LOUISIANA BLUE

Irreversible Electroporation and Histotripsy

Policy # 00912
Original Effective Date: 03/01/2025
Current Effective Date: 03/01/2025

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: Catheter Ablation as Treatment for Atrial Fibrillation is addressed separately in medical policy 00267.

Note: Stereotactic Radiosurgery and Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy is addressed separately in medical policy 00045.

Note: Microwave Tumor Ablation is addressed separately in medical policy 00569.

Note: Cryosurgical Ablation of Primary or Metastatic Liver Tumors is addressed separately in medical policy 00220.

Note: Radiofrequency Ablation of Primary or Metastatic Liver Tumors is addressed separately in medical policy 00182.

Note: Radiofrequency Ablation of Miscellaneous Solid Tumors Excluding Liver Tumors is addressed separately in medical policy 00175.

Note: Transcatheter Arterial Chemoembolization (TACE) to Treat Primary or Metastatic Liver Malignancies is addressed separately in medical policy 00227.

Note: Radioembolization for Primary and Metastatic Tumors of the Liver is addressed separately in medical policy 00110.

Note: Focal Treatments for Prostate Cancer is addressed separately in medical policy 00484.

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 irreversible electroporation for treatment of primary or metastatic solid tumors including, but not limited to, tumors of the liver, pancreas, kidney or lung to be **investigational.***

Irreversible Electroporation and Histotripsy

Policy # 00912
Original Effective Date: 03/01/2025
Current Effective Date: 03/01/2025

Based on review of available data, the Company considers histotripsy for treatment of primary or metastatic solid tumors including, but not limited to, tumors of the liver or kidney to be **investigational.***

Policy Guidelines

Pulsed field ablation is a form of irreversible electroporation energy used to treat patients with atrial fibrillation. Pulsed field ablation for atrial fibrillation is discussed in medical policy 00267 Catheter Ablation as Treatment for Atrial Fibrillation.

Focal therapy with irreversible electroporation and high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) as a treatment for prostate cancer is addressed separately in medical policy 00484 Focal Treatments for Prostate Cancer.

Background/Overview

Irreversible Electroporation

Electroporation generates high-frequency electric pulses between two or more electrodes which produces an electric current that damages the cell membrane and allows molecules to pass into the cell passively. Electroporation can be temporary (reversible electroporation) or permanent (irreversible electroporation or IRE). In IRE the cell membrane is permanently damaged causing cell death due to the inability to maintain homeostasis. IRE achieves its action with no thermal effect. IRE appears to preserve vessels, nerves and the extracellular matrix.

Histotripsy

High-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) uses thermal effect of long ultrasound bursts with rapid heating and thermal ablation. Histotripsy is a relatively new HIFU-based technology. In contrast to conventional HIFU thermal therapy, histotripsy aims not to heat but to mechanically liquefy targeted tissue into subcellular debris using sequence of short, high-amplitude focused ultrasound pulses causing bubble activity at the focus. As the major mechanism of histotripsy is mechanical, it enables localized tissue disintegration without thermal damage to the overlaying and surrounding tissues.

A high-intensity pulsed ultrasound beam is focused noninvasively to the targeted site. Short pulses with a duration ranging from microseconds to milliseconds are delivered to the focus to generate gas and vapor bubbles. The bubble activity results in mechanical disintegration or liquefaction of tissue. Histotripsy can be monitored in real time using conventional ultrasound due to the presence of bubbles. Connective tissue structures (e.g., blood vessels, biliary structures) are more resistant to mechanical ablation than are cells. The nonthermal mechanism of the approach results in a sharper boundary and higher treatment precision compared with thermal ablation, which is limited by heat sinking and heat diffusion effects. Histotripsy-treated liquefied tissue is reabsorbed by the body over 1–2 months, leaving a millimeter-sized scar tissue. Histotripsy has also been shown to stimulate an immune response and induce abscopal effects in animal models, which may have positive implications for future cancer treatment.

Two major approaches sometimes termed cavitational histotripsy (CH) and boiling histotripsy (BH) have recently been explored. CH relies on initiation of a dense bubble cloud using microsecond-long pulses. By repeatedly expanding and collapsing during each pulse, the cavitation cloud completely homogenizes the tissue. BH uses milliseconds-long pulses containing shock fronts to rapidly heat tissue to boiling temperature and produce a vapor bubble at the focus within each pulse. The interaction between the rest of the pulse and the vapor cavity results in mechanical fractionation of tissue.

