Plasma Exchange (PE)

Policy # 00249
Original Effective Date: 03/19/2010
Current Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Applies to all products administered or underwritten by Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and its subsidiary, HMO Louisiana, Inc. (collectively referred to as the “Company”), unless otherwise provided in the applicable contract. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Medical Policy periodically.

Note: Immune Globulin Therapy is addressed separately in medical policy 00170.

When Services Are Eligible for Coverage
Coverage for eligible medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products may be provided only if:

- Benefits are available in the member’s contract/certificate, and
- Medical necessity criteria and guidelines are met.

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider plasma exchange (PE) to be eligible for coverage for the conditions listed below:

Autoimmune
- Severe multiple manifestations of mixed cryoglobulinemia (MC) such as cryoglobulinemic nephropathy, skin ulcers, sensory motor neuropathy and widespread vasculitis in combination with immunosuppressive treatment;
- Catastrophic antiphospholipid syndrome (CAPS)

Hematologic
- ABO incompatible hematopoietic progenitor cell transplantation;
- Hyperviscosity syndromes associated with multiple myeloma or Waldenstrom’s macroglobulinemia;
- Idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura (ITP) in emergency situations;
- Thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura (TTP);
- Atypical hemolytic-uremic syndrome (HUS);
- Post-transfusion purpura;
- HELLP syndrome of pregnancy (a severe form of preeclampsia, characterized by hemolysis [H], elevated liver enzymes [EL], and low platelet [LP] counts);
- Myeloma and acute renal failure

Neurological
- Acute inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy (Guillain-Barre [GBS] syndrome); severity grade 1-2 within two weeks of onset; severity grade 3-5 within four weeks of onset; and children less than ten years old with severe GBS;
- Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (CIDP);
- Multiple sclerosis (MS); acute fulminant central nervous system (CNS) demyelination;
- Myasthenia gravis in crisis or as part of preoperative preparation;
- Paraproteinemia polyneuropathy; IgA, IgG.
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**Renal**
- Anti-glomerular basement membrane (GBM) disease (Goodpasture’s syndrome);
- ANCA [antineutrophil cytoplasmic antibody]-associated vasculitis [e.g., Wegener’s granulomatosis [also known as granulomatosis with polyangitis (GPA)] with associated renal failure;
- Dense deposit disease with factor H deficiency and/or elevated C3 Nephritic factor

**Transplantation**
- ABO incompatible solid organ transplantation;
  - Kidney;
  - Heart (infants);
- Renal transplantation: antibody mediated rejection; HLA desensitization;
- Focal segmental glomerulosclerosis after renal transplant.

**When Services Are Considered Investigational**

Coverage is not available for investigational medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products.

Based on review of available data, the Company considers plasma exchange (PE) to be investigational* in all other conditions, including, but not limited to, the following:
- ABO incompatible solid organ transplant; liver;
- Acute disseminated encephalomyelitis;
- Acute inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy (GBS) in children less than ten years old with mild or moderate forms;
- Acute liver failure;
- Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis;
- ANCA [antineutrophil cytoplasmic antibody]-associated rapidly progressive glomerulonephritis (Wegener’s granulomatosis or GPA without renal failure);
- Aplastic anemia;
- Asthma;
- Autoimmune hemolytic anemia; warm autoimmune hemolytic anemia; cold agglutinin disease;
- Chronic fatigue syndrome;
- Coagulation factor inhibitors;
- Cryoglobulinemia; except for severe mixed cryoglobulinemia (MC) as noted above;
- Dermatomyositis and polymyositis;
- Focal segmental glomerulosclerosis (other than after renal transplant);
- Heart transplant rejection treatment;
- Hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS); typical (diarrheal-related);
- Idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura; refractory or non-refractory;
- Inclusion body myositis;
- Lambert-Eaton myasthenic syndrome;
- Multiple sclerosis; chronic progressive or relapsing remitting;
- Mushroom poisoning;
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- Myasthenia gravis (MG) with anti-MuSK antibodies;
- Overdose and poisoning (other than mushroom poisoning);
- Paraneoplastic syndromes;
- Paraproteinemia polyneuropathy; IgM;
- Pediatric autoimmune neuropsychiatric disorders associated with streptococcal infections (PANDAS);
- Pemphigus vulgaris;
- Phytanic acid storage disease (Refsum’s disease);
- POEMS (polyneuropathy, organomegaly, endocrinopathy, M protein, skin changes);
- Psoriasis;
- Red blood cell alloimmunization in pregnancy;
- Rheumatoid arthritis (RA);
- Sepsis;
- Scleroderma (systemic sclerosis);
- Stiff person syndrome;
- Sydenham’s chorea (SC);
- Systemic lupus erythematosus (including SLE [systemic lupus erythematosus] nephritis);
- Thyrotoxicosis;
- Hyperviscosity syndromes with renal failure (other than associated with multiple myeloma or Waldenstrom’s macroglobulinemia).

