Median PFS, mo	5-Year PFS, %
Vaira et al (2009) [14,]	60	0/45	NR	94	NR	80
Elias et al (2008)[3,]	105	8/68	>100	80	NR	68
Yan et al (2007)[16,] (SR)	NR	NR	51 to 156	52 to 96	NR	NR
Recurrence						
Lord et al (2015)[17,,c]	35	NR	129.5[e]	79	NR	NR
Sardi et al (2013)[18,,d]	26	0/42	NR	34	NR	NR

CRS: cytoreductive surgery; HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; NR: not reported; OS: overall survival; PFS: progression-free survival; SR: systematic review.
[a] Median OS not reached with mean follow-up of 36 months.
[b] Five-year disease-free survival.
[c] Data from Lord et al (2015) represents 35 patients who had recurrence and redo CRS plus HIPEC out of 512 patients in the total study cohort.
[d] Results after second procedure shown.
[e] Mean OS.

Recurrence

From the same U.S. medical center database studied by Jimenez et al (2014; previously described), Sardi et al (2013) identified 26 patients who underwent repeat CRS plus HIPEC for peritoneal carcinomatosis recurrence.[18,] Sixteen (62%) patients had high-grade peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis and 10 (38%) patients had low-grade disseminated peritoneal adenomucinosis. Patients eligible for repeat CRS plus HIPEC had Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status scores of 0 or 1. The proportion of patients who had a preoperative PCI score of less than 20 was 35% before the second procedure and 75% before the third procedure (1/4 patients). There were no 30-day postoperative deaths; postoperative morbidity was 42% after the second procedure and 50% after the third procedure. After the second procedure, 1-, 3-, and 5-year OS rates were 91%, 53%, and 34%, respectively. After the third procedure, the 1-year OS rate was 75%.

Lord et al (2015) reported on a retrospective cohort study of 512 patients with perforated appendiceal tumors and pseudomyxoma peritonei who received CRS plus HIPEC at a single center in the U.K. and achieved complete cytoreduction.[17,] Thirty-five (26%) of 137 patients who experienced recurrence underwent repeat CRS plus HIPEC; median time to recurrence was 26 months. Complete cytoreduction was achieved (again) in 20 (57%) patients. The mean OS in patients without recurrence (n=375), patients who recurred and had repeat CRS plus HIPEC (n=35), and patients who recurred but did not have repeat CRS plus HIPEC (n=102) was 171

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

months (95% CI, 164 to 178 months), 130 months (95% CI, 105 to 153 months), and 101 months (95% CI, 84 to 119 months) across the 3 groups, respectively (p=.001). Five-year survival rates were 91%, 79%, and 65%, respectively. The incidence of complications was similar between primary and repeat procedures.

Section Summary: Pseudomyxoma Peritonei
Retrospective cohort studies and systematic reviews have reported median survival ranging from 47 to 156 months and 5-year OS ranging from 41% to 96% for patients with primary treatment for pseudomyxoma peritonei treated with CRS plus HIPEC. Two retrospective studies reported results of CRS plus HIPEC for recurrence with 5-year OS rates of 34% and 79%. Although no direct comparisons between CRS plus HIPEC and other interventions have been published, traditional surgical debulking is not curative, and complete CRS alone (without HIPEC) has been associated with a 5-year OS of approximately 50%, along with high recurrence rates (91%, with a median DFS of 24 months).[3,] Median PFS with CRS plus HIPEC as primary treatment has been reported as 40 to 78 months, with 5-year PFS rates of 38% to 80%. Procedure-related morbidity and mortality have generally decreased over time. Because the prevalence of pseudomyxoma peritonei is very low, conducting comparative trials is difficult.

PERITONEAL CARCINOMATOSIS OF COLORECTAL ORIGIN

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of CRS plus HIPEC in individuals with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations
The relevant population(s) of interest are individuals with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin.

Interventions
The combination therapy being considered is CRS plus HIPEC.

Cytoreductive surgery includes peritonectomy (ie, peritoneal stripping) procedures and multivisceral resections, depending on the extent of intra-abdominal tumor dissemination.[9,] It may be followed by the infusion of intraperitoneal chemotherapy, most commonly mitomycin C or a platinum agent. The intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be heated, which is intended to improve the tissue penetration, and this is referred to as HIPEC. Inflow and outflow catheters are placed in the abdominal cavity, along with probes to monitor the temperature. The skin is then temporarily closed during the chemotherapy perfusion, which typically runs for 1 to 2 hours.

Comparators
The following therapies are currently being used to treat peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin: CRS alone and systemic chemotherapy.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival (eg, PFS), QOL, treatment-related mortality, and treatment-related morbidity.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Morbidity and mortality from the procedure are measured in the early postoperative period. Survival outcomes (PFS and OS) should be measured out to 5 years.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Consistent with a 'best available evidence approach,' within each category of study design, studies with larger sample sizes and longer durations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Systematic Reviews

Li et al (2022) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies evaluating CRS with HIPEC in patients with peritoneal metastasis from colorectal cancer.[19,] A total of 10 trials (3 RCTs) with 3200 patients were included. Cytoreductive surgery plus HIPEC improved OS compared with control (hazard ratio [HR], 0.53; 95% CI, 0.38 to 0.73; p<.00001; I^2=82.9%). A notable limitation of the analysis is the large number of observational trials and high heterogeneity among trials.

Huang et al (2017) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies assessing CRS plus HIPEC in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer.[20,] Reviewers included 76 studies published between 1993 and 2016. Fifteen studies were controlled, 1 of which was an RCT, and 61 were uncontrolled studies. In a meta-analysis of the controlled studies, there was a significantly higher survival rate in patients who received CRS plus HIPEC compared with standard therapy (eg, palliative surgery alone or with systemic chemotherapy) (pooled HR, 2.67; 95% CI, 2.21 to 3.23; I^2=0%, p<.001). In sensitivity analyses, date of publication, geographic location of study conduct, and chemotherapy regimen used in the HIPEC procedure did not have a significant impact. In the controlled studies, the mean mortality rate was 4.3% in the CRS plus HIPEC group compared with 6.2% in the traditional treatment group (p=.423). The mean morbidity rate was 19.8% in the CRS plus HIPEC group and 20.5% in the traditional treatment group (p=.815). In all 76 studies, the mean mortality rate was 2.8% and mean morbidity rate was 33%.

Randomized Controlled Trials

RCTs have compared CRS plus HIPEC to CRS alone in patients with peritoneal colorectal metastases. Trials not previously included in the meta-analyses above are summarized in Tables 3 through 6 below.

Quenet et al (2021) reported results from a randomized, open label RCT comparing CRS plus oxaliplatin-based HIPEC to CRS alone in patients with colorectal cancer and peritoneal metastases (Tables 3 through 6).[21,] Most patients in the trial achieved complete cytoreduction, and all

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

patients had <1 mm of residual disease after cytoreduction. After a median follow-up of 63.8 months, the primary endpoint of median OS was not significantly different between groups. Other survival outcomes were also similar between groups. Subgroup analyses did not identify any differences in OS between treatments in any subgroup. Grade 3 or 4 adverse events were similar between groups in the first 30 days post-treatment, but CRS plus HIPEC was associated with higher adverse event rates 31 to 60 days posttreatment. Limitations of this trial include a short duration of HIPEC administration (30 minutes vs. 90 to 120 minutes) and the extensive use of systemic oxaliplatin-based chemotherapy prior to surgery.

Table 3. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	Comparator
Quenet et al (2021)[21,]	France	17	2008-2014	265 patients aged 18 to 70 years with colorectal cancer with peritoneal metastases, WHO performance status of 0 or 1, and PCI ≤25; all patients had complete macroscopic resection or surgical resection with less than 1 mm residual tumor tissue	133 patients received CRS plus HIPEC	132 patients received CRS alone

CRS: cytoreductive surgery; HIPEC; hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; PCI: Peritoneal Cancer Index; RCT: randomized controlled trial; WHO: World Health Organization.

Table 4. Summary of Key RCT Results

Study	Median OS, mo	Median RFS, mo	5-year OS, %	5-year RFS, %	Grade 3 or 4 AEs, %
Quenet et al (2021)[21,]					*Days 1 through 30; Days 31 through 60*
N			265	265	
CRS alone	41.2	11.1	36.7	13.1	32; 15
CRS plus HIPEC	41.7	13.1	39.4	14.8	42; 26
HR (95% CI)	1.00 (0.63 to 1.58)	0.91 (0.71 to 1.15)			
p	.99	.43	NR	NR	.083;.035

AE: adverse event; CI: confidence interval; CRS: cytoreductive surgery; HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; HR: hazard ratio; NR: not reported; OS: overall survival; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RFS: relapse-free survival.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 5. Study Relevance Limitations

Study	Population[a]	Intervention[b]	Comparator[c]	Outcomes[d]	Follow-Up[e]
Quenet et al (2021)[21,]	3. Approximately 90% of patients achieved complete cytoreduction, which may have limited the benefit achieved with the addition of HIPEC; patients deemed not amenable to complete resection were excluded from the trial			6. No clinical significant difference found between treatment groups	

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy.
[a] Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Study population is unclear; 3. Study population not representative of intended use; 4, Enrolled populations do not reflect relevant diversity; 5. Other.
[b] Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest (e.g., proposed as an adjunct but not tested as such); 5: Other.
[c] Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively; 5. Other.
[d] Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. Incomplete reporting of harms; 4. Not established and validated measurements; 5. Clinically significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinically significant difference not supported; 7. Other.
[e] Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms; 3. Other.

Table 6. Study Design and Conduct Limitations

Study	Allocation[a]	Blinding[b]	Selective Reporting[c]	Data Completeness[d]	Power[e]	Statistical[f]
Quenet et al (2021)[21,]	2. Open-label	1-3. Not blinded				

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
[a] Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias; 5. Other.
[b] Blinding key: 1. Participants or study staff not blinded; 2. Outcome assessors not blinded; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician; 4. Other.
[c] Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication; 4. Other.
[d] Data Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials); 7. Other.
[e] Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference; 4. Other.
[f] Statistical key: 1. Analysis is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Analysis is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated; 5. Other.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

A trial by Verwaal et al (2003), included in the Huang et al (2017) meta-analysis, randomized 105 patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis to standard treatment with systemic chemotherapy (fluorouracil and leucovorin) and palliative surgery, if necessary (ie, treatment of bowel obstruction), or to CRS plus HIPEC followed by standard systemic chemotherapy.[22,] Patients with other sites of metastases (ie, lung or liver) were excluded. The primary endpoint was OS, measured from the time of randomization to death from any cause. After a median follow-up of 21.6 months, 20 (39%) of 51 patients in the standard therapy group were still alive compared with 30 (55%) of 54 patients in the cytoreduction group (HR for death, 0.55; 95% CI, 0.32 to 0.95; p=.032). The median OS in the control group was 12.6 months compared with 22.4 months in the cytoreduction group. Subgroup analysis revealed that OS was particularly poor among patients with a residual tumor measuring greater than 2.5 mm and in patients with tumor involvement in 6 or more regions in the abdomen. In these groups, median survival was approximately 5 months compared with 29 months in patients with no residual tumor. In the cytoreduction group, 4 (8%) patients died from treatment. The most important complications were small bowel leakage and abdominal sepsis; the most common grade 3 and 4 adverse events were leukopenia (7 [15%] patients) and gastrointestinal fistula (7 [15%] patients), respectively.

Verwaal et al (2008) reported on the 8-year follow-up to the RCT and evaluated all patients alive until 2007.[23,] Minimum follow-up was 6 years (median, 7.8 years; range, 6 to 9.6 years). During follow-up, 1 patient crossed over from the standard arm to the CRS plus HIPEC arm after recurrent disease 30 months post-randomization. The median disease-specific survival was 12.6 months in the standard arm and 22.2 months in the CRS plus HIPEC arm (p=.028). Median PFS was 7.7 months in the standard arm and 12.6 months in the CRS plus HIPEC arm (p=.02).