Currently, histotripsy therapy is being evaluated in preclinical studies with small and large animal models for treating cancer, cardiac diseases, thrombosis, hematomas, and abscesses; enhancing tumor-specific immune response; and neurological applications. The first clinical trials using CH for benign prostatic hyperplasia, liver cancer, and renal cancer have been undertaken. Histotripsy is rapidly growing area of research, and many aspects are yet to be studied.

FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

The NanoKnife System™‡ (Angiodynamics) was originally cleared through the 510(k) process (K102329) in 2011 for the surgical ablation of soft tissue. NanoKnife has not received clearance for the treatment of any specific disease. FDA product code: OAB.

In October 2021, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) granted HistoSonics, Inc. Breakthrough Device Designation for its new histotripsy platform (HistoSonics, 2021b). In October 2023, the Edison®‡ System (HistoSonics®, Ann Arbor, MI)‡ received de novo marketing clearance from the FDA for the non-invasive non-thermal destruction of liver tumors, including unresectable liver tumors. On February 14, 2024, an updated Edison system was cleared for use in the non-invasive destruction of liver tumors. The authorization was based in part on the 30-day data from two single-arm, non-randomized prospective trials evaluating primary or metastatic liver tumors. Participants will be followed for 5 years post-procedure (NCT04572633, NCT04573881).

Rationale/Source

This medical policy was developed through consideration of peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval status, nationally accepted standards of medical practice and accepted standards of medical practice in this community, technology evaluation centers, reference to regulations, other plan medical policies, and accredited national guidelines.

Irreversible electroporation produces high-frequency electric pulses to create an electric current that permanently damages cell membranes causing cell death due to the inability to maintain homeostasis. Irreversible electroporation produces no thermal effect and appears to preserve vessels, nerves and the extracellular matrix.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals being treated with locoregional therapy for tumors in the liver who receive irreversible electroporation, the evidence includes primarily single-arm studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, quality of life. Irreversible electroporation may be an option for locoregional therapy that is less damaging to nearby blood vessels, bile ducts, and nerves than thermal ablation therapies. Most studies of IRE for liver tumors lack a comparator arm. One comparative study was identified reporting health outcomes but the study is retrospective and included 18 patients treated with IRE. Therefore, there is insufficient data to determine how survival or adverse events compare to other methods for locoregional therapy. There is a lack of standardization on appropriate use. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with locally advanced pancreatic cancer who receive irreversible electroporation, the evidence includes single-arm studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, quality of life. Thermal ablation therapies are not commonly used to treat pancreatic cancer due to the increased risk of trauma to the adjacent major anatomical structures. IRE may be alternative that does not cause thermal injury to nearby sensitive structures. However, there is a lack of consensus on the optimal IRE treatment protocol. Studies of IRE for pancreatic tumors are single-arm. There is insufficient data to determine whether survival is improved with chemotherapy followed by IRE compared to chemotherapy alone. 2 RCTs are underway. Prospective, single arm studies suggest a high complication rate. There are no studies reporting functional or quality of life outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals being treated with locoregional therapy for tumors in the kidneys who receive irreversible electroporation, the evidence includes single-arm studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, quality of life. Studies of IRE for kidney tumors are single-arm. Only one study has included more than 10 participants. No comparative data are available. Therefore, there is no data to determine how survival or adverse events compare to other methods for locoregional therapy. There are no studies reporting functional or quality of life outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals being treated with locoregional therapy for tumors in the lungs who receive irreversible electroporation, the evidence includes single-arm studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, quality of life. Irreversible electroporation may be an option for locoregional therapy that is less damaging to nearby bronchovascular structures. Studies of IRE for lung tumors are single-arm. The ALICE study was a prospective, single-arm study conducted at two centers that was stopped early (n=23) due to failing to meet expected efficacy at an interim analysis based on high recurrence rates of 61% at a median follow-up of 1 year. No comparative data are available. Therefore, there is no data to determine how survival or adverse events compare to other methods for locoregional therapy. There are no studies

reporting functional or quality of life outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals being treated with locoregional therapy for tumors in the liver who receive histotripsy, the evidence includes two human single-arm studies of 8 and 44 patients, a phase I trial (THERESA, NCT03741088) and a multicenter clinical trial (HOPE4LIVER) in the United States (eight sites; NCT04572633) and Europe (six sites; NCT04573881). Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, quality of life. Histotripsy may be an option for locoregional therapy that is less damaging to nearby blood vessels, bile ducts, and nerves than thermal ablation therapies. Published studies of histotripsy for liver tumors lack a comparator arm.