**Background/Overview**

Plasma exchange (PE) is a procedure in which the plasma is isolated, then discarded and replaced with a substitution fluid such as albumin. Plasma exchange is a nonspecific therapy, since the entire plasma is discarded. PE has been used in a wide variety of acute and chronic conditions, as well as in the setting of solid organ transplantation.

The terms therapeutic apheresis, plasmapheresis, and PE are often used interchangeably, but when properly used denote different procedures. The American Society for Apheresis (ASFA) definitions for these procedures are as follows:

**Apheresis:** A procedure in which blood of the patient or donor is passed through a medical device which separates out one or more components of blood and returns remainder with or without extracorporeal treatment or replacement of the separated component.

**Plasmapheresis:** A procedure in which blood of a patient or the donor is passed through a medical device which separates out plasma from the other components of blood and the plasma is removed (i.e., less than 15% of total plasma volume) without the use of replacement solution.

**Plasma exchange:** A therapeutic procedure in which blood of the patient is passed through a medical device which separates out plasma from other components of blood, the plasma is removed and replaced.
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with a replacement solution such as colloid solution (e.g., albumin and/ or plasma) or a combination of crystalloid/colloid solution.

This policy addresses only plasma exchange as a therapeutic apheresis procedure. The rationale for PE is based on the fact that circulating substances, such as toxins or autoantibodies, can accumulate in the plasma. Also, it is hypothesized that removal of these factors can be therapeutic in certain situations. PE is essentially a symptomatic therapy, since it does not remove the source of the pathogenic factors. Therefore the success of PE will depend on whether the pathogenic substances are accessible through the circulation and whether their rate of production and transfer to the plasma component can be adequately addressed by PE. For example, PE can rapidly reduce levels of serum autoantibodies; however, through a feedback mechanism, this rapid reduction may lead to a rebound overproduction of the same antibodies. This rebound production of antibodies is thought to render the replicating pathogenic clone of lymphocytes more vulnerable to cytotoxic drugs; therefore, PE is sometimes used in conjunction with cyclophosphamide.

Applications of PE can be broadly subdivided into two general categories: 1) acute self-limited diseases, in which PE is used to acutely lower the circulating pathogenic substance; and 2) chronic diseases, in which there is ongoing production of pathogenic autoantibodies. Because PE does not address underlying pathology, and, due to the phenomenon of rebound antibody production, its use in chronic diseases has been more controversial than in acute self-limited diseases.

In addition, plasmapheresis has been used in the setting of solid organ transplantation. It has been used as a technique to desensitize high-risk patients prior to transplant and also as a treatment of antibody-mediated rejection reaction (AMR) occurring after transplant. Prior to transplant, plasmapheresis has been most commonly used to desensitize patients receiving an ABO mismatched kidney, often in combination with a splenectomy. As a treatment of AMR, plasmapheresis is often used in combination with intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIg) or anti-CD-20 therapy (i.e., Rituxan).

**FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval**

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)
The CMS, Medicare Coverage Database, National Coverage Determination (NCD) for apheresis (therapeutic pheresis) states: "For purposes of Medicare coverage, apheresis is defined as an autologous procedure, i.e., blood is taken from the patient, processed, and returned to the patient as part of a continuous procedure (as distinguished from the procedure in which a patient donates blood preoperatively and is transfused with the donated blood at a later date). Apheresis is covered for the following indications: Plasma exchange for acquired myasthenia gravis; Leukapheresis in the treatment of leukemia; Plasmapheresis in the treatment of primary macroglobulinemia (Waldenstrom); Treatment of hyperglobulinemias, including (but not limited to) multiple myelomas, cryoglobulinemia and hyperviscosity syndromes; Plasmapheresis or plasma exchange as a last resort treatment of thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura (TTP); Plasmapheresis or plasma exchange in the last resort treatment of life threatening rheumatoid vasculitis; Plasma perfusion of charcoal filters for treatment of pruritis of cholestatic liver disease; Plasma exchange in the treatment of Goodpasture's Syndrome; Plasma exchange in the treatment of glomerulonephritis associated with antiglomerular basement membrane antibodies and advancing renal
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failure or pulmonary hemorrhage; Treatment of chronic relapsing polyneuropathy for patients with severe or life threatening symptoms who have failed to respond to conventional therapy; Treatment of life threatening scleroderma and polymyositis when the patient is unresponsive to conventional therapy; Treatment of Guillain-Barre Syndrome; and Treatment of last resort for life threatening systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) when conventional therapy has failed to prevent clinical deterioration.