Section Summary: Peritoneal Carcinomatosis of Colorectal Origin
RCTs, a number of observational studies, and systematic reviews of these studies have been published. A 2017 systematic review included 76 studies, of which 15 were controlled and 1 was an RCT. In a meta-analysis of the controlled studies, there was a significantly higher survival rate in patients who received CRS plus HIPEC compared with standard therapy (eg, palliative surgery alone or with systemic chemotherapy). Also, in the controlled studies, CRS plus HIPEC was not associated with a significantly higher rate of treatment-related morbidity. One RCT, in which patients were followed for at least 6 years, demonstrated improved survival in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis due to colorectal cancer who received CRS plus HIPEC and systemic chemotherapy compared with patients who received systemic chemotherapy alone. At the 8-year follow-up, disease-specific survival was 22.2 months in the CRS plus HIPEC arm and 12.6 months in the control arm. However, procedure-related morbidity and mortality were relatively high; 4 (8%) patients in the CRS plus HIPEC group died from treatment. A more recent RCT found no survival benefit with CRS plus HIPEC over CRS alone, and a higher rate of adverse events 31 to 60 days post-procedure in the CRS plus HIPEC group. The lack of benefit seen with HIPEC in this trial may have been due to several factors, including the short duration of HIPEC treatment, the extensive use of preprocedural systemic chemotherapy, and the high rates of complete cytoreduction achieved in both groups.

PERITONEAL CARCINOMATOSIS OF GASTRIC ORIGIN

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of CRS plus HIPEC in individuals with peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations

The relevant population(s) of interest are individuals with peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin.

Interventions

The combination therapy being considered is CRS plus HIPEC.

Cytoreductive surgery includes peritonectomy (ie, peritoneal stripping) procedures and multivisceral resections, depending on the extent of intra-abdominal tumor dissemination.[9,] It may be followed by the infusion of intraperitoneal chemotherapy, most commonly mitomycin C or a platinum agent. The intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be heated, which is intended to improve the tissue penetration, and this is referred to as HIPEC. Inflow and outflow catheters are placed in the abdominal cavity, along with probes to monitor the temperature. The skin is then temporarily closed during the chemotherapy perfusion, which typically runs for 1 to 2 hours.

Comparators

The following therapies are currently being used to treat peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin: CRS alone and systemic chemotherapy.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival (eg, PFS), QOL, treatment-related mortality, and treatment-related morbidity.

Morbidity and mortality from the procedure are measured in the early postoperative period. Survival outcomes (PFS and OS) should be measured out to 5 years.

Study Selection Criteria

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Consistent with a 'best available evidence approach,' within each category of study design, studies with larger sample sizes and longer durations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Systematic Reviews

Mu et al (2025) published a Cochrane systematic review of 2 trials (N=173) evaluating CRS plus HIPEC vs CRS alone in patients with gastric cancer and peritoneal metastases.[24,] The authors found that HIPEC may increase OS (HR, 0.52; 95% CI, 0.28 to 0.96) but the evidence was of very low certainty.

Langellotti et al (2024) published a meta-analysis of 24 studies (2 RCTs) comparing HIPEC plus CRS to palliative systemic chemotherapy in 1369 patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin.[25,] Overall survival was significantly increased with HIPEC plus CRS in the 4 studies evaluating survival outcomes (-1.9; 95% CI, -2.58 to -1.21). The analysis is limited as the studies are primarily retrospective, observational studies.

Stefano et al (2024) published a meta-analysis of 16 RCTs comparing surgery plus HIPEC versus other palliative options that evaluated patients (N=1641) with peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin.[26,] Overall survival was significantly increased in both preventive (HR, 0.56; 95% CI, 0.46 to 0.68; p<.0001; I^2=23.1%) and therapeutic (HR, 0.57; 95% CI, 0.35 to 0.93; p=.023; I^2=0.0%) settings by surgery plus HIPEC. The pooled 3-year mortality rate was 32% (95% CI, 20 to 47; I^2=86.2%) for surgery plus HIPEC for prophylactic use compared to 55% (95% CI, 29 to 78; I^2=80.7%) in the control group. Additionally, there was a decrease in the peritoneal and overall recurrence rates (risk ratio [RR], 0.40 and 0.59, respectively). There was no significant difference in morbidity between the groups (RR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.54 to 1.56; p=.76; I^2=49.0%).

Granieri et al (2022) published a meta-analysis of 12 RCTs that evaluated patients (N=1376) with gastric cancer who underwent CRS plus HIPEC compared to usual standard care in both prophylactic and curative settings.[27,] The included RCTs were all unblinded. Median follow-up duration (reported in 5 studies) was 35.4 months for patients in the treatment group. In the analysis of all studies, the 1, 2, 3, and 5-year OS rate for patients was 86.9%, 70.5%, 63.7%, and 55.7%, respectively. A survival benefit was noted for CRS plus HIPEC at all timepoints, however, a significant difference was only found in 1 (RR, 0.6; 95% CI, 0.47 to 0.75; p<.0001), 2 (RR, 0.7; 95% CI, 0.57 to 0.87; p=.0009) and 3 (RR, 0.68; 95% CI, 0.57 to 0.81; p<.0001) year follow-up.

Desiderio et al (2017) published a meta-analysis of controlled studies comparing CRS plus HIPEC with standard surgical management in the treatment of advanced gastric cancer.[28,] A separate analysis was conducted of studies focused on patients with and without peritoneal carcinomatosis. For the treatment of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin, reviewers identified 2 small RCTs (discussed below) and 12 controlled nonrandomized studies. In a meta-analysis of survival at 1 year, there was a significantly higher survival rate in the group receiving HIPEC than the group receiving control treatment (RR, 0.67; 95% CI, 0.52 to 0.86; p=.002). However, there was no significant difference between HIPEC and control groups in 2-year survival (RR, 0.87; 95% CI, 0.73 to 1.04; p=.12) or 3-year survival (RR, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.93 to 1.06; p=.85).

Randomized Controlled Trials

In a phase 3 trial, Rau et al (2024) randomized 105 patients with peritoneal metastasis from gastric cancer to either perioperative chemotherapy and CRS alone (n=53) or CRS plus HIPEC

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

(n=52).[29,] The median OS for each group was 14.9 months. The difference in median PFS was statistically significant when comparing the CRS alone group (3.5 months; 95% CI, 3.0 to 7.0) to the CRS plus HIPEC group (7.1 months; 95% CI, 3.7 to 10.5; p=.0472). The CRS plus HIPEC group also had a significantly longer median time to occurrence of other distant metastases (10.2 months; 95% CI, 7.7 to 14.7) compared to the CRS alone group (9.2 months; 95% CI, 6.8 to 11.5).

Rudloff et al (2014) reported on results of a preliminary, open-label RCT in 17 patients from several U.S. centers who had gastric cancer metastatic to the liver and lung and peritoneal carcinomatosis.[30,] Eligible patients could, in the opinion of the principal investigator, be resected to "no evidence of disease" based on imaging studies or staging laparoscopy. Patients were assigned using a computerized randomization algorithm to systemic chemotherapy (n=8) or to systemic chemotherapy plus gastrectomy and CRS plus HIPEC (n=9). Median and 1-year OS were 4.3 months and 0%, respectively, in the control group, and 11.3 months and 78%, respectively, in the CRS plus HIPEC group (statistical testing not reported). Factors associated with survival more than 1 year in the CRS plus HIPEC group were complete cytoreduction and initial PCI score of 15 or less. Enrollment to complete a larger planned trial was discontinued due to slow accrual.

Yang et al (2011) randomized 68 patients (1:1) to CRS plus HIPEC or to CRS alone.[31,] Median OS was 11.0 months (95% CI, 10.0 to 11.9 months) in the CRS plus HIPEC group and 6.5 months (95% CI, 4.8 to 8.2 months) in the CRS-only group (p=.046). One-, 2-, and 3-year OS rates in the CRS plus HIPEC and CRS-only groups were 41.2% and 29.4%, 14.7% and 5.9%, and 5.9% and 0%, respectively. The incidence of serious adverse events was similar between groups (15% in the CRS plus HIPEC group vs. 12% in the CRS-only group).

Section Summary: Peritoneal Carcinomatosis of Gastric Origin
A 2024 meta-analysis identified 16 RCTS evaluating CRS plus HIPEC and found it to be a promising prophylactic and treatment therapy option for peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin; however, the scarcity of large-cohort studies and the heterogeneity of the included studies prevented authors from making a definitive recommendation for use. A 2022 meta-analysis identified 12 RCTs evaluating CRS plus HIPEC in both prophylactic and curative settings. A survival benefit was noted in the CRS plus HIPEC groups at 1, 2, and 3 years. A 2017 meta-analysis identified 2 RCTs and 12 controlled nonrandomized studies comparing CRS plus HIPEC with standard surgical management in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis due to gastric cancer. The meta-analysis found significantly increased rates of survival in the CRS plus HIPEC group at 1 year but there was no difference in survival rates at 2 or 3 years. A phase 3 RCT (N=105) found no difference in OS between CRS plus HIPEC or CRS alone. One small (N=17) preliminary RCT showed improved survival in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis due to gastric cancer who received CRS plus HIPEC compared with patients who received chemotherapy alone. Another (N=68) RCT showed improved survival in patients who received CRS plus HIPEC compared with CRS alone. Additional studies with larger sample sizes are needed.

PERITONEAL CARCINOMATOSIS OF ENDOMETRIAL ORIGIN

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of CRS plus HIPEC in individuals with peritoneal carcinomatosis of endometrial origin is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations
The relevant population(s) of interest are individuals with peritoneal carcinomatosis of endometrial origin.

Interventions
The combination therapy being considered is CRS plus HIPEC.

Cytoreductive surgery includes peritonectomy (ie, peritoneal stripping) procedures and multivisceral resections, depending on the extent of intra-abdominal tumor dissemination.[9,] It may be followed by the infusion of intraperitoneal chemotherapy, most commonly mitomycin C or a platinum agent. The intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be heated, which is intended to improve the tissue penetration, and this is referred to as HIPEC. Inflow and outflow catheters are placed in the abdominal cavity, along with probes to monitor the temperature. The skin is then temporarily closed during the chemotherapy perfusion, which typically runs for 1 to 2 hours.

Comparators
The following therapies are currently being used to treat peritoneal carcinomatosis of endometrial origin: CRS alone and systemic chemotherapy.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival (eg, PFS), QOL, treatment-related mortality, and treatment-related morbidity.

Morbidity and mortality from the procedure are measured in the early postoperative period. Survival outcomes (PFS and OS) should be measured out to 5 years.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Consistent with a 'best available evidence approach,' within each category of study design, studies with larger sample sizes and longer durations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Systematic Review
Panczel et al (2024) reported the results of a meta-analysis comparing CRS only to CRS plus HIPEC in patients with endometrial cancer and peritoneal metastases.[32,] There were a total of 21 (N=1116) studies evaluating CRS alone and 10 studies (N=152) evaluating CRS plus HIPEC. Survival rates were higher for the combination compared to CRS alone at 1 year (82.28% vs

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

64.68%; difference, 17.60%; p=.0102), 2 years (56.07% vs 36.95%; difference, 19.12%; p=.0014), but not at 5 years (21.88% vs 16.45%; difference, 5.43%; p=.3918). The analysis is limited by the non-randomized trials, the high heterogeneity, and the small number of studies evaluating HIPEC plus CRS.

Cohort Studies

No RCTs or nonrandomized comparative studies were identified. Two noncomparative, non-U.S. retrospective cohort studies have reported outcomes for CRS plus HIPEC in primary or recurrent endometrial cancer with peritoneal metastasis; these studies are summarized in Tables 7 and 8.[33,34,] These studies are limited by their retrospective observational designs and lack of control groups.

Navarro-Barrios et al (2020) reported on a cohort of 43 patients with primary (n=15) or recurrent (n=28) peritoneal dissemination of endometrial cancer undergoing CRS plus HIPEC.[33,] Histopathologic subtype of cancer was endometroid carcinoma in 35% of patients and non-endometroid carcinoma in 65%. Median PCI at the time of surgery was 12 (interquartile range, 7 to 19). Complete cytoreduction was achieved in 41 (95%) patients. Postoperative complications were observed in 14 patients (33%). Five-year relapse-free survival (RFS) and OS were 23% and 34%, respectively. Factors associated with decreased RFS were preoperative chemotherapy (p=.027), resection of more than 3 peritoneal areas (p=.010), cytoreduction of the supramesocolic compartment (p=.023), HIPEC treatment with paclitaxel (p=.013), and the presence of metastatic lymph nodes in histological analysis (p=.029). Of note, 21 patients (61%) underwent adjuvant therapies after CRS plus HIPEC, further limiting the study's ability to specifically demonstrate benefit for CRS plus HIPEC.