THERESA trial, first-in-human feasibility, phase I, single-arm study (Barcelona, Spain), included eight (8) patients with multifocal liver malignancy (colorectal liver metastasis, breast cancer metastasis, cholangiocarcinoma metastases, and hepatocellular carcinoma), with histotripsy delivered to 11 tumors < 3 cm in diameter using a prototype system (HistoSonics). The primary endpoint was technical success, creating a zone of tissue destruction per MRI one day post-procedure. Safety device-related adverse events through 2 months was a secondary endpoint. The 8 patients had a median age of 60.4 years with an average targeted tumor diameter of 1.4 cm. The primary endpoint was achieved in all procedures. There was one mistargeting as tumor could not be visualized clearly on ultrasound. Remaining 10 tumors were successfully ablated (confirmed by MRI). Nine of the 10 tumors had local tumor regression at a 2-month follow-up (72% volume retraction). Two patients had decline in tumor markers and one patient had off-target tumor shrinkage. The secondary safety profile endpoint identified no device-related adverse events. Trial had several limitations, including small heterogeneous patient population limiting any conclusions regarding long-term effectiveness and the interaction with other therapies. The device used was an investigational prototype device. The trial had a short follow-up period limiting the ability to assess the durability of histotripsy, local recurrence rate, or disease-free survival. Authors concluded that the need for more definitive clinical trials is warranted.

The HOPE4LIVER trials were parallel United States, European Union and England prospective, multicenter, single-arm nonrandomized studies. Up to three tumors smaller than 3 cm in size could be treated. CT or MRI and clinic visits were performed at index-procedure, 36-hours post procedure, and 30-days post procedure. There were co-primary end points of technical success of tumor treatment (tumor treated volume being greater or equal to targeted volume based on CT or MRI) and absence of procedure-related major complications within 30 days, with performance goals of greater than 70% and less than 25%, respectively. Forty-four participants (21 from the United States, 23 from the European Union or England; 22 female participants, 22 male participants; mean age, 64 years ± 12 [SD]) with 49 tumors were enrolled and treated. Eighteen participants (41%) had hepatocellular carcinoma and 26 (59%) had non-hepatocellular carcinoma liver metastases (primary colon cancer 5, rectum 5, breast 4, pancreas 5, other 7). The maximum pretreatment tumor diameter

was 1.5 cm ± 0.6 and the maximum post-histotripsy treatment zone diameter was 3.6 cm ± 1.4. Thirty-nine (39) participants had one tumor, and 5 participants had 2 tumors treated.

Technical success was observed in 42 of 44 treated tumors (95%; 95% CI: 84, 100) with 2 tumors mistargeted. Procedure-related major complications were reported in three of 44 participants (7%; 95% CI: 2, 18). Total 101 adverse events were reported within 30 days; 7 were rated as serious with 3 of them as major adverse events. Two patients had grade 3 event (sepsis related to biliary stent and pleuritic pain), and one patient had grade 5 event with liver failure on day 12 due to extensive liver parenchyma replacement by metastases (patient died 37 days after procedure). Four patients had serious adverse events (splenic hematoma, melena, procedural pain, metastatic colorectal cancer progression). Additional 6 patients had liver damage outside of the expected margin (1 case due to mistargeting and 5 had perfusion changes next to treatment area). A secondary end point was technical efficacy at 30-days (lack of a nodular or mass-like area of enhancement within or along the edge of the treated volume on CT or MRI), reported as 83% and achieved in 30 of 36 lesions (remaining 6 treated lesions did not have imaging, and efficacy could not be assessed in 2 treated lesions). Other clinical outcomes were not reported. Subjects will be evaluated at 6 months and followed annually for up to five years post-index procedure (estimated study completion in 7/2026). Trial had several limitations including short follow-up (long-term follow-up of treatment zones is needed to determine rate of local control), small sample size, and lack of control. Authors concluded that larger trials with longer follow-up in typical candidates for local-regional treatment will provide further outcome data to help define the role of this emerging technology. There is no data to determine how survival or adverse events compare to other methods for locoregional therapy. There are no studies reporting functional or quality of life outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals being treated with locoregional therapy for renal cancer there are no published studies evaluating the use of histotripsy. Two prospective, multi-center, single-arm clinical trials are underway to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the device in treating renal tumors (NCT05432232, NCT05820087). The preferred treatment of renal cancer is a partial or radical nephrectomy. For individuals with small tumors or for individuals who are not candidates for surgery, ablative therapy, such as RFA, cryoablation or stereotactic ablative body radiation therapy are considered standard alternative therapies (National Cancer Institute (NCI), Renal Cancer Treatment, 2024; NCCN, Kidney cancer V2.2025). Histotripsy is not mentioned as a potential treatment of renal tumors in any current guidelines. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Supplemental Information

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in 'Supplemental Information' if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given

to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

National Comprehensive Cancer Network
The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines for Hepatocellular Carcinoma (v2.2024) states that 'Irreversible electroporation (IRE) is an emerging modality for tumor ablation' and that 'Larger studies are needed to determine the effectiveness of IRE for local HCC treatment.'