Rationale/Source

Autoimmune Diseases

One potential type of evidence in support of the clinical effectiveness of PE in treating autoimmune diseases is the identification of a pathogenic component of plasma that is reliably eliminated by plasmapheresis. Although many laboratory abnormalities are associated with autoimmune connective tissue diseases, it is unclear which, if any, cause the clinical manifestations of the disease. Furthermore, it is not known to what extent plasma levels parallel clinical disease. For example, in many of the controlled trials discussed as follows, PE reliably reduced circulating autoantibodies and immune complexes, but without demonstrable clinical benefit. It may be that the patient had already suffered irreversible damage or that the pathogenesis of the disease was a local process unrelated to circulating factors. Over the past 10 years, randomized trials of PE have been conducted and, in general, have shown a lack of effectiveness as treatment of chronic autoimmune diseases. Clinical results of randomized trials of plasmapheresis for specific chronic autoimmune diseases are discussed here.

Systemic Lupus Erythematosus

Reporting on the results of a randomized controlled trial (RCT), Lewis and colleagues concluded that PE had no benefit in patients with systemic lupus and glomerulonephritis compared to a standard therapy regimen of prednisone and cyclophosphamide. Plasmapheresis has also been investigated as a technique to improve the effectiveness of cyclophosphamide therapy. For example, it is thought that the acute lowering of pathogenic autoantibodies with plasmapheresis may result in their rebound production. It is hoped that the pathogenic lymphocytes would be more sensitive to cyclophosphamide at this point. Danielli and colleagues reported on a prospective nonrandomized trial of 28 patients with proliferative lupus nephritis; 12 underwent synchronized plasmapheresis and pulse cyclophosphamide therapy, while the remaining 16 underwent cyclophosphamide alone. While plasmapheresis was associated with a decreased time to remission of renal disease, at the end of the 4-year follow-up, there was no difference in outcome.

Multiple Sclerosis (MS)

There have been several RCTs of PE in patients with MS that have reported inconclusive results. Khatri and colleagues studied 54 patients with chronic progressive MS randomized to receive sham or true PE. The degree of improvement in the PE group was greater than that in the control group. Weiner et al. reported on a study that randomized patients with acute attacks of MS to receive either PE or sham treatments; there was no statistical difference in improvement between groups, although patients receiving PE did have a faster recovery rate from acute attacks. A Canadian trial randomized 168 patients with progressive MS to receive either PE or immunosuppressive therapy. There were no significant differences in the rates of treatment failures between groups.
Lambert-Eaton Myasthenic Syndrome (LEMS) and Other Paraneoplastic Syndromes

Paraneoplastic neuromuscular syndromes are characterized by the production of tumor antibodies that cross-react with the patient’s nervous system tissues. The LEMS, characterized by proximal muscle weakness of the lower extremities and associated most frequently with small cell lung cancer, is the most common paraneoplastic syndrome. The presumed autoimmune nature of LEMS and other paraneoplastic syndromes led to the use of a variety of immunomodulatory therapies, including PE. However, there are minimal data in the published literature and no controlled trials. The largest case series focusing on LEMS was reported by Tim and colleagues and included 73 patients with LEMS, 31 of whom were found to have lung cancer. Although detailed treatment strategies are not provided, 19 underwent plasmapheresis, with 27% reporting a moderate to marked response. However, the improvement after plasmapheresis, even when marked was only transient. Patients also received other therapies, for example, various chemotherapy regimens for the underlying lung cancer. In addition, 53 of the 73 patients received 3,4-diaminopyridine, with 79% reporting marked or moderate responses. A small RCT of 3,4 diaminopyridine has also reported positive results, confirming other anecdotal reports. Anderson and colleagues reported on a case series of 12 patients with paraneoplastic cerebellar degeneration. Although plasmapheresis was associated with an acute drop in the autoantibody titer, only 2 patients showed a minor improvement in neurologic symptoms.

Rheumatoid Arthritis

In 1983, Dwosh and colleagues reported on 26 patients with chronic rheumatoid arthritis randomized in a crossover design to either true or sham PE. The authors concluded that PE did not have any clinical benefit despite impressive laboratory changes.

Polymyositis/Dermatomyositis

Miller and colleagues conducted a randomized trial of PE in the treatment of 39 patients with polymyositis and dermatomyositis and found that it was no more effective than sham pheresis.

Pemphigus

Pemphigus is an autoimmune blistering skin disease that is characterized by serum antibodies that bind to squamous epithelia. Steroids or other immunosuppressants are the most common forms of treatment, but the high doses of steroids can produce significant side effects. Guillaume and colleagues reported on a study of 40 patients with pemphigus randomized to receive prednisone alone or prednisone plus plasmapheresis. The goal of the study was to determine whether plasmapheresis could reduce the required dose of steroids, thus limiting its toxicity. Unfortunately, disease control in the two groups was the same, and the authors concluded that plasmapheresis in conjunction with low-dose steroids is not effective in treating pemphigus.