Cornali et al (2018) reported on a cohort of 33 patients undergoing primary (n=5) or secondary (n=28) CRS plus HIPEC for peritoneal metastatic spread from advanced or recurrent endometrial cancer.[34,] Median PCI was 15 (range, 3 to 35). Complete cytoreduction was achieved in 22 patients (66.6%). Major postoperative morbidity (Clavien-Dindo grade 3 or 4) occurred in 21%, and the postoperative mortality rate was 3% (1 patient experienced intraoperative massive pulmonary embolism). Adjuvant chemotherapy was given to 30 patients post-surgery. Rates of 5-year OS and PFS were 30% and 15.5%, respectively. Median OS and PFS were 33.1 months and 18 months, respectively. Complete cytoreduction was associated with increased OS (p<.016).

Table 7. Summary of Key Cohort Study Characteristics for CRS Plus HIPEC in Peritoneal Carcinomatosis of Endometrial Origin

Study	Country	Dates	Participants	Follow-Up
Navarro-Barrios et al (2020)[33,]	Spain (8 centers)	2012-2018	Patients with endometrial cancer and primary or recurrent peritoneal dissemination undergoing CRS plus HIPEC; ECOG performance status 0 to 2	Median, 25 months (IQR, 10 to 37 months)
Cornali et al (2018)[34,]	Italy and Greece (2 centers)	2002-2016	Patients with peritoneal metastatic spread from advanced or recurrent endometrial cancer; age <75 years; ECOG performance status 0 to 2	Median, 73 months (range, 8 to 141 months)

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

CRS: cytoreductive surgery; ECOG: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; IQR: interquartile range.

Table 8. Summary of Key Cohort Study Results for CRS Plus HIPEC in Peritoneal Carcinomatosis of Endometrial Origin

Study	N	Postoperative complications, %	Postoperative morbidity/mortality, %	5-year OS, %	Median OS, mo	5-year RFS, %	5-year PFS, %	Median PFS, mo
Navarro-Barrios et al (2020)[33,]	43	33	NR	34	NR	23	NR	NR
Cornali et al (2018)[34,]	33	NR	21/3	30	33.1	NR	15.5	18

CRS: cytoreductive surgery; HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; NR: not reported; OS: overall survival; PFS: progression-free survival; RFS: relapse-free survival.

Section Summary: Peritoneal Carcinomatosis From Endometrial Cancer
A meta-analysis compared survival outcomes in studies with CRS alone compared with CRS plus HIPEC and found improved survival with CRS plus HIPEC. However, the analysis is largely limited by the retrospective nature of the studies and lack of direct comparisons. Two uncontrolled retrospective cohort studies in patients with primary or recurrent endometrial cancer and peritoneal carcinomatosis have suggested that survival with CRS plus HIPEC may be better than systemic chemotherapy (median OS, 33.1 months vs. <12 months in published reports). However, 1 study reported a complication rate of 33%, and major postoperative morbidity was reported in 21% of patients in another study. Further, there were absent parallel control groups, and potential bias was introduced by confounding factors, such as disease history, cancer subtype, preoperative PCI score, and treatment. Randomized trials comparing CRS plus HIPEC with standard treatment (surgery [including CRS], systemic chemotherapy, brachytherapy, radiotherapy, and/or hormone therapy) in larger numbers of patients are needed.

PERITONEAL MESOTHELIOMA

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of CRS plus HIPEC in individuals with peritoneal mesothelioma is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations
The relevant population(s) of interest are individuals with peritoneal mesothelioma.

Interventions
The combination therapy being considered is CRS plus HIPEC.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Cytoreductive surgery includes peritonectomy (ie, peritoneal stripping) procedures and multivisceral resections, depending on the extent of intra-abdominal tumor dissemination.[9,] It may be followed by the infusion of intraperitoneal chemotherapy, most commonly mitomycin C or a platinum agent. The intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be heated, which is intended to improve the tissue penetration, and this is referred to as HIPEC. Inflow and outflow catheters are placed in the abdominal cavity, along with probes to monitor the temperature. The skin is then temporarily closed during the chemotherapy perfusion, which typically runs for 1 to 2 hours.

Comparators

The following therapies are currently being used to treat peritoneal mesothelioma: CRS alone, systemic chemotherapy, and radiotherapy.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival (eg, PFS), QOL, treatment-related mortality, and treatment-related morbidity.

Morbidity and mortality from the procedure are measured in the early postoperative period. Survival outcomes (PFS and OS) should be measured out to 5 years.

Study Selection Criteria

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Consistent with a 'best available evidence approach,' within each category of study design, studies with larger sample sizes and longer durations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Systematic Reviews

For a systematic review, Baratti et al (2011) searched the PubMed database for studies on the clinical management of diffuse malignant peritoneal mesothelioma.[7,] They included 14 studies with a total of 427 patients, 289 of whom underwent CRS plus HIPEC with 106 receiving both HIPEC and early postoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy. Studies that included patients with well-differentiated or low-grade types of mesothelioma were excluded. All selected studies were prospective, uncontrolled case series. The mean patient age ranged from 49 to 56 years. All institutions used peritonectomy and multivisceral resection to remove the visible disease. Protocols for HIPEC varied widely across institutions in terms of techniques, drugs, carriers, timing, and temperatures. Operative mortality and morbidity were reported in 11 single-institution case series. Operative mortality rates ranged from 0% to 10.5%. Overall, death occurred in 11 (3.1%) of 373 assessable patients. In a multi-institutional series, mortality was 2.2%. Morbidity (severe and life-threatening complications) varied from 20% to 41%. For patients who underwent CRS plus HIPEC, median OS ranged from 29.5 to 92 months. The median OS was not reached in 3 series but exceeded 100 months in 1 of them. One-, 2-, 3-, and

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

5-year OS rates varied from 43% to 88%, 43% to 77%, 43% to 70%, and 33% to 68%, respectively. In 4 studies, median PFS ranged from 7.2 to 40 months.

Results of a systematic review by Helm et al (2015), which included 7 studies published after the Baratti et al (2011) review, aligned with Baratti's findings: pooled 1-, 3-, and 5-year survival estimates were 84%, 59%, and 42%, respectively.[35,]

Observational Studies

Table 9 summarizes relevant observational studies on peritoneal mesothelioma; the largest studies (N>50 patients) are discussed further below.

Table 9. Study Results for CRS Plus HIPEC in Peritoneal Mesothelioma

Study	N	Postoperative, %		Median OS, mo	5-Year OS, %	Median PFS, mo
		Mortality	Morbidity			
Robella et al (2014)[36,]	42	7	36	65	44	NR
Alexander et al (2013)[37,]	211	2	30	38	41	NR
Glehen et al (2010)[11,]	88	NR	NR	41	NR	NR
Yan et al (2009)[38,]	401	NR	NR	53	47	NR

CRS: cytoreductive surgery; HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; NR: not reported; OS: overall survival; PFS: progression-free survival.

The largest observational study (which was included in both systematic reviews) was an international registry study by Yan et al (2009), for which 401 (99%) patients had a complete follow-up.[38,] Of these patients, 92% received HIPEC. Median and 1-, 3-, and 5-year survival rates were 53 months, 81%, 60%, and 47%, respectively.

Alexander et al (2013) reported on 211 patients from 3 U.S. tertiary care centers who had malignant peritoneal mesothelioma and had undergone CRS plus HIPEC.[37,] On multivariate analysis, factors statistically associated with favorable outcome were age younger than 60 years, complete or almost complete cytoreduction, low histologic grade, and HIPEC with cisplatin (rather than mitomycin C).

In the retrospective, multicenter cohort study by Glehen et al (2010), discussed in the Pseudomyxoma Peritonei section, the principal origin of the tumor was peritoneal mesothelioma in 88 patients.[11,] The median survival for this group of patients was 41 months. Independent prognostic indicators in multivariate analysis were: institution, the origin of peritoneal carcinomatosis, completeness of CRS, the extent of carcinomatosis, and lymph node involvement.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Section Summary: Peritoneal Mesothelioma

Retrospective cohort studies have shown median and 5-year OS ranging from 30 to 92 months and from 33% to 68%, respectively, for patients with peritoneal mesothelioma treated with CRS plus HIPEC. Although no RCTs or comparative studies have been published, historical case series have reported a median survival of 12 months with treatment by palliative surgery, systemic or intraperitoneal chemotherapy, and abdominal irradiation. Procedure-related morbidity and mortality rates with CRS plus HIPEC have remained relatively steady over time, at approximately 35% and 5%, respectively. Because the prevalence of peritoneal mesothelioma is very low, conducting comparative trials is difficult.

NEWLY DIAGNOSED STAGE III OVARIAN CANCER

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of CRS plus HIPEC in individuals with newly diagnosed stage III ovarian cancer is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations

The relevant population(s) of interest are individuals with newly diagnosed stage III ovarian cancer.

Interventions

The combination therapy being considered is CRS plus HIPEC.

Cytoreductive surgery includes peritonectomy (ie, peritoneal stripping) procedures and multivisceral resections, depending on the extent of intra-abdominal tumor dissemination.[9,] It may be followed by the infusion of intraperitoneal chemotherapy, most commonly mitomycin C or a platinum agent. The intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be heated, which is intended to improve the tissue penetration, and this is referred to as HIPEC. Inflow and outflow catheters are placed in the abdominal cavity, along with probes to monitor the temperature. The skin is then temporarily closed during the chemotherapy perfusion, which typically runs for 1 to 2 hours.

Comparators

The following therapies are currently being used to treat newly diagnosed stage III ovarian cancer: CRS alone and systemic chemotherapy.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival (eg, PFS), QOL, treatment-related mortality, and treatment-related morbidity.

Morbidity and mortality from the procedure are measured in the early postoperative period. Survival outcomes (PFS and OS) should be measured out to 5 years.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Study Selection Criteria

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Consistent with a 'best available evidence approach,' within each category of study design, studies with larger sample sizes and longer durations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Systematic Reviews

Altayf et al (2026) published a time-to event analysis of 7 RCTs in newly diagnosed or recurrent ovarian cancer.[39,] In new diagnosed ovarian cancer, CRS with HIPEC had a PFS (HR, 0.65; 95% CI, 0.52 to 0.82; p<.001) and OS (HR, 0.68; 95% CI, 0.54 to 0.86; p=.001) advantage over CRS alone.

Taliento et al (2025) published a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating HIPEC in patients with recurrent or newly diagnosed ovarian cancer.[40,] In patients with newly diagnosed primary advanced ovarian cancer, 3 RCTs evaluated PFS with HIPEC plus CRS or CRS alone. PFS was significantly improved with the addition of HIPEC (HR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.39 to 0.88; p=.01). The overall risk of acute kidney failure is significantly higher with HIPEC (OR, 4.01; 95% CI, 1.62 to 9.96).

Kim et al (2022) published a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating HIPEC in patients with ovarian cancer.[41,] Fifteen studies (N=1806) of patients with advanced (stage IC to IV) ovarian cancer were included. Patients were stratified according to recent (<6 months) and non-recent (≥6 months) chemotherapy. Progression-free survival and OS were improved with HIPEC in patients who had recent chemotherapy exposure (HR, 0.585; 95% CI, 0.422 to 0.811 and HR, 0.519; 95% CI, 0.346 to 0.777, respectively). However, in patients without recent chemotherapy, HIPEC did not improve PFS (HR, 1.037; 95% CI, 0.84 to 1.571) or OS (HR, 0.932; 95% CI, 0.607 to 1.430). In the full population both PFS (HR, 0.733; 95% CI, 0.538 to 0.999) and OS (HR, 0.715; 95% CI, 0.545 to 0.937) were improved with HIDEC.