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines for Biliary Tract Cancers (v3.2024) states that ablation is a reasonable alternative to surgical resection for intrahepatic CCA, particularly in patients with high-risk disease and 'Options for ablation include cryoablation, radiofrequency ablation, microwave ablation, and irreversible electroporation' for treatment of small, single intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma tumors (<3cm) amenable to complete ablation, whether recurrent or primary.

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines for Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma (v3.2024) states that 'Irreversible electroporation (IRE) is an ablative technique in which electric pulses are used to create nanopores to induce cell death. This technique has been used in patients with locally advanced pancreatic cancer and may be safe and feasible and improve survival. However, due to concerns about complications and technical expertise, the Panel does not currently recommend IRE for treatment of locally advanced pancreatic cancer.'

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines for Kidney Cancer (v1.2025) do not refer to irreversible electroporation. The guidelines state that 'Thermal ablation (eg, cryosurgery, radiofrequency ablation, microwave ablation) is an option for the management of clinical stage T1 renal lesions. Thermal ablation is suitable for renal masses ≤3 cm. Thermal ablation is an option for clinical T1b masses in select patients not eligible for surgery.'

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines for Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (v8.2024) do not refer to irreversible electroporation. With respect to ablation therapies, the guidelines state that:

- 'Image-guided thermal ablation (IGTA) therapy (eg, cryotherapy, microwave, radiofrequency) may be an option for select patients' for initial treatment for stage 1A disease.
- 'IGTA may be considered for those patients who are deemed “high risk”—those with tumors that are for the most part surgically resectable but rendered medically inoperable due to comorbidities. In cases where IGTA is considered for high-risk or borderline operable patients, a multidisciplinary evaluation is recommended.'
- 'IGTA is an option for the management of NSCLC lesions <3 cm. Ablation for NSCLC lesions >3 cm may be associated with higher rates of local recurrence and complications.'

- 'There is evidence on the use of IGTA for selected patients with stage 1A NSCLC, those who present with multiple lung cancers, or those who present with locoregional recurrence of symptomatic local thoracic disease.'
- 'In the setting of progression at a limited number of sites on a given line of systemic therapy (oligoprogression), local ablative therapy to the oligoprogressive sites may extend the duration of benefit of the current line of systemic therapy.'

Histotripsy is not recommended as a treatment option in the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) published an interventional procedures guidance in 2017 on irreversible electroporation for treating pancreatic cancer. The guidance stated that 'Current evidence on the safety and efficacy of irreversible electroporation for treating pancreatic cancer is inadequate in quantity and quality. Therefore, this procedure should only be used in the context of research.'

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

Medicare National Coverage
There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
NCT03899636[a]	A Pivotal Study of Safety and Effectiveness of NanoKnife IRE for Stage 3 Pancreatic Cancer (DIRECT)	528	Dec 2023
NCT03899649[a]	A Registry Study of NanoKnife IRE for Stage 3 Pancreatic Cancer (DIRECT)	532	Dec 2024
NCT05170802	AHPBA Registry Database (Collection of Clinical Data Related to Pancreatic Cancer &	30	Dec 2024

	Treatment - Irreversible Electroporation (IRE))		
ISRCTN14986389[b]	Investigating the feasibility of a clinical trial to test using irreversible electroporation to treat locally advanced pancreatic cancer following initial chemotherapy (LAP-PIE)	50	Nov 2024