Stiff Man (aka Stiff Person) Syndrome

Stiff man syndrome is an autoimmune disorder characterized by involuntary stiffness of axial muscles and intermittent painful muscle spasm. Stiff man syndrome may be idiopathic in nature or seen in association with thymoma, Hodgkin's disease, and small cell lung; colon; or breast cancer. The mainstay of treatment of stiff man syndrome is diazepam. The published literature regarding plasmapheresis consists of small case series and anecdotal reports.
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Cryoglobulinemia

There are several types of cryoglobulinemia. Type I is associated with hematologic disorders. Types II and III are considered mixed cryoglobulins. Mixed cryoglobulin syndrome is a consequence of immune-complex mediated vasculitis and may be associated with infectious and systemic disorders (e.g., hepatitis C virus). In 2010, Rockx and Clark published a review of studies evaluating PE for treating cryoglobulinemia that included at least 5 patients. They identified 11 studies with a total of 156 patients. The authors concluded, “The quality and variability of the evidence precludes a meta-analysis or even a systematic analysis. However, these studies weakly support the use of plasma exchange largely on a mechanistic basis.”

Hematologic

Thrombotic Thrombocytopenic Purpura (TTP) and Haemolytic Uraemic Syndrome (HUS)

Once considered distinct syndromes, TTP and HUS are now considered different manifestations of the same disease process, i.e., thrombotic microangiopathy. In 2009, a systematic review evaluated the benefits and harms of different interventions for HUS and TTP (separately). Interventions compared with placebo or supportive therapy or a comparison of two or more interventions. Interventions examined included heparin, aspirin/dipyridamole, prostanoids, ticlopidine, vincristine, fresh frozen plasma (FFP) infusion, plasmapheresis with fresh frozen plasma, systemic corticosteroids, Shiga toxin-binding agents, or immunosuppressive agents. For TTP, 6 RCTs (n=331 participants) were identified evaluating PE with FFP as the control. Interventions tested included antiplatelet therapy plus PE with FFP, FFP transfusion, and PE with cryosupernatant plasma. Two studies compared plasma infusion (PI) to PE with FFP and showed a significant increase in failure of remission at 2 weeks (risk ratio [RR]: 1.48) and all-cause mortality (RR: 1.91) in the PI group. The authors concluded that PE with fresh frozen plasma is the most effective treatment available for TTP. Seven RCTs included children with HUS. None of the assessed interventions was superior to supportive therapy alone for all-cause mortality, neurological/extrarenal events, renal biopsy changes, proteinuria, or hypertension at the last follow-up visit. Bleeding was significantly higher in those receiving anticoagulation therapy compared to supportive therapy alone (RR: 25.89). For patients with HUS, supportive therapy including dialysis was the most effective treatment. All studies in HUS have been conducted in the diarrheal form of the disease. There were no RCTs evaluating the effectiveness of any interventions on patients with atypical HUS who have a more chronic and relapsing course. A recent review article by Noris and Remuzzi describes the data supporting use of PE in the atypical form of this disease, with results showing remission in up to 60% of patients.

Because the available evidence for patients with typical HUS shows supportive therapy, including dialysis, to be the most effective treatment, all studies in HUS have been conducted with patients with the diarrheal (typical) form of the disease; the use of PE for the treatment of typical HUS is inadequate to draw clinical conclusions. PE for HUS was considered medically necessary in previous updates. PE remains medically necessary for atypical HUS.

Idiopathic Thrombocytopenic Purpura (ITP)

ITP is an acquired disease of either adults or children characterized by the development of autoantibodies to platelets. Management of acute bleeding due to thrombocytopenia typically involves immediate platelet transfusion, occasionally in conjunction with a single infusion of IVIg. PE has been occasionally used in emergency situations.
Post-transfusion Purpura
Post-transfusion purpura is a rare disorder characterized by an acute severe thrombocytopenia occurring about 1 week after a blood transfusion in association with a high titer of anti-platelet alloantibodies. Due to its rapid effect, PE is considered the initial treatment of choice.

HELLP Syndrome of Pregnancy
The HELLP syndrome of pregnancy (characterized by hemolysis [H], elevated liver enzymes [EL], and low platelet [LP] counts) is a severe form of preeclampsia, characterized by hemolysis, elevated liver enzymes, and low platelet counts. The principal form of treatment is delivery of the fetus. However, for patients with severe thrombocytopenia, PE may be indicated if the fetus cannot safely be delivered, or if the maternal thrombocytopenia persists into the postnatal period.