Zhang et al (2019) published a systematic review and meta-analysis assessing the impact of HIPEC on patients with ovarian cancer.[42,] Thirteen studies (N ranging from 12 to 122) with patients with advanced (stage IC to IV) primary ovarian cancer were included. Groups treated with HIPEC had a better OS (HR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.46 to 0.72) and PFS (HR, 0.41; 95% CI, 0.32 to 0.54) than those who did not receive HIPEC. The review was limited by the inclusion of only English language studies, the small number of RCTs (n=2) identified for inclusion, and only 1 of the included studies reporting information about adverse events.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Randomized Controlled Trials

Antonio et al (2022) conducted a single-center, parallel-group, phase 3, RCT in patients with ovarian cancer (stage IIIB/IIIC).[43,] Tables 10 and 11 summarize trial characteristics and results. All 71 patients were originally treated with neoadjuvant systemic chemotherapy then randomized to CRS alone or CRS with cisplatin-based HIPEC. Patients treated with HIPEC had improved DFS and OS.

van Driel et al (2018) reported that CRS plus HIPEC reduced mortality for patients with newly diagnosed stage III epithelial ovarian cancer (see Tables 10 and 11).[44,] Disease recurrence or death occurred in 81% of patients treated with CRS plus HIPEC compared with 89% treated with CRS alone. At 5-year follow-up, 50% of patients treated with CRS plus HIPEC had died compared with 62% treated with CRS alone (p=.02). Median OS was 45.7 months in the HIPEC group and 33.9 months in the control group. The incidence of grade 3 or 4 adverse events was similar in both groups (25% for surgery alone vs. 27% for CRS plus HIPEC; p=.76).

Table 10. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	Comparator
Antonio et al (2022)[43,]	Spain	1	2012-2018	71 women with stage IIIB/IIIC primary epithelial ovarian cancer, tubal carcinoma, or primary peritoneal carcinoma who received 3 cycles of adjuvant chemotherapy	35 patients received CRS plus HIPEC	36 patients received CRS
van Driel et al (2018)[44,]	EU	8	2007-2017	245 women with newly diagnosed stage III epithelial ovarian cancer after 3 cycles of carboplatin and paclitaxel and complete or optimal cytoreduction	122 patients received CRS plus HIPEC	123 patients received CRS alone

CRS: cytoreductive surgery; EU: European Union; HIPEC; hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; RCT: randomized controlled trial.

Table 11. Summary of Key RCT Results

Study	Disease Recurrence or Death, n (%)	Median RFS, mo	Mortality , n (%)	Median OS, mo	Grade 3 or 4 AEs, %
Antonio et al (2022)[43,]					
N	71				

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Study	Disease Recurrence or Death, n (%)	Median RFS, mo	Mortality , n (%)	Median OS, mo	Grade 3 or 4 AEs, %
CRS alone		12		45	27.8
CRS plus HIPEC		18		52	28.6
HR (95% CI)	0.12 (0.02 to 0.89)				
p	.038			.19	
van Driel et al (2018)[44,]					
N	245				
CRS alone	110 (89)	10.7	76 (62)	33.9	25
CRS plus HIPEC	99 (81)	14.2	61 (50)	45.7	27
HR (95% CI)	0.66 (0.50 to 0.87)		0.67 (0.48 to 0.94)		
p	.003		.02		.76

AE: adverse event; CI: confidence interval; CRS: cytoreductive surgery; HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; HR: hazard ratio; OS: overall survival; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RFS: relapse-free survival (disease recurrence or progression or death).

The limitations tables (see Tables 12 and 13) below display notable limitations identified in each study. This information is synthesized as a summary of the body of evidence following each table and provides the conclusions on the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the position statement. The major limitation of the van Driel et al (2018) trial was the lack of blinding, which might be expected to have a minor effect on the objective measure of mortality.

Table 12. Study Relevance Limitations

Study	Population[a]	Intervention[b]	Comparator[c]	Outcomes[d]	Follow-Up[e]
Antonio et al (2022)[43,]	4. Single-center study conducted in Spain				
Van Driel et al (2018)[44,]	3. There were very selective inclusion criteria, so the effect of the intervention on a broader patient population (eg, recurrent disease) is unknown				

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

[a] Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Study population is unclear; 3. Study population not representative of intended use; 4, Enrolled populations do not reflect relevant diversity; 5. Other.
[b] Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest (e.g., proposed as an adjunct but not tested as such); 5: Other.
[c] Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively; 5. Other.
[d] Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. Incomplete reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinically significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinically significant difference not supported; 7. Other.
[e] Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms; 3. Other.

Table 13. Study Design and Conduct Limitations

Study	Allocation[a]	Blinding[b]	Selective Reporting[c]	Data Completeness[d]	Power[e]	Statistical[f]
Antonio et al (2022)[43,]		4. Blinding not reported				
Van Driel et al (2018)[44,]		1-3. Not blinded				

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
[a] Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias; 5. Other.
[b] Blinding key: 1. Participants or study staff not blinded; 2. Outcome assessors not blinded; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician; 4. Other.
[c] Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication; 4. Other.
[d] Data Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials); 7. Other.
[e] Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference; 4. Other.
[f] Statistical key: 1. Analysis is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Analysis is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated; 5. Other.

Section Summary: Newly Diagnosed Stage III Ovarian Cancer

Evidence for HIPEC includes systematic reviews and RCTs in patients with newly diagnosed stage III epithelial ovarian cancer who were treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy and had complete or optimal cytoreduction. In the largest RCT, HIPEC increased the time to disease recurrence and reduced mortality. It did not increase serious adverse events compared with surgery alone. The major limitation in the trial was the lack of blinding, which might be expected to have a minor effect on the objective measure of mortality.

RECURRENT STAGE IIIC OR IV OVARIAN CANCER

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of CRS plus HIPEC in individuals with recurrent stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations
The relevant population(s) of interest are individuals with recurrent stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer.

Interventions
The combination therapy being considered is CRS plus HIPEC.

Cytoreductive surgery includes peritonectomy (ie, peritoneal stripping) procedures and multivisceral resections, depending on the extent of intra-abdominal tumor dissemination.[9,] It may be followed by the infusion of intraperitoneal chemotherapy, most commonly mitomycin C or a platinum agent. The intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be heated, which is intended to improve the tissue penetration, and this is referred to as HIPEC. Inflow and outflow catheters are placed in the abdominal cavity, along with probes to monitor the temperature. The skin is then temporarily closed during the chemotherapy perfusion, which typically runs for 1 to 2 hours.

Comparators
The following therapies are currently being used to treat recurrent stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer: CRS alone and systemic chemotherapy.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival (eg, PFS), QOL, treatment-related mortality, and treatment-related morbidity.

Morbidity and mortality from the procedure are measured in the early postoperative period. Survival outcomes (PFS and OS) should be measured out to 5 years.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Consistent with a 'best available evidence approach,' within each category of study design, studies with larger sample sizes and longer durations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Systematic Reviews
A systematic review and meta-analysis of studies assessing CRS plus HIPEC for treating ovarian cancer was published by Huo et al (2015).[45,] Reviewers selected studies that included more than 10 patients with primary or recurrent ovarian cancer who were treated with CRS plus HIPEC. Thirty-seven studies were identified, 9 comparative studies and 28 uncontrolled studies. Only 1 RCT (Spiliotis et al [2015][46,]), described below, was identified in the literature search. A pooled

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

analysis of 8 studies comparing CRS plus HIPEC with CRS plus non-HIPEC chemotherapy found significantly higher 1-year survival in the CRS plus HIPEC group (odds ratio [OR], 4.24; 95% CI, 2.17 to 8.30). There were similar findings on 3-year survival (pooled OR , 4.31; 95% CI, 2.11 to 8.11). Most of the comparative studies were not randomized and thus subject to potential selection and observational biases.

Altayf et al (2026; see previous indication) published a time-to event analysis of 7 RCTs in newly diagnosed (n=3) or recurrent (n=4) ovarian cancer.[39,] In recurrent ovarian cancer, CRS with HIPEC did not improve OS (HR, 0.85; 95% CI, 0.69 to 1.03; p=.10) or PFS (HR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.81 to 1.12; p=.52). However, another 2026 meta-analysis (Wei et al 2026) of the same 4 RCTs did find improved OS in recurrent ovarian cancer (HR, 0.73; 95% CI, 0.58 to 0.92; p=.008) but the primary analysis appears to have excluded the RCT by Fagotti et al discussed below.[47,]

Taliento et al (2025; see previous indication) published a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating HIPEC in patients with recurrent or newly diagnosed ovarian cancer.[40,] In patients with recurrent ovarian cancer, 3 RCTs evaluated PFS with HIPEC plus CRS or CRS alone. PFS was not significantly improved with the addition of HIPEC (HR, 1.04; 95% CI, 0.72 to 1.49; p=.85). The overall risk of acute kidney failure is significantly higher with HIPEC (OR, 4.01; 95% CI, 1.62 to 9.96).

Kim et al (2022; see previous indication) also included a subgroup analysis for patients with recurrent ovarian cancer.[41,] In this setting, HIPEC did not significantly improve PFS (HR, 0.968; 95% CI, 0.542 to 1.728) or OS (HR, 1.010; 95% CI, 0.663 to 1.539).

Zhang et al (2019; see previous indication) also included results for patients with recurrent ovarian cancer.[42,] In this subgroup, HIPEC had significantly improved OS (HR, 0.45; 95% CI, 0.24 to 0.83) compared with groups that did not receive HIPEC; however, PFS (HR, 0.55; 95% CI, 0.27 to 1.11) was not significantly improved.

Wang et al (2019; see previous indication) also provided a subgroup analysis of patients with recurrent ovarian cancer.[48,] In this population, the HIPEC group had significantly improved OS (HR, 0.48; 95% CI, 0.24 to 0.96; p <.01) but not DFS (HR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.33 to 1.08; p=.09).

Randomized Controlled Trials

Fagotti et al (2025; HORSE/MITO-18; NCT01539785) and Classe et al (2024; CHIPOR) published phase 3, multicenter RCTs evaluating HIPEC in recurrent ovarian cancer.[49,50,] In the open-label HORSE study by Fagotti et al (2025), patients with primary platinum-sensitive recurrence of ovarian, fallopian tube, or peritoneal cancer were randomized to secondary CRS alone or CRS with HIPEC.[49,] Patients did not receive neoadjuvant chemotherapy. The study failed to find a difference in PFS between treatments. Similarly, the CHIPOR trial published by Classe et al (2024) was an open-label, multicenter study in patients with relapsed epithelial ovarian cancer.[50,] Patients in the CHIPOR trial received 6 cycles of platinum-based chemotherapy prior to surgery. This trial found improved OS with HIPEC plus CRS compared with CRS alone. The discrepancies in findings between these 2 trials have raised concerns regarding the reproducibility and robustness of the reported survival benefits with HIPEC in patients with recurrent ovarian cancer.[51,]

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Zivanovic et al (2021) reported on a multi-center RCT of 117 women who had platinum-sensitive recurrent ovarian cancer. [52,] There was a median follow-up of 39.5 months, and the median PFS in the CRS plus HIPEC group versus the control group was 12.3 and 15.7 months, respectively (p=.05). There was no reported significant difference in median OS between the two groups (p=.31).

Spiliotis et al (2015) reported on a single-center RCT of 120 women who had recurrent stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer after surgery and systemic chemotherapy.[46,] In Kaplan-Meier survival analysis, mean OS was 26.7 months in the CRS plus HIPEC group and 13.4 months in the non-HIPEC group (p=.006) However, completeness of cytoreduction and PCI score were associated with survival, and these measures were not comparable between groups. Treatment-related morbidity and mortality were not reported.

Tables 14 and 15 below summarize key characteristics and results of these studies.