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

References

1. Scheltema MJ, van den Bos W, de Bruin DM, et al. Focal vs extended ablation in localized prostate cancer with irreversible electroporation; a multi-center randomized controlled trial. BMC Cancer. May 05 2016; 16: 299. PMID 27150293
2. Rubinsky B, Onik G, Mikus P. Irreversible electroporation: a new ablation modality--clinical implications. Technol Cancer Res Treat. Feb 2007; 6(1): 37-48. PMID 17241099
3. Davalos RV, Mir IL, Rubinsky B. Tissue ablation with irreversible electroporation. Ann Biomed Eng. Feb 2005; 33(2): 223-31. PMID 15771276
4. Siegel RL, Giaquinto AN, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2024. CA Cancer J Clin. 2024; 74(1): 12-49. PMID 38230766
5. McGlynn KA, Petrick JL, El-Serag HB. Epidemiology of Hepatocellular Carcinoma. Hepatology. Jan 2021; 73 Suppl 1(Suppl 1): 4-13. PMID 32319693
6. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Hepatocellular Carcinoma. Version 2.2024. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/hcc.pdf.
7. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Biliary Tract Cancers. Version 3.2024. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/btc.pdf.
8. Kim HS, El-Serag HB. The Epidemiology of Hepatocellular Carcinoma in the USA. Curr Gastroenterol Rep. Apr 11 2019; 21(4): 17. PMID 30976932
9. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Hepatocellular carcinoma - United States, 2001-2006. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. May 07 2010; 59(17): 517-20. PMID 20448528
10. Food and Drug Administration. NanoKnife System 510(k) Summary: K183385. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf18/K183385.pdf.
11. Geboers B, Scheffer HJ, Graybill PM, et al. High-Voltage Electrical Pulses in Oncology: Irreversible Electroporation, Electrochemotherapy, Gene Electrotransfer, Electrofusion, and Electroimmunotherapy. Radiology. May 2020; 295(2): 254-272. PMID 32208094
12. AngioDynamics. NanoKnife Patient Guide. https://nanoknife.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/GL-ON-BR-911-REV-01-NanoKnife-Patient-Guide-WEB.pdf.
13. Brar G, Greten TF, Graubard BI, et al. Hepatocellular Carcinoma Survival by Etiology: A SEER-Medicare Database Analysis. Hepatol Commun. Oct 2020; 4(10): 1541-1551. PMID 33024922

14. Dhanasekaran R, Hemming AW, Zendejas I, et al. Treatment outcomes and prognostic factors of intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma. Oncol Rep. Apr 2013; 29(4): 1259-67. PMID 23426976
15. Wade R, South E, Anwer S, et al. Ablative and non-surgical therapies for early and very early hepatocellular carcinoma: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. Health Technol Assess. Dec 2023; 27(29): 1-172. PMID 38149643
16. Cheung W, Kavnoudias H, Roberts S, et al. Irreversible electroporation for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: initial experience and review of safety and outcomes. Technol Cancer Res Treat. Jun 2013; 12(3): 233-41. PMID 23369152
17. Cannon R, Ellis S, Hayes D, et al. Safety and early efficacy of irreversible electroporation for hepatic tumors in proximity to vital structures. J Surg Oncol. Apr 2013; 107(5): 544-9. PMID 23090720
18. Frühling P, Nilsson A, Duraj F, et al. Single-center nonrandomized clinical trial to assess the safety and efficacy of irreversible electroporation (IRE) ablation of liver tumors in humans: Short to mid-term results. Eur J Surg Oncol. Apr 2017; 43(4): 751-757. PMID 28109674
19. Granata V, Fusco R, Catalano O, et al. Percutaneous ablation therapy of hepatocellular carcinoma with irreversible electroporation: MRI findings. AJR Am J Roentgenol. May 2015; 204(5): 1000-7. PMID 25905934
20. Padia SA, Johnson GE, Yeung RS, et al. Irreversible Electroporation in Patients with Hepatocellular Carcinoma: Immediate versus Delayed Findings at MR Imaging. Radiology. Jan 2016; 278(1): 285-94. PMID 26523493
21. Niessen C, Beyer LP, Pregler B, et al. Percutaneous Ablation of Hepatic Tumors Using Irreversible Electroporation: A Prospective Safety and Midterm Efficacy Study in 34 Patients. J Vasc Interv Radiol. Apr 2016; 27(4): 480-6. PMID 26922979
22. Scheffer HJ, Nielsen K, van Tilborg AA, et al. Ablation of colorectal liver metastases by irreversible electroporation: results of the COLDFIRE-I ablate-and-resect study. Eur Radiol. Oct 2014; 24(10): 2467-75. PMID 24939670
23. Narayanan G, Gentile NT, Eyshi J, et al. Irreversible Electroporation in Treating Colorectal Liver Metastases in Proximity to Critical Structures. J Vasc Interv Radiol. Aug 30 2024. PMID 39218213
24. Belfiore MP, Reginelli A, Maggialetti N, et al. Preliminary results in unresectable cholangiocarcinoma treated by CT percutaneous irreversible electroporation: feasibility, safety and efficacy. Med Oncol. Apr 09 2020; 37(5): 45. PMID 32270353
25. Sugimoto K, Kakimi K, Takeuchi H, et al. Irreversible Electroporation versus Radiofrequency Ablation: Comparison of Systemic Immune Responses in Patients with Hepatocellular Carcinoma. J Vasc Interv Radiol. Jun 2019; 30(6): 845-853.e6. PMID 31126596
26. Blaise L, Pereira H, Vilgrain V, et al. Percutaneous ablation for locally advanced hepatocellular carcinoma with tumor portal invasion. Clin Res Hepatol Gastroenterol. Nov 2021; 45(6): 101731. PMID 34139320
27. Ruarus AH, Barabasch A, Catalano O, et al. Irreversible Electroporation for Hepatic Tumors: Protocol Standardization Using the Modified Delphi Technique. J Vasc Interv Radiol. Nov 2020; 31(11): 1765-1771.e15. PMID 32978054