Neurological

Guillain-Barré Syndrome (GBS)
Guillain-Barré syndrome is an acute demyelinating neuropathy whose severity is graded on a scale of 1–5. In 2012, The Cochrane Collaboration published an updated systematic review of the evidence concerning the efficacy of PE for treating GBS. Six eligible trials (n=649) were identified comparing PE versus supportive treatment alone. No additional trials were published since the 2002 review. The primary outcome measures of the review included time to recover walking with aid and time to onset of motor recovery in mildly affected patients. A pooled analysis of data from 3 trials found that PE significantly increased the proportion of patients who recovered the ability to walk with assistance after 4 weeks (RR: 1.60, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.19 to 2.15). Data on time to onset of motor recovery were not pooled. Pooled analyses found that PE led to significant improvement in secondary outcomes including reduced time to recover walking without aid, increased likelihood of full muscle strength recovery and reduced likelihood of severe motor sequelae. However, there was a significantly higher risk of relapse in the group that received PE compared to supportive treatment alone (RR: 2.89, 95% CI: 1.05 to 7.93, 6 trials).

A 2007 systematic review evaluated the available randomized trials of immunotherapy to treat GBS. In 4 trials with severely affected adult participants (n=585), those treated with PE improved significantly more on the disability scale 4 weeks after randomization than those who were not (weighted mean difference [WMD]: -0.89; range: -1.14 to -0.63). In 5 trials (n=582), the improvement on the disability grade scale with IVlg was very similar to that with PE, WMD: -0.02 (range: -0.25 to 0.20). There was also no significant difference between IVlg and PE for any of the other outcome measures. There was 1 trial that included patients (n=91) with the mild form of GBS who were able to walk unaided at enrollment. Patients were randomized to receive either 2 sessions of PE in 3 days or supportive care. The number of patients with one or more grades of improvement at 1 month was significantly greater, 26/45 in the treated compared to the control group, 13/45. Fewer patients in the PE-treated group had clinical deterioration (4%) as compared to the control group (39%) or required ventilation; PE group (2%) versus the control group (13%). In 1 trial (n=148), following PE with IVlg, did not produce significant extra benefit. Limited evidence from 3 open trials in children suggested that IVlg hastens recovery compared with supportive care alone. None of the treatments significantly reduced mortality. The authors concluded that “since approximately 20% of patients die or have persistent disability despite immunotherapy, more research is needed to identify better treatment regimens and new therapeutic strategies.”
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In 2003, a report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology (AAN), *Practice parameter: immunotherapy for Guillain-Barré syndrome*, was published. The following are the key findings: 1) treatment with PE or IVIg hastens recovery from Guillain-Barré syndrome; 2) combining the 2 treatments is not beneficial; and 3) steroid treatment given alone is not beneficial. The AAN’s recommendations are: 1) PE is recommended for nonambulant adult patients with GBS who seek treatment within 4 weeks of the onset of neuropathic symptoms (PE should also be considered for ambulant patients examined within 2 weeks of the onset of neuropathic symptoms); 2) IVIg is recommended for nonambulant adult patients with GBS within 2 or possibly 4 weeks of the onset of neuropathic symptoms (the effects of PE and IVIg are equivalent); 3) corticosteroids are not recommended for the management of GBS; 4) sequential treatment with PE followed by IVIg, or immunoabsorption followed by IVIg is not recommended for patients with GBS; and 5) PE and IVIg are treatment options for children with severe GBS.

A 2011 RCT from Iran addresses PE for treating young children with severe GBS. The study included 41 children with GBS who required mechanical ventilation and had muscle weakness for no more than 14 days. Patients were randomized to receive PE (n=21) or IVIg (n=20). Mean age of the patients was 96 months in the PE group and 106 months in the IVIg group. Duration of ventilation, the primary outcome, was a mean of 11 days (standard deviation [SD]=1.5) in the PE group and 13 days (SD=2.1) in the IVIg group, p=0.037. Duration of stay in the intensive care unit, a secondary outcome, was 15.0 days (SD=2.6 days) in the PE group and 16.5 days (SD=2.1 days) in the IVIg group; p=0.94.

In conclusion, the available evidence is sufficient regarding PE for the treatment of patients with all severity grades of GBS. This therapy has a beneficial impact on net health outcome for all severity grades. The published studies are insufficient regarding PE for treatment of GBS in the pediatric population. However, based on limited published data, as well as extrapolated data from studies in adults and clinical input, PE may be considered as a treatment option for children younger than 10 years-old with severe GBS. *Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyradiculoneuropathy (CIDP)*

A 2012 Cochrane review by Mehnidiratta and Hughes identified 2 randomized trials on PE for CIDP. Both trials were considered to be of high quality, but both had small sample sizes. One trial with 29 patients used a parallel design and compared PE to sham treatment. The other study included 15 patients and used a cross-over design to compare PE and sham treatment. A pooled analysis of data from the 2 trials found a statistically significantly greater improvement in impairment after 4 weeks with PE versus sham (mean difference 31 points on the Neuropathy Impairment Score, 95% CI: 16 to 45 points). The scale ranges from 0 (normal) to 280 (maximally affected). Data on other outcomes were not suitable for pooled analysis.

*Acute Fulminant Central Nervous System (CNS) Demyelination*

The policy statement, which suggests that plasmapheresis may be considered medically necessary in patients with acute fulminant CNS demyelination, is based on the results of a randomized, double-blinded trial, in which 22 patients with MS or other acute idiopathic inflammatory demyelinating diseases of the CNS were enrolled a minimum of 14 days after having failed to respond to at least 5 days of high-dose corticosteroids. Patients were randomized to receive either 7 real or sham PE procedures over a 14-day period. The primary outcome was a targeted neurologic deficit (i.e., aphasia, cognitive dysfunction, etc.).
Overall, moderate to marked improvement of the targeted outcome was obtained in 42% of the treatment group, compared to only 6% in the placebo group.

**Paraproteinemic Polyneuropathies**
A randomized, double-blinded trial compared PE to sham treatment in 39 patients with monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS)-associated polyneuropathy. After twice weekly PE for 3 weeks, the treatment group reported improvements in neurologic function in the IgG and IgA groups but not the IgM MGUS groups. In addition, those from the sham group who were later crossed over to the PE group also reported improvement.

**Myasthenia Gravis**
A randomized trial from China was published in 2009. Liu and colleagues assigned 40 patients with late-onset myasthenia gravis to treatment with double-filtration plasmapheresis (n=15), immunoadsorption (IA) (n=10), or intravenous immune globulin (n=15). Treatment was clinically effective, defined as at least a 50% improvement in the relative symptom score, in 12 of 15 (80%) of the plasmapheresis group, 7 of 10 (70%) in the immunoadsorption group, and 6 of 15 (40%) of the immune globulin group. The clinical efficacy rate was significantly higher in both the plasmapheresis and immunoadsorption groups compared to the immune globulin group (p<0.05). Findings were similar for other outcomes; the study was limited by the small sample size.

A 2011 RCT from Germany randomized patients with myasthenic crisis to treatment with PE (n=10) or immunoadsorption (IA) (n=9). In both groups, 3 apheresis treatments were performed within 7 days; patients could have additional treatments if needed. A total of 16/19 (84%) of patients, 8 in each group, completed the study and were included in the efficacy analysis. The mean number of treatments was 3.5 in the PE group and 3.4 in the IA group (p>0.05). The primary outcome was change in the modified clinical score (maximum of 3 points) on day 14 after the last treatment. The baseline modified clinical score was 2.6 in the PE group and 2.5 in the IA group. At day 14, score improvement was 1.6 points in the PE group and 1.4 points in the IA group; p>0.05. Within the 180 days after treatment, 1 patient in the PE group and 3 patients in the IA group experienced another myasthenic crisis; the number of events was too small for meaningful statistical analysis for this outcome. There were no statistically significant differences in outcomes in this study, but the sample was very small and the study was probably underpowered.

**Renal**

**Rapidly Progressive Glomerulonephritis (RPGN)**
RPGN is a general term describing the rapid loss of renal function in conjunction with the finding of glomerular crescents on renal biopsy specimens. There are multiple etiologies of RPGN including vasculitis, the deposition of anti-glomerular basement membrane (GBM) antibodies as seen in Goodpasture’s syndrome, or the deposition of immune complexes as seen in various infectious diseases or connective tissue diseases. PE has long been considered a treatment alternative in immune-mediated RPGN. However, there have been few controlled clinical trials published, and their interpretation is difficult due to the small number of patients, choice of intermediate outcomes (i.e., the reduction in antibody levels as opposed to more direct patient outcomes), and heterogeneity in patient groups. Aside from cases of Goodpasture’s disease, the rationale for PE in idiopathic RPGN is not as strong, due to the lack of an
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An identifiable immune component. Studies of PE in this population have not demonstrated a significant improvement in outcome compared to the use of pulse steroid therapy.

Antineutrophil Cytoplasmic Antibody (ANCA)-associated Vasculitis
In 2011, Walsh and colleagues published a meta-analysis of studies on plasma exchange in adults with the diagnosis of either idiopathic renal vasculitis or rapidly progressive glomerulonephritis. A total of 9 trials including 387 patients were identified. The clinical populations in the studies were somewhat ill-defined, but most patients appeared to have ANCA-associated vasculitis. In a pooled analysis of study findings, there was a significantly lower risk of end-stage renal disease in patients treated with adjunctive PE compared to standard care alone (RR 0.64, 95% CI: 0.47 to 0.88). The risk of death did not differ significantly in the 2 groups (RR:1.01, 95% CI: 0.71-1.40).