Table 14. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	Comparator
Fagotti et al (2025)[49,]	Italy	8	2012-2023	167 women with platinum-sensitive recurrent epithelial ovarian cancer undergoing secondary CRS	CRS plus HIPEC	CRS alone
Classe et al (2024)[50,]	France, Belgium, Spain, Canada	31	2011-2021	415 women with first relapse of epithelial ovarian cancer undergoing secondary CRS ≥6 months after completing platinum-based chemotherapy	CRS plus HIPEC	CRS alone
Zivanovic et al (2021) [52,]	US	4	2014-2019	117 women undergoing secondary CRS with first recurrence of high-grade epithelial ovarian cancer after completion of first-line platinum-based chemotherapy	CRS plus HIPEC	CRS plus systemic chemotherapy
Spiliotis et al (2015)[46,]	EU	1	2006-2013	120 women with advanced (stage IIIC or IV) recurrent epithelial ovarian cancer	CRS plus HIPEC	CRS plus systemic chemotherapy

CRS: cytoreductive surgery; EU: European Union; HIPEC; hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; RCT: randomized controlled trial; US: United States

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 15. Summary of Key RCT Results

Study	Event recurrence/death, n (%)	Median PFS/RFS, mo (95% CI)	Mortality, n (%)	Median OS, mo	Grade 3 or 4 AEs, %
Fagotti et al (2025)[49,]					
N	167				
CRS	69 (81.2)	23 (17 to 29)	37 (43.5)		34.7
CRS plus HIPEC	70 (85.4)	25 (18 to 32)	35 (42.7)		29.1
HR (95% CI)	1.02 (0.73 to 1.42)		0.86 (0.54 to 1.37)		
p	.91				
Classe et al (2024)[50,]	**OS, n (%)**				
N	415				
CRS	66 (32)	9.5 (8.6 to 11.6)		45.8	Grade 3: 22%; Grade 4: 4%
CRS plus HIPEC	81 (39)	10.2 (9.3 to 11.9)		54.3	Grade 3: 41%; Grade 4: 8%
HR (95% CI)	0.73 (0.56 to 0.96)				
p	.024				
Zivanovic et al (2021) [52,]					
N	117	117			
CRS plus systemic chemotherapy		15.7		59.7	20
CRS plus HIPEC		12.3		52.5	24

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Study	Event recurrence/death, n (%)	Median PFS/RFS, mo (95% CI)	Mortality, n (%)	Median OS, mo	Grade 3 or 4 AEs, %
HR (95% CI)		1.54 (1 to 2.37)		1.39 (0.73 to 2.67)	
p		.05		.31	.81
Spiliotis et al (2015)[46,]					
N	120	120			
CRS plus systemic chemotherapy				13.4	
CRS plus HIPEC				26.7	
p				.006	

AE: adverse event; CRS: cytoreductive surgery; HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; OS: overall survival; PFS: progression-free survival; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RFS: relapse-free survival (disease recurrence or progression or death).

Limitations in relevance and design and conduct are noted in Tables 16 and 17. For the Spiliotis et al (2015) study, baseline between-group differences in the stage of disease and completeness of cytoreduction, which is a prognostic indicator for survival, limit interpretation of the trial results.

Table 16. Study Relevance Limitations

Study	Population[a]	Intervention[b]	Comparator[c]	Outcomes[d]	Follow-Up[e]
Fagotti et al (2025)[49,]					
Classe et al (2024)[50,]	2. Absence of important baseline information; 3. Chemotherapy was administered before surgery which differs from other trials				
Zivanovic et al (2021) [52,]			3. More patients in the control group had complete cytoreduction (94% vs. 82%).		

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Study	Population[a]	Intervention[b]	Comparator[c]	Outcomes[d]	Follow-Up[e]
Spiliotis et al (2015)[46,]	3. The HIPEC group had more patients with stage IIIC disease (68% vs. 60%)		3. More patients in the HIPEC group had complete cytoreduction (65% vs. 55%).		

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy.

[a] Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Study population is unclear; 3. Study population not representative of intended use; 4, Enrolled populations do not reflect relevant diversity; 5. Other.
[b] Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest (e.g., proposed as an adjunct but not tested as such); 5: Other.
[c] Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively; 5. Other.
[d] Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. Incomplete reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinically significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinically significant difference not supported; 7. Other.
[e] Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms; 3. Other.

Table 17. Study Design and Conduct Limitations

Study	Allocation[a]	Blinding[b]	Selective Reporting[c]	Data Completeness[d]	Power[e]	Statistical[f]
Fagotti et al (2025)[49,]		1-3. Not blinded				
Classe et al (2024)[50,]		1-3. Not blinded				
Zivanovic et al (2021) [52,]		1-3. Not blinded				
Spiliotis et al (2015)[46,]		1-3. Not blinded				

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
[a] Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias; 5. Other.
[b] Blinding key: 1. Participants or study staff not blinded; 2. Outcome assessors not blinded; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician; 4. Other.
[c] Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication; 4. Other.
[d] Data Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials); 7. Other.
[e] Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference; 4. Other.
[f] Statistical key: 1. Analysis is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Analysis is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated; 5. Other.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Section Summary: Recurrent Stage IIIC or IV Ovarian Cancer
Cytoreductive surgery plus HIPEC has been studied in RCTs of patients with recurrent stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer. For recurrent disease (second-line setting), evidence from an RCT indicated that CRS plus HIPEC improved survival compared with CRS without HIPEC. Treatment groups in this RCT were unbalanced at baseline and in the completeness of cytoreduction, which has consistently been shown to be associated with survival. Another RCT reported that CRS plus HIPEC resulted in significant benefit in median PFS compared to CRS without HIPEC for patients with platinum-sensitive recurrent disease, however there was no significant difference in median OS. The most recent RCTs combining HIPEC with CRS in patients with recurrent disease are conflicting, and the survival benefit of HIPEC with CRS compared with CRS alone remains unclear.

APPENDICEAL GOBLET CELL TUMORS

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of CRS plus HIPEC in individuals with appendiceal goblet cell tumors is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations
The relevant population(s) of interest are individuals with appendiceal goblet cell tumors.

Interventions
The combination therapy being considered is CRS plus HIPEC.

Cytoreductive surgery includes peritonectomy (ie, peritoneal stripping) procedures and multivisceral resections, depending on the extent of intra-abdominal tumor dissemination.[9,] It may be followed by the infusion of intraperitoneal chemotherapy, commonly mitomycin C or a platinum agent. The intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be heated, which is intended to improve the tissue penetration, and this is referred to as HIPEC. Inflow and outflow catheters are placed in the abdominal cavity, along with probes to monitor the temperature. The skin is then temporarily closed during the chemotherapy perfusion, which typically runs for 1 to 2 hours.

Comparators
The following therapies are currently being used to treat appendiceal goblet cell tumors: CRS alone and systemic chemotherapy.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival (eg, PFS), QOL, treatment-related mortality, and treatment-related morbidity.

Morbidity and mortality from the procedure are measured in the early postoperative period. Survival outcomes (PFS and OS) should be measured out to 5 years.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Consistent with a 'best available evidence approach,' within each category of study design, studies with larger sample sizes and longer durations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Cohort Studies

Sluiter et al (2020) analyzed a propensity score-matched cohort of 44 patients with peritoneally-metastasized goblet cell carcinoids, comparing survival outcomes in patients receiving CRS plus HIPEC versus surgery alone (see Tables 18 and 19).[53,] In this observational analysis, CRS plus HIPEC was associated with improved median OS compared to surgery alone (39 months vs. 12 months). Surgery without HIPEC was correlated with poor OS in a multivariate model (HR, 2.77; 95% CI, 1.06 to 7.26), as was high age and the presence of ovarian metastases. This analysis is limited by the sample size and observational design; although propensity score matching was used to reduce selection bias, differences between patient groups likely remained and confounding by treatment indication cannot be ruled out. It is unclear how many patients attained complete cytoreduction in each treatment group, and differences in the rate of complete cytoreduction may have influenced outcomes.

Table 18. Summary of Key Observational Comparative Study Characteristics

Study	Study Type	Country	Dates	Participants	CRS plus HIPEC	Surgery alone	Follow-Up
Sluiter et al (2020)[53,]	Propensity score-matched cohort	Netherlands and Belgium	2003-2016	Patients with confirmed peritoneal metastases of goblet cell carcinoids	22	22	Mean, 21.2 months

CRS: cytoreductive surgery; HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 19. Summary of Key Observational Comparative Study Results

Study	Median OS, mo
Sluiter et al (2020)[53,]	
CRS plus HIPEC	39
Surgery alone	12
p	.017
HR (95% CI), p	2.77 (1.06 to 7.26), p =.038

CI: confidence interval; CRS: cytoreductive surgery; HIPEC: hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy; HR: hazard ratio; OS:overall survival.

Noncomparative retrospective cohort studies have reported on additional outcomes with CRS plus HIPEC in patients with appendiceal goblet cell tumors. In a multicenter, retrospective cohort study, McConnell et al (2014) studied appendiceal goblet cell tumors (n=45) and compared outcomes for CRS plus HIPEC with those in nonmucinous (n=52) and low-grade (n=567) and high-grade (n=89) mucinous appendiceal tumors.[54,] All patients had peritoneal malignancy due to advanced disease but none was identified as having pseudomyxoma peritonei. With a median follow-up of 49 months, patients with goblet cell tumors had better survival outcomes than those in patients with low-grade mucinous tumors and similar outcomes to those in patients with high-grade mucinous tumors: 3-year OS rates in patients with goblet cell, low-grade mucinous, high-grade mucinous, and nonmucinous tumor were 63%, 81% (p=.003), 40% (p=.07), and 52% (p=.48), respectively. In 489 (65%) patients who achieved complete cytoreduction, the pattern of 3-year DFS outcomes was similar: 43%, 73% (p<.001), 44% (p=.85), and 44% (p=.82), respectively (p values for rates vs. goblet cell tumors). Treatment-related adverse events were not reported. Grade 3 or 4 surgical complications occurred in approximately 20% of patients in each group.

A noncomparative, single-center retrospective cohort study by Zambrano-Vera et al (2020) reported outcomes in 20 patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis from appendiceal goblet cell carcinoma who successfully underwent CRS plus HIPEC.[55,] Complete cytoreduction was achieved in 75%. Grade 3 postoperative complications were reported in 15%. With a median follow-up time of 70 months, 1-, 3-, and 5-year OS rates were 100%, 75%, and 65%, respectively. Median OS was not reached at 5 years. Rates of 1-, 3-, and 5-year PFS were 94%, 67%, and 59%, respectively, with a median PFS of 97 months.

Section Summary: Appendiceal Goblet Cell Tumors

Evidence is limited to retrospective cohort studies of patients with goblet cell tumors of the appendix. A propensity score-matched analysis found that CRS plus HIPEC was associated with improved median survival compared to surgery alone. However, this analysis was limited by the retrospective nature of the data and small sample size (N=44). Rates of complete cytoreduction were not reported or accounted for in this study, so between-group differences in this or other variables may have influenced the observed outcomes. Noncomparative retrospective studies

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

have found 3-year survival rates of 63% to 75% with CRS plus HIPEC, and 1 study reported a 5-year survival rate of 65%.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

The purpose of the following information is to provide reference material. Inclusion does not imply endorsement or alignment with the evidence review conclusions.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

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

American Society of Clinical Oncology

In 2022, the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) published recommendations for the treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer.[56,] The guidelines recommend cytoreductive surgery (CRS) plus systemic chemotherapy for select patients. However, they recommend against CRS with oxaliplatin-based hyperthermic peritoneal chemotherapy based on evidence that this combination results in worse adverse events than CRS plus chemotherapy and little or no survival benefit.