28. Balaban EP, Mangu PB, Khorana AA, et al. Locally Advanced, Unresectable Pancreatic Cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline. J Clin Oncol. Aug 01 2016; 34(22): 2654-68. PMID 27247216
29. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma. Version 3.2024. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/pancreatic.pdf.
30. Klein AP. Pancreatic cancer epidemiology: understanding the role of lifestyle and inherited risk factors. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. Jul 2021; 18(7): 493-502. PMID 34002083
31. van Roessel S, Kasumova GG, Verheij J, et al. International Validation of the Eighth Edition of the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) TNM Staging System in Patients With Resected Pancreatic Cancer. JAMA Surg. Dec 01 2018; 153(12): e183617. PMID 30285076
32. Ellis LM, Bernstein DS, Voest EE, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology perspective: Raising the bar for clinical trials by defining clinically meaningful outcomes. J Clin Oncol. Apr 20 2014; 32(12): 1277-80. PMID 24638016
33. Charalambous P, Moris D, Karachaliou GS, et al. The efficacy and safety of the open approach irreversible electroporation in the treatment of pancreatic cancer: A systematic review. Eur J Surg Oncol. Sep 2020; 46(9): 1565-1572. PMID 32536525
34. Martin RC, McFarland K, Ellis S, et al. Irreversible electroporation therapy in the management of locally advanced pancreatic adenocarcinoma. J Am Coll Surg. Sep 2012; 215(3): 361-9. PMID 22726894
35. Martin RC, Kwon D, Chalikonda S, et al. Treatment of 200 locally advanced (stage III) pancreatic adenocarcinoma patients with irreversible electroporation: safety and efficacy. Ann Surg. Sep 2015; 262(3): 486-94; discussion 492-4. PMID 26258317
36. Månsson C, Bergenfeldt M, Brahmstaedt R, et al. Safety and preliminary efficacy of ultrasound-guided percutaneous irreversible electroporation for treatment of localized pancreatic cancer. Anticancer Res. Jan 2014; 34(1): 289-93. PMID 24403476
37. Scheffer HJ, Vroomen LG, de Jong MC, et al. Ablation of Locally Advanced Pancreatic Cancer with Percutaneous Irreversible Electroporation: Results of the Phase I/II PANFIRE Study. Radiology. Feb 2017; 282(2): 585-597. PMID 27604035
38. Ruarus AH, Vroomen LGPH, Geboers B, et al. Percutaneous Irreversible Electroporation in Locally Advanced and Recurrent Pancreatic Cancer (PANFIRE-2): A Multicenter, Prospective, Single-Arm, Phase II Study. Radiology. Jan 2020; 294(1): 212-220. PMID 31687922
39. Narayanan G, Hosein PJ, Arora G, et al. Percutaneous irreversible electroporation for downstaging and control of unresectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma. J Vasc Interv Radiol. Dec 2012; 23(12): 1613-21. PMID 23177107
40. Narayanan G, Hosein PJ, Beulaygue IC, et al. Percutaneous Image-Guided Irreversible Electroporation for the Treatment of Unresectable, Locally Advanced Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma. J Vasc Interv Radiol. Mar 2017; 28(3): 342-348. PMID 27993507
41. Martin RC, McFarland K, Ellis S, et al. Irreversible electroporation in locally advanced pancreatic cancer: potential improved overall survival. Ann Surg Oncol. Dec 2013; 20 Suppl 3: S443-9. PMID 23128941