A relatively large RCT, included in the Walsh et al. meta-analysis, was published in 2007 by Jayne and colleagues. This was a multicenter trial conducted on behalf of the European Vasculitis Study Group. The study investigated whether the addition of PE was more effective than intravenous methylprednisolone. Patients (n=137) with a new diagnosis of ANCA-associated systemic vasculitis confirmed by renal biopsy and serum creatinine greater than 500 micromol/L (5.8 mg/dL) were randomly assigned to receive 7 PEs (n=70) or 3,000 mg of intravenous methylprednisolone (n=67). Both groups received oral cyclophosphamide and oral prednisolone. The primary endpoint was dialysis independence at 3 months. Secondary endpoints included renal and patient survival at 1 year and severe adverse event rates. At 3 months, 33 (49%) of 67 were alive and independent of dialysis after intravenous methylprednisolone, as compared with 48 (69%) of 70 after PE. As compared with intravenous methylprednisolone, PE was associated with a reduction in risk for progression to end-stage renal disease of 24% at 12 months. At 1 year, the patient survival rate was 51 (76%) of 67 in the intravenous methylprednisolone group; 51 (73%) of 70 in the PE group; severe adverse event rates, 32 of 67 (48%) in the intravenous methylprednisolone group; 35 of (50%) 70 in the PE group. PE increased the rate of renal recovery in ANCA-associated systemic vasculitis that presented with renal failure when compared with intravenous methylprednisolone. Patient survival and severe adverse event rates were similar in both groups.

Transplantation

Solid Organ Transplant
Prior to 2006, plasmapheresis in the setting of solid organ transplant was not addressed by this policy. However, plasmapheresis has been extensively used in this setting, both as pretransplant prophylaxis (i.e., desensitization) for highly sensitized patients at high risk of AMR, and as a treatment of AMR after transplant. Desensitization protocols vary among transplant centers; two commonly used protocols are referred to as the Cedars-Sinai protocol and the Johns Hopkins protocol. The Cedars-Sinai protocol consists of high-dose IVIg (2 g/kg) and is offered to patients awaiting either a deceased or live donor. The Johns Hopkins protocol consists of low-dose IVIg (100 mg/kg) in combination with plasmapheresis with or without treatment with anti-CD-20 (i.e., Rituxan). Plasmapheresis is more commonly used in patients receiving a living kidney transplant from an ABO mismatched donor. A variety of protocols have also been developed for the treatment of AMR, often in combination with other therapies, such as IVIg or anti-CD-20. e.g. The majority of studies of plasmapheresis in the transplant setting are retrospective case series from single institutions. Therefore, it is not possible to compare immunomodulatory regimens to determine their
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relative efficacy. Nevertheless, in part based on the large volume of literature published on this subject, it appears that plasmapheresis is a component of the standard of care for the management of AMR.

Other conditions or applications

Asthma
There has been some research interest in the use of plasmapheresis in patients with severe, steroid-dependent asthma. However, preliminary results do not suggest treatment effectiveness.

Pediatric Autoimmune Neuropsychiatric Disorders Associated with Streptococcal infections (PANDAS) and Sydenham’s chorea (SC)

PANDAS is defined as rapid, episodic onset of obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) and/or tic disorder symptoms after a group A β-hemolytic streptococcal infection (GABHS). SC is the neurologic manifestation of acute rheumatic fever. The choreatic symptoms of Sydenham’s chorea are characterized by involuntary rapid and jerky movements that affect the extremities, trunk, and face. SC is generally a self-limited disorder with symptoms resolving in weeks to months. Perlmutter and colleagues conducted an RCT to evaluate the effectiveness of PE and IVIg in reducing the severity of neuropsychiatric symptoms in children diagnosed in the PANDAS subgroup. Children (n=30) with clear evidence of a strep infection as the trigger of their OCD and tics were randomized to receive PE (n=10; 5 to 6 procedures over 2 weeks), IVIg (n=9; 2 gm/kg over 2 days) or placebo (n=10; mimic IVIg). All were severely ill at the time of treatment. At 1 month, both active treatment groups demonstrated symptom improvement, but those in the placebo group were unchanged. The treatment effect was still apparent after 1 year. However, 50% of the children were on the same or higher doses of their baseline medications; thus it is not entirely clear that IVIg or PE had a beneficial effect. This study needs to be replicated with a larger number of patients. The authors noted that children in the placebo group (IVIg control group) subsequently received PE in an open trial and had only minor improvements.

Garvey and colleagues conducted an RCT designed to determine if IVIg or PE would be superior to prednisone in decreasing the severity of chorea. Children with Sydenham’s chorea (n=18) were randomized to treatment with PE (n=8; 5 to 6 procedures over 1 to 2 weeks), IVIg (n=4; 2 gm/kg over 2 days), or prednisone (n=6; 1 mg/kg/day for 10 days followed by taper over next 10 days). The primary outcome was chorea severity at 1 month. The secondary outcome variable was chorea severity at 1 year following treatment. There was no significant difference between the baseline chorea severity scores by the treatment group. Chorea severity was assessed at baseline and at 1, 2, 3, 6, and 12 months following treatment. The chorea rating scale scores range from 0 (no chorea) to 18 (severe or paralytic chorea). A score of 9 or higher was required for study entry. Baseline medications to control choreatic symptoms were discontinued 1 week prior to baseline assessment and each follow-up evaluation. Mean chorea severity for the entire group was lower at the 1-month follow-up evaluation (overall 48% improvement). The between-group differences were not statistically significant. Larger studies are needed to confirm these clinical observations.
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Clinical Input Received through Physician Specialty Societies and Academic Medical Centers
In response to requests, input was received through 2 physician specialty societies and 3 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2012. While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process, through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted. There was consensus or near-consensus that plasma exchange for dense deposit disease with Factor H deficiency and/or elevated C3 nephritis factor, catastrophic antiphospholipid syndrome, focal segmental glomerulosclerosis after renal transplant, and myeloma with acute renal failure may be considered medically necessary. Clinical input was mixed on the medical necessity of hyperviscosity syndromes with renal failure (other than associated with multiple myeloma or Waldenstrom’s macroglobulinemia). In addition, there was no consensus about an optimal creatinine threshold for instituting plasma exchange in patients with renal failure associated with ANCA-associated vasculitis or other diagnoses.

Summary
In conclusion, due to data from published studies and/or clinical support, plasma exchange is considered medically necessary for selected conditions. For conditions in which there is a lack of efficacy data and clinical support, plasma exchange is considered investigational.
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Coding
The five character codes included in the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines are obtained from Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®), copyright 2013 by the American Medical Association (AMA). CPT is developed by the AMA as a listing of descriptive terms and five character identifying codes and modifiers for reporting medical services and procedures performed by physician.

The responsibility for the content of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines is with Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and no endorsement by the AMA is intended or should be implied. The AMA disclaims responsibility for any consequences or liability attributable or related to any use, nonuse or interpretation of information contained in Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines. Fee schedules, relative value units, conversion factors and/or related components are not assigned by the AMA, are not part of CPT, and the AMA is not recommending their use. The AMA does not directly or indirectly practice medicine or dispense medical services. The AMA assumes no liability for data contained or not contained herein. Any use of CPT outside of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines should refer to the most current Current Procedural Terminology which contains the complete and most current listing of CPT codes and descriptive terms. Applicable FARS/DFARS apply.

CPT is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association.

Codes used to identify services associated with this policy may include (but may not be limited to) the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>36514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPCS</td>
<td>No codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD-9 Diagnosis</td>
<td>All relative diagnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD-9 Procedure</td>
<td>No codes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Investigational – A medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational if the effectiveness has not been clearly tested and it has not been incorporated into standard medical practice. Any determination we make that a medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational will be based on a consideration of the following:

A. whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product can be lawfully marketed without approval of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and whether such approval has been granted at the time the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is sought to be furnished; or

B. whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product requires further studies or clinical trials to determine its maximum tolerated dose, toxicity, safety, effectiveness, or effectiveness as compared with the standard means of treatment or diagnosis, must improve health outcomes, according to the consensus of opinion among experts as shown by reliable evidence, including:

1. Consultation with the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association technology assessment program (TEC) or other nonaffiliated technology evaluation center(s);
2. credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community; or
3. reference to federal regulations.

**Medically Necessary (or “Medical Necessity”) - Health care services, treatment, procedures, equipment, drugs, devices, items or supplies that a Provider, exercising prudent clinical judgment, would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury, disease or its symptoms, and that are:

A. in accordance with nationally accepted standards of medical practice;
B. clinically appropriate, in terms of type, frequency, extent, level of care, site and duration, and considered effective for the patient's illness, injury or disease; and
C. not primarily for the personal comfort or convenience of the patient, physician or other health care provider, and not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of that patient's illness, injury or disease.

For these purposes, “nationally accepted standards of medical practice” means standards that are based on credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, Physician Specialty Society recommendations and the views of Physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas and any other relevant factors.

‡ Indicated trademarks are the registered trademarks of their respective owners.

NOTICE: Medical Policies are scientific based opinions, provided solely for coverage and informational purposes. Medical Policies should not be construed to suggest that the Company recommends, advocates, requires, encourages, or discourages any particular treatment, procedure, or service, or any particular course of treatment, procedure, or service.