ASCO published a guideline update for neoadjuvant chemotherapy for newly diagnosed, advanced ovarian cancer in 2025.[57,] The update states, "For patients diagnosed with FIGO [International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics] stage III disease who have good PS [performance status], adequate renal function, and treated with NACT [neoadjuvant chemotherapy], HIPEC [hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy] may be offered during ICS [interval cytoreductive surgery] through a shared decision-making process that considers patient preferences, quality of life, and availability. Participation in HIPEC clinical trials is encouraged. (Evidence quality: Moderate; Strength of recommendation: Conditional)"

American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons

In 2022, the practice guidelines on the treatment of colon cancer by the American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons stated that "in patients with resectable colorectal cancer peritoneal metastases, cytoreductive surgery with or without intraperitoneal chemotherapy should be considered as part of a multimodality treatment plan (strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B)."[58,]

In 2025 , the American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons guidelines on the management of appendiceal neoplasms stated that "in selected patients with appendiceal epithelial neoplasms, intraperitoneal chemotherapy after cytoreductive surgery compared to cytoreductive surgery alone mayreduce peritoneal disease recurrence, although its impact on overall survival is not established and has been associated with increased costs and toxicity." The guidelines mention that HIPEC performed concurrently with CRS is the most common method of delivering this intraperitoneal chemotherapy.[59,]

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Chicago Consensus Working Group
In 2020, the Chicago Consensus Working Group for the Management of Peritoneal Surface Malignancies published a consensus statement on the management of ovarian neoplasms.[60,] The consensus statement mentions HIPEC, and includes it in its management pathway for patients with peritoneal metastasis from epithelial ovarian cancer. However, the authors also state that "level I evidence is lacking for HIPEC at the time of primary CRS or for stage IV disease" and "similarly, no level I evidence exists for HIPEC use in patients with rare ovarian histologies." Other consensus statements from this group on appendiceal neoplasms, peritoneal mesothelioma, gastric metastases, and colorectal metastases include CRS plus intraperitoneal chemotherapy or CRS +/- intraperitoneal chemotherapy in their management pathways; however, they do not specify whether this intraperitoneal chemotherapy should be HIPEC or another form of intraperitoneal chemotherapy.[61,62,63,64,]

Gastric Cancer Working Group
A consensus guideline from the Gastric Cancer Working group summarized recommendations for gastric cancer with synchronous peritoneal metastases.[65,] The consensus recommended, "In patients with PCI ≤7 but in whom complete cytoreduction is not predicted, or their functional status would not permit an extensive surgery (ECOG ≤2), intraperitoneal chemotherapy with or without additional systemic therapy may be considered." They also state, "CRS with IPC is not recommended in patients with PCI >7 despite stable/responsive disease. The survival benefit is reduced in these patients and a risk of substantial morbidity exists with surgery and chemotherapy. Instead, these patients should be referred for further lines of systemic therapy, a clinical trial, or supportive care."

International Consensus
A multisociety international consensus reviewed evidence for the use of HIPEC with CRS in stage 3 high-grade serous ovarian cancer (HGSOC) and for individuals with platinum-sensitive recurrent HGSOC.[66,] They made the following recommendations:

- "iCRS [interval cytoreductive surgery] + HIPEC vs iCRS should be used for selected patients who have received 3 cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for stage III HGSOC ovarian cancer, as compared to CRS alone." (Strong recommendation)
- "Either sCRS [secondary CRS] in association with systemic therapy or systemic therapy should be used in patients with the platinum-sensitive recurrent HGSOC (recurrence after a minimum period 6 months after the end first-line treatment)." (Conditional recommendation)

National Comprehensive Cancer Network
The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines include the following relevant recommendation for colon cancer (v.2.2026): "The panel currently believes that complete CRS and/or intraperitoneal chemotherapy can be considered in experienced centers for selected patients with limited peritoneal metastases for whom R0 resection can be achieved. However, the significant morbidity and mortality associated with HIPEC, as well as the conflicting data on clinical efficacy, make this approach very controversial."[67,] They additionally state that for patients with appendiceal adenocarcinoma with metastatic disease limited to the peritoneum, " In select patients diagnosed with metastatic spread to the peritoneum, CRS and HIPEC have the potential to be curative. CRS and HIPEC are associated with morbidity and mortality, and it is

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

imperative that a capable multidisciplinary medical team perform extensive preoperative tests to deem a patients fit for this combination therapy."

The NCCN guidelines on gastric cancer (v.2.2026) state that HIPEC "may be a therapeutic alternative for carefully selected patients with peritoneal carcinoma as only disease."[6,] In addition they recommend "IC [intraperitoneal chemotherapy]/HIPEC can be used in conjunction with cytoreductive surgery for patients with low PCI [peritoneal cancer index] (≤10) who are candidates to undergo complete cytoreduction. In patients with a higher burden of peritoneal disease (PCI >10), IC/HIPEC may be considered in the setting of a clinical trial. The role of prophylactic IC/HIPEC/PIPAC [pressurized intraperitoneal aerosolized chemotherapy] is currently investigational for patients with non-metastatic cancers and should only be performed in the setting of a clinical trial."

The NCCN guidelines on uterine neoplasms (v.2.2026) and rectal cancer (v.2.2026) do not discuss cytoreductive surgery (CRS) plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC).[68,69,]

The NCCN guidelines on ovarian cancer (v.4.2026) state that "select patients with low-volume residual disease after surgical cytoreduction for invasive epithelial ovarian or peritoneal cancer are potential candidates for intraperitoneal therapy" and "HIPEC with cisplatin (100 mg/m^2) can be considered at the time of interval debulking surgery for stage III disease. HIPEC can also be considered for suitable stage IV patients (category 2B) who have had a favorable response to neoadjuvant therapy both intraperitoneally and extraperitoneally, or in whom stage IV disease sites have completely resolved (eg, resolution of malignant pleural effusion) or are now deemed resectable."[70,] The guidelines also suggest consideration of HIPEC in poor surgical candidates or those with low likelihood of optimal cytoreduction who have had a response or have stable disease after neoadjuvant therapy.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations
Not applicable.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
Some currently ongoing or unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 20.

Table 20. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Title	Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
Colorectal and appendiceal cancer			
NCT01815359	ICARuS Post-operative Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (EPIC) and Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) After Optimal Cytoreductive Surgery (CRS) for Neoplasms of the Appendix, Colon or Rectum With Isolated Peritoneal Metastasis	292	Sep 2026 (active, not recruiting)
Gastric cancer			

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

NCT No.	Title	Enrollment	Completion Date
NCT05300945	HIPEC Combined Gastrectomy in Patients With Advanced Gastric Cancer Received Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy	200	Dec 2028 (active, not recruiting)
NCT01882933	GASTRICHIP : D2 Resection and HIPEC (Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemoperfusion) in Locally Advanced Gastric Carcinoma. A Randomized and Multicentric Phase III Study	367	May 2026 (active, not recruiting)
Ovarian cancer			
NCT06544460	Secondary Cytoreduction and Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Recurrent Ovarian Cancer Patients With PARP Inhibitors Resistance: a Phase II Clinical Study	94	Dec 2026 (active, not recruiting)
NCT05827523	Phase III Randomized Trial of HIPEC in Primary Stage Three & Four Ovarian Cancer After Interval Cytoreductive Surgery (FOCUS)	520	Dec 2030 (recruiting)
NCT05316181	Randomized Phase III Trial of Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) for Platinum-Resistant Recurrent Ovarian Cancer	140	Dec 2029 (active, not recruiting)
NCT02124421	Phase II Randomized Study: Cytoreductive Surgery (CRS) With/Without Carboplatin Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) Followed by Adjuvant Chemotherapy as Initial Treatment of Ovarian, Fallopian Tube, & Primary Peritoneal Cancer	32	Apr 2028 (active, not recruiting)
NCT01376752	A Phase III Randomized Study Evaluating Hyperthermic Intra-Peritoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) in the Treatment of Relapse Ovarian Cancer	415	May 2027 (active, not recruiting)
NCT03772028	Phase III Randomized Clinical Trial for Stage III Epithelial Ovarian Cancer Randomizing Between Primary Cytoreductive Surgery With or Without Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy	538	Dec 2028 (active, not recruiting)
Unpublished			
Gastric cancer			
NCT02240524	A Phase III Study of Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy in the Treatment of Locally Advanced Gastric Cancer After radical Gastrectomy With D2 Lymphadenectomy	582	July 2019 (unknown)
Ovarian cancer			
NCT01767675	A Phase II Randomized Study: Outcomes After Secondary Cytoreductive Surgery With or Without Carboplatin Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) Followed by Systemic	99	Aug 2025 (completed)

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

NCT No.	Title	Enrollment	Completion Date
	Combination Chemotherapy for Recurrent Platinum-Sensitive Ovarian, Fallopian Tube, or Primary Peritoneal Cancer		
NCT01628380	Stage IIIC Unresectable Epithelial Ovarian/Tubal Cancer With Partial or Complete Response After 1st Line Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy (3 Cycles CBDCA+Paclitaxel): a Phase 3 Prospective Randomized Study Comparing Cytoreductive Surgery + Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (CDDP+Paclitaxel) + 3 Cycles CBDCA+Paclitaxel vs Cytoreductive Surgery Alone + 3 Cycles CBDCA+Paclitaxel	94	Jul 2018 (unknown)

NCT: national clinical trial.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

CODING

The following codes for treatment and procedures applicable to this policy are included below for informational purposes. This may not be a comprehensive list of procedure codes applicable to this policy.

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.

The code(s) listed below are medically necessary ONLY if the procedure is performed according to the "Policy" section of this document.

CPT / HCPCS CODES	
77605	Hyperthermia, externally generated; deep (i.e., heating to depths greater than 4 cm)
77620	Hyperthermia generated by intracavitary probe(s)
96446	Chemotherapy administration into the peritoneal cavity via implanted port or catheter
96547	Intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy procedure; first 60 minutes
96548	Intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy procedure; each additional 30 minutes
96549	Unlisted chemotherapy procedure

REVISIONS	
08-11-2009	In Policy section: ▪ Added indication "A. Cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for the treatment of pseudomyxoma peritonei is considered medically necessary."
	In Coding section: ▪ Added CPT Code: 77620.
10-19-2009	In Policy section: ▪ Removed, "A. Cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for the treatment of pseudomyxoma peritonei is considered medically necessary." ▪ Revised wording From, "B. Cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for the treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastrointestinal origin is considered experimental / investigational." To "Cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be considered medically necessary for the treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis when clinically confined to the peritoneal cavity."
	Updated Rationale and References sections.
01-28-2011	Description section updated.
	Rationale section updated.
	Diagnosis Code wording updated.
	References section updated.
03-07-2011	In Coding section: ▪ Added CPT code: 96446 ▪ Removed CPT code: 96445
02-28-2014	Description section reviewed
	Rationale section reviewed

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	In Coding section: ▪ Updated Coding Information bullets ▪ Added ICD-10 Diagnoses Codes
	References reviewed
07-23-2015	Policy published 06-23-2015 for an effective date of 07-23-2015
	Title revised from "Cytoreduction and Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for the Treatment of Peritoneal Carcinomatosis of Gastrointestinal Origin" to "Cytoreductive Surgery and Perioperative Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Select Intra-Abdominal and Pelvic Malignancies".
	Description section updated
	In Policy section: ▪ In Item A "removed "peritoneal carcinomatosis when clinically confined to the peritoneal cavity" to read, "Cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be considered medically necessary for the treatment of:" ▪ In Item A added, "1. pseudomyxoma peritonei; and 2. diffuse malignant peritoneal mesothelioma" ▪ Added Item B "Cytoreductive surgery and perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy is considered experimental / investigational for: 1. peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer, gastric cancer, or endometrial cancer; 2. ovarian cancer; and 3. all other indications, including goblet cell tumors of the appendix"
	Rationale section updated
	In Coding section: ▪ Added CPT Code: 96549 ▪ Removed CPT Codes: 77605, 77620 (they were not applicable to this policy). ▪ Added ICD-9 Codes: 158.8, 158.9 and the corresponding ICD-10 code. ▪ Updated Coding notations.
	References updated
02-17-2016	In Policy section: ▪ Added new Item A 2, "invasive epithelial ovarian cancer; and" ▪ Previous Item A 2 is now Item A 3. ▪ In Item B 2, added "all other types" and "not meeting the above" to read, "all other types of ovarian cancer not meeting the above"
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
09-15-2016	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: ▪ In Item A, added "surgery" and "perioperative" and removed "on" and "hyperthermic" to read, "Cytoreductive surgery and perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be considered medically necessary for the treatment of:"
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: ▪ Revised coding bullets.
	Updated References section.
11-15-2016	In Coding section: ▪ Added ICD-10 codes: C56.1, C56.2.
08-15-2017	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section:

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	▪ In Item A, added "plus" and removed "and" to read, "Cytoreductive surgery plus perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy may be considered medically necessary for the treatment of:" ▪ In Item B, added "plus" and removed "and" to read, "Cytoreductive surgery plus perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy is considered experimental / investigational for:"
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
04-12-2019	Policy posted to the bcbsks.com website on 03-13-2019 with an effective date of 04-12-2019.
	The title of the policy was revised from "Cytoreductive Surgery and Perioperative Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Select Intra-Abdominal and Pelvic Malignancies."
	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: ▪ In Item A, removed "perioperative" and added "hyperthermic" and "(HIPEC) at the time of surgery" to read, "Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) at the time of surgery may be considered medically necessary for the treatment of:" ▪ Removed Item A 2, "invasive epithelial ovarian cancer; and" ▪ Added new Item B, "The use of HIPEC may be considered medically necessary in newly diagnosed epithelial ovarian or fallopian tube cancer at the time of interval cytoreductive surgery when ALL of the following criteria are met: 1. The patient has stage III disease (see Policy Guidelines); and 2. The patient is not eligible for primary cytoreductive surgery or surgery had been performed but was incomplete and will receive neoadjuvant chemotherapy and subsequent interval debulking surgery (see Policy Guidelines); and 3. It is expected that complete or optimal cytoreduction can be achieved at time of the interval debulking surgery (see Policy Guidelines)." ▪ Added new Item C, "The use of HIPEC in all other settings to treat ovarian cancer, including, but not limited to, stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer, is considered experimental / investigational." ▪ Removed previous Item B 2 (currently Item D), "all other types of ovarian cancer not meeting the above; and" ▪ Updated Policy Guidelines.
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: ▪ Added CPT codes: 77605, 77620. ▪ ICD-9 codes were removed.
	Updated References section.
04-22-2020	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
05-05-2021	Updated Description section.
	In the Policy section: • Added "and" to item A.1 • Updated Ovarian Staging definition in Policy guideline 1.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
10-08-2021	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding Section • Added ICD-10 C56.3; 10 C79.63 (Effective 10-01-2021)

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">REVISIONS</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated References section.</td></tr>
<tr><td>12-06--2021</td><td>In the Policy section:
Deleted "and" to item A.1. This was added in error</td></tr>
<tr><td>10-11-2022</td><td>Updated Title:
Removed: "Cytoreductive Surgery and" from title
Changed to: "Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Select Intra-Abdominal and Pelvic Malignancies"</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Description Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Rationale Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Update Policy Section
Section A1 added "OR" at the end of "pseudomyxoma peritonei"
Section D: removed "perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy" and added "hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC)"</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Policy Guideline Section
Changed the "Ovarian cancer staging is as follows:" to<table>
<tr><td>IA</td><td>Tumor limited to 1 ovary, capsule intact, no tumor on surface, negative washings.</td></tr>
<tr><td>IB</td><td>Tumor involves both ovaries otherwise like IA.</td></tr>
<tr><td>IC</td><td>Tumor limited to 1 or both ovaries</td></tr>
<tr><td>IC1</td><td>Surgical spill</td></tr>
<tr><td>IC2</td><td>Capsule rupture before surgery or tumor on ovarian surface.</td></tr>
<tr><td>IC3</td><td>Malignant cells in the ascites or peritoneal washings.</td></tr>
<tr><td>IIA</td><td>Extension and/or implant on uterus and/or Fallopian tubes</td></tr>
<tr><td>IIB</td><td>Extension to other pelvic intraperitoneal tissues</td></tr>
<tr><td>IIIA</td><td>(Positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes and /or microscopic metastasis beyond the pelvis)</td></tr>
<tr><td>IIIA1</td><td>Positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes only</td></tr>
<tr><td>IIIA2</td><td>Microscopic, extrapelvic (above the brim) peritoneal involvement ± positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes</td></tr>
<tr><td>IIIB</td><td>Macroscopic, extrapelvic, peritoneal metastasis ≤ 2 cm ± positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes. Includes extension to capsule of liver/spleen</td></tr>
<tr><td>IIIC</td><td>Macroscopic, extrapelvic, peritoneal metastasis > 2 cm ± positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes. Includes extension to capsule of liver/spleen</td></tr>
<tr><td>IVA</td><td>Pleural effusion with positive cytology</td></tr>
<tr><td>IVB</td><td>Hepatic and/or splenic parenchymal metastasis, metastasis to extraabdominal organs (including inguinal lymph nodes and lymph nodes outside of the abdominal cavity)</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Coding Section
Removed Coding Bullets
The coding for this overall procedure would likely involve codes for the surgery, the intraperitoneal chemotherapy, and the hyperthermia.
<u>Cytoreduction</u>
There is no specific CPT code for the surgical component of this complex procedure. It is likely that a series of CPT codes would be used describing exploratory laparotomies of various components of the abdominal cavity, in addition to specific codes for resection of visceral organs, depending on the extent of the carcinomatosis.
<u>Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy</u>
CPT code 96446 identifies "chemotherapy administration into the peritoneal cavity via indwelling port or catheter". When performed using a temporary catheter or performed intraoperatively, the unlisted code 96549 would be reported.
<u>Hyperthermia</u></td></tr>
</table>

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">REVISIONS</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>This procedure does not refer to external application of heat as described by CPT code 77605. There are no codes for the heating of the chemotherapy.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated References Section</td></tr>
<tr><td>08-22-2023</td><td>Updated Description Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Rationale Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Coding Section
▪ Removed ICD-10 Codes</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated References Section</td></tr>
<tr><td>01-01-2024</td><td>Updated Coding Section
▪ Updated nomenclature for 96446 (eff. 01-01-2024)
▪ Added new codes 96547 and 96548 (eff. 01-01-2024)</td></tr>
<tr><td>08-27-2024</td><td>Updated Description Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Rationale Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated References Section</td></tr>
<tr><td>08-26-2025</td><td>Updated Description Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Rationale Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated References Section</td></tr>
<tr><td>09-08-2026</td><td>Updated Description Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Policy Guideline Section
▪ Section A Removed:
<table>
<tr><td>▪ IA</td><td>▪ Tumor limited to 1 ovary, capsule intact, no tumor on surface, negative washings.</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IB</td><td>▪ Tumor involves both ovaries otherwise like IA.</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IC</td><td>▪ Tumor limited to 1 or both ovaries</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IC1</td><td>▪ Surgical spill</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IC2</td><td>▪ Capsule rupture before surgery or tumor on ovarian surface.</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IC3</td><td>▪ Malignant cells in the ascites or peritoneal washings.</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IIA</td><td>▪ Extension and/or implant on uterus and/or Fallopian tubes</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IIB</td><td>▪ Extension to other pelvic intraperitoneal tissues</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IIIA</td><td>▪ (Positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes and /or microscopic metastasis beyond the pelvis)</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IIIA1</td><td>▪ Positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes only</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IIIA2</td><td>▪ Microscopic, extrapelvic (above the brim) peritoneal involvement ± positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IIIB</td><td>▪ Macroscopic, extrapelvic, peritoneal metastasis ≤ 2 cm ± positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes. Includes extension to capsule of liver/spleen</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IIIC</td><td>▪ Macroscopic, extrapelvic, peritoneal metastasis > 2 cm ± positive retroperitoneal lymph nodes. Includes extension to capsule of liver/spleen</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IVA</td><td>▪ Pleural effusion with positive cytology</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ IVB</td><td>▪ Hepatic and/or splenic parenchymal metastasis, metastasis to extraabdominal organs (including inguinal lymph nodes and lymph nodes outside of the abdominal cavity)</td></tr>
</table>
▪ Section A Added:
<table>
<tr><td>▪ Stage I</td><td>▪ The cancer is confined to the ovary or fallopian tube</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ Stage II</td><td>▪ The cancer involves 1 or both ovaries with pelvic extension</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ Stage III</td><td>▪ The cancer has spread within the abdomen</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ Stage IV</td><td>▪ The cancer is widely spread throughout the body</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated Rationale Section</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Updated References Section</td></tr>
</table>

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REFERENCES

1. Maggiori L, Elias D. Curative treatment of colorectal peritoneal carcinomatosis: current status and future trends. Eur J Surg Oncol. Jul 2010; 36(7): 599-603. PMID 20605396
2. National Organization for Rare Disorders. Pseudomyxoma peritonei. Updated November 25, 2019. https://rarediseases.org/rare-diseases/pseudomyxoma-peritonei/. Accessed May 19, 2026.
3. Elias D, Honoré C, Ciuchendéa R, et al. Peritoneal pseudomyxoma: results of a systematic policy of complete cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. Br J Surg. Sep 2008; 95(9): 1164-71. PMID 18690633
4. Yonemura Y, Kawamura T, Bandou E, et al. Advances in the management of gastric cancer with peritoneal dissemination. Recent Results Cancer Res. 2007; 169: 157-64. PMID 17506258
5. Yonemura Y, Endou Y, Shinbo M, et al. Safety and efficacy of bidirectional chemotherapy for treatment of patients with peritoneal dissemination from gastric cancer: Selection for cytoreductive surgery. J Surg Oncol. Sep 15 2009; 100(4): 311-6. PMID 19697437
6. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: gastric cancer. Version 2.2026. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/gastric.pdf. Accessed May 18, 2026.
7. Baratti D, Kusamura S, Deraco M. Diffuse malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: systematic review of clinical management and biological research. J Surg Oncol. Jun 2011; 103(8): 822-31. PMID 21283990
8. Chornokur G, Amankwah EK, Schildkraut JM, et al. Global ovarian cancer health disparities. Gynecol Oncol. Apr 2013; 129(1): 258-64. PMID 23266352
9. Glockzin G, Ghali N, Lang SA, et al. Results of cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer. J Surg Oncol. Sep 15 2009; 100(4): 306-10. PMID 19697436
10. Jimenez W, Sardi A, Nieroda C, et al. Predictive and prognostic survival factors in peritoneal carcinomatosis from appendiceal cancer after cytoreductive surgery with hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. Ann Surg Oncol. Dec 2014; 21(13): 4218-25. PMID 24986239
11. Glehen O, Gilly FN, Boutitie F, et al. Toward curative treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis from nonovarian origin by cytoreductive surgery combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy: a multi-institutional study of 1,290 patients. Cancer. Dec 15 2010; 116(24): 5608-18. PMID 20737573
12. Elias D, Gilly F, Quenet F, et al. Pseudomyxoma peritonei: a French multicentric study of 301 patients treated with cytoreductive surgery and intraperitoneal chemotherapy. Eur J Surg Oncol. May 2010; 36(5): 456-62. PMID 20227231
13. Chua TC, Yan TD, Smigielski ME, et al. Long-term survival in patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei treated with cytoreductive surgery and perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy: 10 years of experience from a single institution. Ann Surg Oncol. Jul 2009; 16(7): 1903-11. PMID 19387742
14. Vaira M, Cioppa T, DE Marco G, et al. Management of pseudomyxoma peritonei by cytoreduction+HIPEC (hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy): results analysis of a twelve-year experience. In Vivo. 2009; 23(4): 639-44. PMID 19567401
15. Marcotte E, Dubé P, Drolet P, et al. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy with oxaliplatin as treatment for peritoneal carcinomatosis arising from the appendix and

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

pseudomyxoma peritonei: a survival analysis. World J Surg Oncol. Nov 07 2014; 12: 332. PMID 25380618
16. Yan TD, Black D, Savady R, et al. A systematic review on the efficacy of cytoreductive surgery and perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for pseudomyxoma peritonei. Ann Surg Oncol. Feb 2007; 14(2): 484-92. PMID 17054002
17. Lord AC, Shihab O, Chandrakumaran K, et al. Recurrence and outcome after complete tumour removal and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in 512 patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei from perforated appendiceal mucinous tumours. Eur J Surg Oncol. Mar 2015; 41(3): 396-9. PMID 25216980
18. Sardi A, Jimenez WA, Nieroda C, et al. Repeated cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in peritoneal carcinomatosis from appendiceal cancer: analysis of survival outcomes. Eur J Surg Oncol. Nov 2013; 39(11): 1207-13. PMID 24007834
19. Li J, Wang AR, Chen XD, et al. Effect of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in combination with cytoreductive surgery on the prognosis of patients with colorectal cancer peritoneal metastasis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. World J Surg Oncol. Jun 14 2022; 20(1): 200. PMID 35701802
20. Huang CQ, Min Y, Wang SY, et al. Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy improves survival for peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of current evidence. Oncotarget. Aug 15 2017; 8(33): 55657-55683. PMID 28903452
21. Quénet F, Elias D, Roca L, et al. Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy versus cytoreductive surgery alone for colorectal peritoneal metastases (PRODIGE 7): a multicentre, randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. Feb 2021; 22(2): 256-266. PMID 33476595
22. Verwaal VJ, van Ruth S, de Bree E, et al. Randomized trial of cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy versus systemic chemotherapy and palliative surgery in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol. Oct 15 2003; 21(20): 3737-43. PMID 14551293
23. Verwaal VJ, Bruin S, Boot H, et al. 8-year follow-up of randomized trial: cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy versus systemic chemotherapy in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal cancer. Ann Surg Oncol. Sep 2008; 15(9): 2426-32. PMID 18521686
24. Mu M, Cai Z, Hu Y, et al. Intraperitoneal chemotherapy for gastric cancer. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Oct 09 2025; 10(10): CD015698. PMID 41065080
25. Langellotti L, Fiorillo C, D'Annibale G, et al. Efficacy of Cytoreductive Surgery (CRS) + HIPEC in Gastric Cancer with Peritoneal Metastasis: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Cancers (Basel). May 18 2024; 16(10). PMID 38792007
26. Stefano M, Perrina D, Vallicelli C, et al. Prophylaxis and treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin using hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. J Gastrointest Surg. Jul 2024; 28(7): 1185-1193. PMID 38599315
27. Granieri S, Bonomi A, Frassini S, et al. Prognostic impact of cytoreductive surgery (CRS) with hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in gastric cancer patients: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Eur J Surg Oncol. Nov 2021; 47(11): 2757-2767. PMID 34001385
28. Desiderio J, Chao J, Melstrom L, et al. The 30-year experience-A meta-analysis of randomised and high-quality non-randomised studies of hyperthermic intraperitoneal