42. Kluger MD, Epelboym I, Schrope BA, et al. Single-Institution Experience with Irreversible Electroporation for T4 Pancreatic Cancer: First 50 Patients. Ann Surg Oncol. May 2016; 23(5): 1736-43. PMID 26714959
43. Leen E, Picard J, Stebbing J, et al. Percutaneous irreversible electroporation with systemic treatment for locally advanced pancreatic adenocarcinoma. J Gastrointest Oncol. Apr 2018; 9(2): 275-281. PMID 29755766
44. Liu S, Qin Z, Xu J, et al. Irreversible electroporation combined with chemotherapy for unresectable pancreatic carcinoma: a prospective cohort study. Onco Targets Ther. 2019; 12: 1341-1350. PMID 30863100
45. Holland MM, Bhutiani N, Kruse EJ, et al. A prospective, multi-institution assessment of irreversible electroporation for treatment of locally advanced pancreatic adenocarcinoma: initial outcomes from the AHPBA pancreatic registry. HPB (Oxford). Aug 2019; 21(8): 1024-1031. PMID 30737097
46. Martin RC, Durham AN, Besselink MG, et al. Irreversible electroporation in locally advanced pancreatic cancer: A call for standardization of energy delivery. J Surg Oncol. Dec 2016; 114(7): 865-871. PMID 27546233
47. Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program (SEER). SEER Stat Fact Sheets: Kidney and Renal Pelvis. http://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/kidrp.html.
48. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Kidney Cancer. Version 1.2025. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/kidney.pdf.
49. Cheungpasitporn W, Thongprayoon C, O'Corragain OA, et al. The risk of kidney cancer in patients with kidney stones: a systematic review and meta-analysis. QJM. Mar 2015; 108(3): 205-12. PMID 25208892
50. Argani P, Laé M, Ballard ET, et al. Translocation carcinomas of the kidney after chemotherapy in childhood. J Clin Oncol. Apr 01 2006; 24(10): 1529-34. PMID 16575003
51. Cho E, Curhan G, Hankinson SE, et al. Prospective evaluation of analgesic use and risk of renal cell cancer. Arch Intern Med. Sep 12 2011; 171(16): 1487-93. PMID 21911634
52. Mandel JS, McLaughlin JK, Schlehofer B, et al. International renal-cell cancer study. IV. Occupation. Int J Cancer. May 29 1995; 61(5): 601-5. PMID 7768630
53. Lowrance WT, Ordoñez J, Udaltsova N, et al. CKD and the risk of incident cancer. J Am Soc Nephrol. Oct 2014; 25(10): 2327-34. PMID 24876115
54. Adams KF, Leitzmann MF, Albanes D, et al. Body size and renal cell cancer incidence in a large US cohort study. Am J Epidemiol. Aug 01 2008; 168(3): 268-77. PMID 18544571
55. Hidayat K, Du X, Zou SY, et al. Blood pressure and kidney cancer risk: meta-analysis of prospective studies. J Hypertens. Jul 2017; 35(7): 1333-1344. PMID 28157813
56. Chin AI, Lam JS, Figlin RA, et al. Surveillance strategies for renal cell carcinoma patients following nephrectomy. Rev Urol. 2006; 8(1): 1-7. PMID 16985554
57. Hilton A, Kourounis G, Georgiades F. Irreversible electroporation in renal tumours: A systematic review of safety and early oncological outcomes. Urologia. Aug 2022; 89(3): 329-337. PMID 35139717