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

chemotherapy in the treatment of gastric cancer. Eur J Cancer. Jul 2017; 79: 1-14. PMID 28456089
29. Rau B, Lang H, Koenigsrainer A, et al. Effect of Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy on Cytoreductive Surgery in Gastric Cancer With Synchronous Peritoneal Metastases: The Phase III GASTRIPEC-I Trial. J Clin Oncol. Jan 10 2024; 42(2): 146-156. PMID 37906724
30. Rudloff U, Langan RC, Mullinax JE, et al. Impact of maximal cytoreductive surgery plus regional heated intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) on outcome of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin: results of the GYMSSA trial. J Surg Oncol. Sep 2014; 110(3): 275-84. PMID 25042700
31. Yang XJ, Huang CQ, Suo T, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy improves survival of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis from gastric cancer: final results of a phase III randomized clinical trial. Ann Surg Oncol. Jun 2011; 18(6): 1575-81. PMID 21431408
32. Panczel I, Acs M, Herold M, et al. Survival Difference of Endometrial Cancer Patients with Peritoneal Metastasis Receiving Cytoreductive Surgery (CRS) with and without Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC): A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Int J Mol Sci. Jul 08 2024; 25(13). PMID 39000603
33. Navarro-Barrios Á, Gil-Martínez J, Ramos-Bernardo I, et al. Intraperitoneal hyperthermic chemotherapy after cytoreduction in patients with peritoneal metastases from endometrial cancer. The next frontier?. Surg Oncol. Jun 2020; 33: 19-23. PMID 32561085
34. Cornali T, Sammartino P, Kopanakis N, et al. Cytoreductive Surgery Plus Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Patients with Peritoneal Metastases from Endometrial Cancer. Ann Surg Oncol. Mar 2018; 25(3): 679-687. PMID 29282600
35. Helm JH, Miura JT, Glenn JA, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Surg Oncol. May 2015; 22(5): 1686-93. PMID 25124472
36. Robella M, Vaira M, Mellano A, et al. Treatment of diffuse malignant peritoneal mesothelioma (DMPM) by cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC. Minerva Chir. Feb 2014; 69(1): 9-15. PMID 24675242
37. Alexander HR, Bartlett DL, Pingpank JF, et al. Treatment factors associated with long-term survival after cytoreductive surgery and regional chemotherapy for patients with malignant peritoneal mesothelioma. Surgery. Jun 2013; 153(6): 779-86. PMID 23489943
38. Yan TD, Deraco M, Baratti D, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: multi-institutional experience. J Clin Oncol. Dec 20 2009; 27(36): 6237-42. PMID 19917862
39. Altayf A, Nelson G, Chiva LM, et al. The role of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in newly diagnosed and recurrent ovarian cancer: A time-to-event meta-analysis of randomized trials. Gynecol Oncol. May 2026; 208: 22-31. PMID 41831249
40. Taliento C, Restaino S, Arcieri M, et al. Cytoreductive Surgery Plus HIPEC in Recurrent or Newly Diagnosed Advanced Epithelial Ovarian Cancer: a Meta-analysis. Ann Surg Oncol. May 2025; 32(5): 3648-3659. PMID 39904852
41. Kim SI, Kim JH, Lee S, et al. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for epithelial ovarian cancer: A meta-analysis. Gynecol Oncol. Dec 2022; 167(3): 547-556. PMID 36273925
42. Zhang G, Zhu Y, Liu C, et al. The prognosis impact of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) plus cytoreductive surgery (CRS) in advanced ovarian cancer: the meta-analysis. J Ovarian Res. Apr 17 2019; 12(1): 33. PMID 30995948

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

43. Antonio CCP, Alida GG, Elena GG, et al. Cytoreductive Surgery With or Without HIPEC After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Ovarian Cancer: A Phase 3 Clinical Trial. Ann Surg Oncol. Apr 2022; 29(4): 2617-2625. PMID 34812982
44. van Driel WJ, Koole SN, Sikorska K, et al. Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy in Ovarian Cancer. N Engl J Med. Jan 18 2018; 378(3): 230-240. PMID 29342393
45. Huo YR, Richards A, Liauw W, et al. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) and cytoreductive surgery (CRS) in ovarian cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Surg Oncol. Dec 2015; 41(12): 1578-89. PMID 26453145
46. Spiliotis J, Halkia E, Lianos E, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC in recurrent epithelial ovarian cancer: a prospective randomized phase III study. Ann Surg Oncol. May 2015; 22(5): 1570-5. PMID 25391263
47. Wei J, Qiu Y, Ding Z, et al. Efficacy of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in advanced ovarian cancer: a bibliometric analysis and updated meta-analysis. Eur J Surg Oncol. Jan 2026; 52(1): 111300. PMID 41308399
48. Wang Y, Ren F, Chen P, et al. Effects of CytoReductive surgery plus hyperthermic IntraPEritoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) versus CytoReductive surgery for ovarian cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Surg Oncol. Mar 2019; 45(3): 301-309. PMID 30786961
49. Fagotti A, Costantini B, Fanfani F, et al. Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy in Platinum-Sensitive Recurrent Ovarian Cancer: A Randomized Trial on Survival Evaluation (HORSE; MITO-18). J Clin Oncol. Mar 2025; 43(7): 852-860. PMID 39571127
50. Classe JM, Meeus P, Hudry D, et al. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for recurrent ovarian cancer (CHIPOR): a randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. Dec 2024; 25(12): 1551-1562. PMID 39549720
51. Karabeg E, Harter P. Expert commentary on HORSE/MITO18 and CHIPOR. J Gynecol Oncol. Mar 2025; 36(2): e87. PMID 40165391
52. Zivanovic O, Chi DS, Zhou Q, et al. Secondary Cytoreduction and Carboplatin Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Platinum-Sensitive Recurrent Ovarian Cancer: An MSK Team Ovary Phase II Study. J Clin Oncol. Aug 10 2021; 39(23): 2594-2604. PMID 34019431
53. Sluiter NR, van der Bilt JD, Croll DMR, et al. Cytoreduction and Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) Versus Surgery Without HIPEC for Goblet-Cell Carcinoids and Mixed Adenoneuroendocrine Carcinomas: Propensity Score-Matched Analysis of Centers in the Netherlands and Belgium. Clin Colorectal Cancer. Sep 2020; 19(3): e87-e99. PMID 32651131
54. McConnell YJ, Mack LA, Gui X, et al. Cytoreductive surgery with hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy: an emerging treatment option for advanced goblet cell tumors of the appendix. Ann Surg Oncol. Jun 2014; 21(6): 1975-82. PMID 24398544
55. Zambrano-Vera K, Sardi A, Munoz-Zuluaga C, et al. Outcomes in Peritoneal Carcinomatosis from Appendiceal Goblet Cell Carcinoma Treated with Cytoreductive Surgery and Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (CRS/HIPEC). Ann Surg Oncol. Jan 2020; 27(1): 179-187. PMID 31646450
56. Morris VK, Kennedy EB, Baxter NN, et al. Treatment of Metastatic Colorectal Cancer: ASCO Guideline. J Clin Oncol. Jan 20 2023; 41(3): 678-700. PMID 36252154
57. Gaillard S, Lacchetti C, Armstrong DK, et al. Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy for Newly Diagnosed, Advanced Ovarian Cancer: ASCO Guideline Update. J Clin Oncol. Mar 2025; 43(7): 868-891. PMID 39841949

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

58. Vogel JD, Felder SI, Bhama AR, et al. The American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Colon Cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. Feb 01 2022; 65(2): 148-177. PMID 34775402
59. Gaertner WB, Brown SR, Deutsch M, et al. The American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Appendiceal Neoplasms. Dis Colon Rectum. Jul 01 2025; 68(7): 815-834. PMID 40262165
60. Hoppenot C, Schuitevoerder D, Izquierdo FJ, et al. The Chicago Consensus on Peritoneal Surface Malignancies: Management of Ovarian Neoplasms. Ann Surg Oncol. Jun 2020; 27(6): 1780-1787. PMID 32285271
61. Izquierdo FJ, Schuitevoerder D, Plana A, et al. The Chicago Consensus on Peritoneal Surface Malignancies: Management of Gastric Metastases. Ann Surg Oncol. Jun 2020; 27(6): 1768-1773. PMID 32285269
62. Izquierdo FJ, Schuitevoerder D, Plana A, et al. The Chicago Consensus on Peritoneal Surface Malignancies: Management of Colorectal Metastases. Ann Surg Oncol. Jun 2020; 27(6): 1761-1767. PMID 32285270
63. Schuitevoerder D, Izquierdo FJ, Plana A, et al. The Chicago Consensus on Peritoneal Surface Malignancies: Management of Peritoneal Mesothelioma. Ann Surg Oncol. Jun 2020; 27(6): 1774-1779. PMID 32285273
64. Schuitevoerder D, Plana A, Izquierdo FJ, et al. The Chicago Consensus on Peritoneal Surface Malignancies: Management of Appendiceal Neoplasms. Ann Surg Oncol. Jun 2020; 27(6): 1753-1760. PMID 32285275
65. Butensky SD, Bansal VV, Su DG, et al. Consensus Guideline for the Management of Gastric Cancer with Synchronous Peritoneal Metastases. Ann Surg Oncol. Jun 2026; 33(6): 5222-5239. PMID 40560499
66. Brennan D, Hawarden A, Cinquini M, et al. Multisocietal Consensus on the Use of Cytoreductive Surgery and HIPEC for the Treatment of Epithelial Ovarian Cancer: A GRADE Approach for Evidence Evaluation and Recommendation. J Surg Oncol. Oct 2025; 132(5): 885-894. PMID 40776838
67. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: colon cancer. Version 2.2026. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/colon.pdf. Accessed May 19, 2026.
68. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: uterine neoplasms. Version 2.2026. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/uterine.pdf. Accessed May 15, 2026.
69. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: rectal cancer. Version 2.2026. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/rectal.pdf. Accessed May 16, 2026.
70. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: ovarian cancer including fallopian tube cancer and primary peritoneal cancer. Version 4.2026. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/ovarian.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2026.

OTHER REFERENCES

1. MCOP board certified General Surgeon consultant, MCOP ID 2062-4612, Reviewer ID 1042, June 29, 2009.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

2. MCOP board certified General Surgeon consultant, MCOP ID 2062-4612, Reviewer ID 1042, August 14, 2009.
3. MCOP board certified General Surgeon consultant, MCOP ID 2062-4612, Reviewer ID 1042, August 18, 2009.
4. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Oncology Liaison Committee Consent Ballot, February 2019.
5. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Surgery Liaison Committee, August 2015; February 2016; May 2017; January 2019.
6. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas OB/GYN Liaison Committee, January 2016; May 2017; January 2019, January 2022, May 2024.
7. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Oncology Liaison Committee, August 2017, August 2024.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information