58. Buijs M, Zondervan PJ, de Bruin DM, et al. Feasibility and safety of irreversible electroporation (IRE) in patients with small renal masses: Results of a prospective study. Urol Oncol. Mar 2019; 37(3): 183.e1-183.e8. PMID 30509869
59. Canvasser NE, Sorokin I, Lay AH, et al. Irreversible electroporation of small renal masses: suboptimal oncologic efficacy in an early series. World J Urol. Oct 2017; 35(10): 1549-1555. PMID 28255621
60. Xing M, Kokabi N, Zhang D, et al. Comparative Effectiveness of Thermal Ablation, Surgical Resection, and Active Surveillance for T1a Renal Cell Carcinoma: A Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER)-Medicare-linked Population Study. Radiology. Jul 2018; 288(1): 81-90. PMID 29737950
61. Thomson KR, Cheung W, Ellis SJ, et al. Investigation of the safety of irreversible electroporation in humans. J Vasc Interv Radiol. May 2011; 22(5): 611-21. PMID 21439847
62. Pech M, Janitzky A, Wendler JJ, et al. Irreversible electroporation of renal cell carcinoma: a first-in-man phase I clinical study. Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol. Feb 2011; 34(1): 132-8. PMID 20711837
63. Diehl SJ, Rathmann N, Kostrzewa M, et al. Irreversible Electroporation for Surgical Renal Masses in Solitary Kidneys: Short-Term Interventional and Functional Outcome. J Vasc Interv Radiol. Sep 2016; 27(9): 1407-1413. PMID 27292599
64. Vroomen LGPH, Scheffer HJ, Melenhorst MCAM, et al. Irreversible Electroporation to Treat Malignant Tumor Recurrences Within the Pelvic Cavity: A Case Series. Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol. Oct 2017; 40(10): 1631-1640. PMID 28470395
65. Liu B, Clark J, Domes T, et al. Percutaneous irreversible electroporation for the treatment of small renal masses: The first Canadian case series. Can Urol Assoc J. Sep 2019; 13(9): E263-E267. PMID 30763229
66. Wendler JJ, Pech M, Fischbach F, et al. Initial Assessment of the Efficacy of Irreversible Electroporation in the Focal Treatment of Localized Renal Cell Carcinoma With Delayed-interval Kidney Tumor Resection (Irreversible Electroporation of Kidney Tumors Before Partial Nephrectomy [IRENE] Trial-An Ablate-and-Resect Pilot Study). Urology. Apr 2018; 114: 224-232. PMID 29305201
67. Wendler JJ, Pech M, Köllermann J, et al. Upper-Urinary-Tract Effects After Irreversible Electroporation (IRE) of Human Localised Renal-Cell Carcinoma (RCC) in the IRENE Pilot Phase 2a Ablate-and-Resect Study. Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol. Mar 2018; 41(3): 466-476. PMID 28929209
68. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. Version 7.2024. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/nscl.pdf.
69. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Lung Cancer Risk Factors. https://www.cdc.gov/lung-cancer/risk-factors/index.html.
70. Ricke J, Jürgens JH, Deschamps F, et al. Irreversible electroporation (IRE) fails to demonstrate efficacy in a prospective multicenter phase II trial on lung malignancies: the ALICE trial. Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol. Apr 2015; 38(2): 401-8. PMID 25609208

71. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Irreversible electroporation for treating pancreatic cancer: Interventional procedures guidance [IPG579]. 2017. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg579.
72. Zhen XU,et al. Histotripsy: A Method for Mechanical Tissue Ablation with Ultrasound. Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering Volume 26, 2024
73. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm?ID=K233466.
74. Joan Vidal-Jove, et al. First-in-man histotripsy of hepatic tumors: the THERESA trial, a feasibility study. International Journal of Hyperthermia Volume 39, 2022 - Issue 1
75. Mishal Mendiratta-lala, et al. The #HOPE4LIVER Single-Arm Pivotal Trial for Histotripsy of Primary and Metastatic Liver Tumors. Multicenter Study Radiology. 2024 Sep;312(3):e233051. doi: 10.1148/radiol.233051.
76. The HistoSonics System for Treatment of Primary and Metastatic Liver Tumors Using Histotripsy (#HOPE4LIVER EU/UK) (#HOPE4LIVER) https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT04573881?term=%23HOPE4LIVER&draw=1&rank=1.
77. The HistoSonics System for Treatment of Primary and Metastatic Liver Tumors Using Histotripsy (#HOPE4LIVER US) https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT04572633?term=%23HOPE4LIVER&draw=1&rank=2.
78. The HistoSonics Edison™ System for Treatment of Primary Solid Renal Tumors Using Histotripsy (#HOPE4KIDNEY). National Cancer institute Clinical Trials.
79. The HistoSonics Investigational System for Treatment of Primary Solid Renal Tumors Using Histotripsy(CAIN)https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT05432232?term=NCT05432232&rank=1
80. http://www.nccn.org. Hepatocellular Carcinoma. V3.2024. Revised September 24,
81. http://www.nccn.org. 2024.Kidney Cancer. V2.2025. Revised September 6, 2025.

Policy History

Original Effective Date: 03/01/2025
Current Effective Date: 03/01/2025
02/06/2025 Medical Policy Committee review
02/12/2025 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. New policy.
Next Scheduled Review Date: 02/2026

Coding

The five character codes included in the Louisiana Blue Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines are obtained from Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®)‡, copyright 2024 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.

Irreversible Electroporation and Histotripsy

Policy # 00912
Original Effective Date: 03/01/2025
Current Effective Date: 03/01/2025

The responsibility for the content of Louisiana Blue Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines is with Louisiana Blue 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 Louisiana Blue 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 Louisiana Blue 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.

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

Code Type	Code
CPT	0600T, 0601T, 0686T, 0888T
HCPCS	NA
ICD-10 Diagnosis	All related diagnoses

*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 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.

NOTICE: If the Patient's health insurance contract contains language that differs from the BCBSLA Medical Policy definition noted above, the definition in the health insurance contract will be relied upon for specific coverage determinations.

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.

NOTICE: Federal and State law, as well as contract language, including definitions and specific contract provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage.