# Medical Coverage Policy

**Effective Date.....8/15/2024**
**Next Review Date.....8/15/2025**
**Coverage Policy Number..... 0528**

# Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy

## Table of Contents



## Related Coverage Resources

Ablative Treatments for Malignant Breast Tumors
eviCore-Cigna cobranded Radiation Therapy Clinical Guidelines
Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS)

***INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE***

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

# Overview

This Coverage Policy (CP) addresses brain laser interstitial thermal therapy, also known as magnetic resonance-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy (MRgLITT). At this time, this technology is specific to the Monteris NeuroBlate® System and the Medtronic Visualase™ Thermal Therapy System.

For interstitial laser coagulation of the prostate, see CP 0159 Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia (BPH) Treatments.

# Coverage Policy

**Epilepsy**

**Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy (LITT) is considered medically necessary in the treatment of refractory epilepsy when ALL of the following criteria are met:**

- there is documentation of disabling seizures despite use of two or more antiepileptic drug regimens (i.e., medically-refractory epilepsy)
- there is a well-defined epileptogenic focus in the temporal lobe or hypothalamus accessible by LITT
- the treatment plan to use LITT has been agreed upon by a multidisciplinary team of physicians to include at least two specialists (e.g., neurosurgery, neurology) and, after considering all relevant possible treatment approaches, LITT is determined to be the best treatment option

**Malignant Brain Neoplasms**

**LITT is considered medically necessary in the treatment of symptomatic, recurrent primary or metastatic malignant brain neoplasms when ALL of the following criteria are met:**

- the recurrent neoplasm measures up to 30 cubic centimeters (cc) in volume
- the individual is considered a poor surgical candidate for resection via craniotomy
- the treatment plan to use LITT has been agreed upon by a multidisciplinary team of physicians to include at least two specialists (e.g., neurosurgery, oncology) and, after considering all relevant possible treatment approaches, LITT is determined to be the best treatment option

**Radiation Necrosis**

**LITT is considered medically necessary in the treatment of symptomatic radiation necrosis in the brain when ALL of the following criteria are met:**

- the radiation necrosis measures up to 30 cc in volume
- the individual is considered a poor surgical candidate for resection via craniotomy
- the individual is not considered a suitable candidate for craniotomy
- the treatment plan to use LITT has been agreed upon by a multidisciplinary team of physicians to include at least two specialists (e.g., neurosurgery, oncology) and, after considering all relevant possible treatment approaches, is determined to be the best treatment option

**Other**

**LITT is considered not medically necessary for all other indications.**

## Health Equity Considerations

Health equity is the highest level of health for all people; health inequity is the avoidable difference in health status or distribution of health resources due to the social conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age.

Social determinants of health are the conditions in the environment that affect a wide range of health, functioning, and quality of life outcomes and risks. Examples include safe housing, transportation, and neighborhoods; racism, discrimination and violence; education, job opportunities and income; access to nutritious foods and physical activity opportunities; access to clean air and water; and language and literacy skills.

## General Background

Laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT) uses thermal energy to induce cell death by damaging DNA and causing protein denaturation. The goal of LITT is to achieve selective thermal injury of pathological tissue while maintaining a sharp thermal border between the tumor and normal brain tissues. LITT is one of several energy delivery methods using interstitial high heat to destroy tissue; another example is radiofrequency ablation (RFA). LITT has been explored since the late 1970s, but recent advances in probe design, cooling mechanisms, and real-time magnetic resonance (MR) thermography have increased interest in LITT.

LITT is also referred to as magnetic resonance-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy (MRgLITT), laser induced thermal therapy/thermotherapy, interstitial laser photocoagulation/coagulation, interstitial laser ablation, MRI-guided laser surgery, and MRI-guided percutaneous laser ablation.

LITT involves the creation of a small cranial bur hole, through which a thin laser fiber is introduced into the brain until the tip reaches the targeted location. After the probe is inserted in the operating room, the thermal ablation procedure is performed in the MRI suite. Thereafter, the patient is moved back into the operating room for probe removal. In real time, laser-induced temperature change is monitored by MR thermometry and correlated with predicted cell death by computer models. The workstation is located in the MRI control room. The surgeon controls the probe position inside the MRI and regulates ablation time and intensity on the workstation. Alternatively, the whole procedure could be performed under intraoperative MRI monitoring.

Alternate procedures that may be performed depend on the diagnosis/location. For example, alternate treatments for brain tumors may include but are not limited to craniotomy or stereotactic radiosurgery (SRS).
Alternate treatment examples for intractable epilepsy may include anterior temporal lobectomy or vagus nerve stimulation.

**Indications**
The clinical indications for LITT are currently being defined. Ablation of deep-seated, eloquently situated primary and metastatic brain tumors, epileptogenic foci, and radiation necrosis are the majority of indications described in the literature.

**Benefits and Risks**

Proposed benefits include providing a minimally invasive option for 1) treating surgically challenging tumors in locations that would otherwise have represented an intrinsic comorbidity by the approach itself, and 2) those with comorbidities that preclude open surgical procedures because of potentially high risks of morbidity and mortality. Surgical site infections, bleeding, anesthesia-related risks, and inpatient length of stay are considered lower in LITT than those in open craniotomy.

Specific risks of LITT include damage to the cerebral vasculature by the laser probe which could result in hemorrhage or pseudoaneurysm that may require subsequent open or endovascular surgery. Although MR thermometry allows precise control of the ablated tissue, the risk of damage to the critical cortex areas and white matter tracts by the probe or thermal energy remains. Delayed transitory neurologic deficits due to increasing brain edema usually resolve after steroid therapy. Nonspecific adverse effects include balance disorder, dizziness, and headache. Brain abscess, seizures, and wound infection have also been reported. Risks and contraindications for MRI are also applicable to LITT. Other potential risks include variable skill level/technology learning curve. LITT should be performed by a neurosurgeon who has completed procedure-specific training in the use of a Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved LITT ablation system and who has been granted hospital privileges to perform LITT ablation procedures. The exact rates of complications vary among patient populations and facilities. Neurosurgeons considering LITT balance the potential benefits of surgical treatment with the risks of surgery in patients with comorbidities (Belykh, et al., 2017; Lagman, et al., 2017; Shukla, et al., 2017; Riordan, et al., 2014).

**U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)**
The NeuroBlate® System (Monteris Medical, Plymouth, MN) and the Visualase® Thermal Therapy System (Medtronic Inc., Dublin, Ireland) are FDA-approved devices that are being used in LITT. Both systems can be used with intraoperative MRI, navigation or stereotactic systems, and provide predictive thermal dosage lines to estimate ablation volume.

- Monteris NeuroBlate System: The NeuroBlate System is a collection of MRI-compatible laser devices and accessories that create an MRI guided delivery of precision thermal therapy in the practice of neurosurgery. Indications for use include:
  - to ablate, necrotize, or coagulate soft tissue through interstitial irradiation or thermal therapy in medicine and surgery in the discipline of neurosurgery with 1064 nm lasers
  - for planning and monitoring thermal therapies under MRI visualization. It provides MRI based trajectory planning assistance for the stereotaxic placement of MRI compatible (conditional) NeuroBlate™ Laser Delivery Probes. It also provides real time thermographic analysis of selected MRI images
  - When interpreted by a trained physician, this System provides information that may be useful in the determination or assessment of thermal therapy. Patient management decisions should not be made solely on the basis of the NeuroBlate System analysis

- Visualase™ Thermal Therapy System: The Visualase Thermal Therapy System comprises four devices: a laser energy source, a cooled laser applicator, a pump for circulating coolant through the applicator, and a computer workstation with magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) analysis software for determination and visualization of relative changes in tissue temperature during therapy. Indications for use include:
  - to necrotize or coagulate soft tissue through interstitial irradiation or thermal therapy under magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) guidance in medicine and surgery in cardiovascular thoracic surgery (excluding the heart and the vessels in the pericardial sac), dermatology, ear-nose-throat surgery, gastroenterology, general surgery, gynecology, head and neck surgery, neurosurgery, plastic surgery, orthopedics, pulmonology, radiology, and urology, for wavelengths 80Onm through 1064nm

- when therapy is performed under MRI guidance, and when data from compatible MRI sequences is available, the Visualase system can process images to determine relative changes in tissue temperature during therapy. The image data may be manipulated and viewed in a number of different ways and the values of data at certain selected points may be monitored and/or displayed over time

**Literature Review**
The use of MR-guided LITT for treatment of epilepsy and brain tumors continues to expand in the US. Although the majority of studies are small, retrospective case series, numerous published studies and meta-analysis in the peer-reviewed literature demonstrate the safety and efficacy of MR-guided LITT in the treatment of:

- refractory epilepsy
- symptomatic, recurrent metastatic malignant brain neoplasms
- symptomatic radiation necrosis in the brain.

The Laser Ablation of Abnormal Neurological Tissue using Robotic NeuroBlate System (LAANTERN) trial is an ongoing multicenter, non-randomized, prospective NeuroBlate LITT study (NCT02392078). Several studies from the LAANTERN trial have been published:

Kim et al. (2020) has reported 12 month outcomes from 223 subjects enrolled at 14 US centers with 231 ablated tumors. The cohort included 10 pediatric patients (<18 yr of age). The median age was 54.3 years. In total, 73.6% of patients had baseline neurological symptoms. The median baseline Karnofsky Performance Score (KPS) was 90. LITT indications included primary brain tumor (131; 58.7%) or metastatic brain tumor (92; 41.3%). Nearly all metastatic lesions (92.4%) were previously treated, and the LITT procedure was indicated for tumor recurrence (50.6%), radiation necrosis (40%), or unknown (9.4%). The median length of follow-up was 223 days. Results reported a 1 year estimated survival rate of 73%, with no significant difference observed between patients with metastatic or primary tumors in overall survival. A total of 50.5% had stabilized/improved KPS at six months. There were no significant differences in KPS or QoL between patients with metastatic vs primary tumors. The authors concluded that data in this first outcome analysis of the LAANTERN registry show that the overall survival in this population of patients with brain tumors reflects similar if not improved outcomes to those previously reported for a population of patients with mostly recurrent disease. Patient-reported QoL outcomes were also stabilized and better than expected in a population with malignant brain tumors. Enrollment is ongoing, and further subanalyses of these data are planned and are likely to yield additional learning regarding patient selection and management.

Landazuri et al. (2020) reported of 60 patients enrolled into LAANTERN specifically for epilepsy treatment, 42 reached one year follow up. Patients with mesial temporal lobe epilepsy (MTLE) comprised 56.7 % of this cohort of multiple epilepsy types. Thirty-one out of 42 patients were considered responders (Engel I or II outcome). Engel I outcome was achieved in 27/42 patients (64.3 %). At last follow-up, median quality of life scores increased 14.1 points with 72.4 % (21/29) reporting an improvement in quality of life; however, total score change was not statistically significant. The authors concluded that initial reporting of an ongoing prospective multicenter study presents further data in support of LITT as a surgical treatment for drug-resistant epilepsy.

Chan et al. (2023) conducted a substudy of 90 patients with one or more radiographically progressive brain metastasis with biopsy-proven RN at time of LITT procedure, without evidence of tumor recurrence on pathology. Median follow-up was 1.65 years (range 0.02–4.18 years). Chan et al. reported 82.2% were White, 13.3% were Black, 1.1% American Indian, 2.2% multiracial/unknown race. Median post-procedure overall survival was 2.55 years [1.66, infinity]

and 77.1% at one year as estimated by Kaplan-Meier. Median Karnofsky performance status (KPS) remained at 80 through 2-year follow-up. Seizure prevalence was 12% within 1 month post-LITT and 7.9% at 3 months; down from 34.4% within 60-day prior to procedure.

de Groot et al. (2022) conducted an analysis of participants enrolled in the LAANTERN trial with newly diagnosed and recurrent Isocitrate dehydrogenase 1 (IDH1) wild-type glioblastoma. Glioblastoma *IDH* wild type WHO grade 4 (N = 89) participants were subdivided into of 29 newly diagnosed and 60 recurrent adult patients.
Median overall survival (OS) was 9.73 months for newly diagnosed patients and median post-procedure survival was 8.97 months for recurrent patients. Factors associated with improved survival were MGMT promoter methylation, adjuvant chemotherapy within 12 weeks, and tumor volume <3 cc. The authors concluded that LITT offers an effective cytoreductive approach for patients with newly diagnosed and recurrent *IDH* wild-type glioblastoma. The authors state its use in newly diagnosed patients who are followed by post-LITT chemoradiotherapy produces a median OS similar to that of patients treated with conventional surgical resection, thus making LITT a viable alternative in patients with inoperable tumors or those not amenable to resection.

The Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) Technology Assessment on Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for Epilepsy and/or Brain Tumours (Williams, et al., 2019) notes that no comparative evidence on disease progression, overall survival, hospitalization, or quality of life was found. The evidence, drawn primarily from retrospective chart reviews, case series, and case reports, suggested that magnetic resonance-guided LITT proffers no advantage over stereotactic radiosurgery in reducing seizures in patients with drug-resistant, medically-intractable temporal lobe epilepsy (TLE). Also, relative to patients treated with SRS for medically-intractable TLE and craniotomy for high grade tumours in areas of eloquence, patients treated with LITT appeared to experience fewer adverse events and complications. None of the studies reported on the incidence of epileptic episodes, post-operative pain, use of medication, or hospital readmissions.

**Epilepsy Meta-analysis**

| Diagnosis | Number of patients | Type of laser | Author / year | Key Points |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| drug-resistant epilepsy | 559<br><br>28 studies | Not specified<br><br>(only Visualase mentioned in background) | Barot 2021 | ✓ Seizure freedom rate:<br>➢ Hypothalamic hamartomas (HH) 67%<br>➢ Mesial temporal lobe epilepsy (mTLE) (56%)<br>➢ Extratemporal epilepsy (50%) (Outcome was overall comparable)<br>✓ Pooled prevalence of seizure freedom decreases from 60% with short follow-up duration (6–12 months) to 53% when mean follow-up duration was above 24 months.<br>✓ The mTLE cases with mesial temporal sclerosis had better outcome vs non-lesional cases of mTLE.<br>✓ The prevalence of postoperative adverse events was 19% and the most common adverse event was visual field deficits.<br>✓ The reoperation rate was 9%, which included repeat ablation and open resection. |
| drug-refractory mesial | 554<br><br>13 studies | Not specified | Kohlhase 2021 | ✓ Compared MRgLITT, RFA, and conventional surgical approaches to the temporal lobe (i.e., |

| Diagnosis | Number of patients | Type of laser | Author / year | Key Points |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| temporal lobe epilepsy (mTLE). | | | | anterior temporal lobe resection [ATL] or selective amygdalohippocampectomy [sAHE]).<br>✓ 43 studies (13 MRgLITT, 6 RFA, and 24 surgery studies) involved 554, 123, 1504, and 1326 patients treated by MRgLITT, RFA, ATL, or sAHE, respectively.<br>✓ MRgLITT and RFA were both inferior relative to conventional surgical approaches (ATL and sAHE) in terms of seizure outcome (Engel Class I). Engel-I outcomes were achieved after:<br>➢ MRgLITT in 57% (315/554, range = 33.3%–67.4%),<br>➢ RFA in 44% (54/123, range = 0%–67.2%),<br>➢ ATL in 69% (1032/1504, range = 40%–92.9%), and<br>➢ sAHE in 66% (887/1326, range = 21.4%–93.3%).<br>✓ Meta-analysis revealed no significant difference in seizure outcome between MRgLITT and RFA (p = .098), whereas ATL and sAHE were both superior to MRgLITT (ATL: p = .002; sAHE: p = .037) and RFA (ATL: p = .0113; sAHE: p = .0247), with better outcome in patients at follow-up of 60 months or more.<br>✓ The rate of major complications was 3.8% for MRgLITT, 3.7% for RFA, 10.9% for ATL, and 7.4% for sAHE; the differences did not show statistical significance.<br>✓ Cognitive outcome might be more favorable after MRgLITT compared to ATL and sAHE. Lateral functions such as naming or object recognition may be more preserved in MRgLITT. |
| temporal lobe epilepsy | 551 | Not specified | Kerezoudis 2020 | ✓ The mean follow-up ranged from 6 to 42.9 months.<br>✓ The pooled mean epilepsy duration was 24.4 years.<br>✓ A total of 384 patients had MTS (70% of overall cohort).<br>✓ Overall seizure freedom rate was 58% and was not significantly associated with total ablation volume (p=0.42).<br>✓ Pooled seizure freedom rate of 58% for all patients with TLE and 66% for patients with MTS (in contrast to 73% and 67% for open anterior temporal lobectomy and selective amygdalohippocampectomy, respectively).<br>✓ Total ablation volume as well as hippocampal or amygdala ablation were not significantly associated with seizure freedom.<br>✓ Overall complication rate was 17%. The permanent complication rate was 5%, the temporary complication rate was 10%. |
| Mesial temporal lobe | 434 | Not stated | R. Wang 2021 | ✓ Literature review (not meta-analysis)<br>✓ 1094 patients (LITT: 434, SRS: 81, RF-TC: 402, Cortico-amygdalohippocampectomy |

| Diagnosis | Number of patients | Type of laser | Author / year | Key Points |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| epilepsy (mTLE). | | | | (CAH): 153, and selective amygdalohippocampectomy (SelAH): 24).<br>✓ Seizure freedom was similar between all LITT studies and to rates achieved by cortico-amygdalohippocampectomy (CAH) and selective amygdalohippocampectomy (SelAH) however, direct comparisons were lacking.<br>✓ Although ablation volume was not associated with seizure outcomes, targeting more of the mesial, anterior, and inferior temporal structures was associated with increased rates of Engel I.<br>✓ Common complications included transient postprocedure headaches (LITT: 0.4%-27%, SRS: 15%-70%, and RF-TC: 23%) and visual field deficits (VFDs) (LITT: 3%-40%, SRS: 34%-50%, and RF-TC: 2%-5%) Cranial nerve (CN) palsies were unique to LITT with 7%of patients experiencing this complication. |
| drug-resistant epilepsies (DRE) | 414 | Not specified | Y. Wang 2020 | ✓ 16 studies with MRgLiTT (414 patients)<br>✓ 10 studies with stereoelectroencephalography-guided radiofrequency thermocoagulation (SEEG-RFTC) (390 patients)<br>✓ Follow-up minimum 6 months<br>✓ Overall complication rate across all samples was low in the two approaches (5%).<br>✓ In this analysis, authors included those who received repeated ablations and became seizure free into the seizure-free group.<br>✓ Authors propose that the underlying mechanism of the significant difference in postoperative rates of seizure-free outcomes between MRgLiTT and SEEG-RFTC (65 % vs. 23 % respectively, p=0.00) was most likely related to the sizes of the ablated lesions.<br>✓ MRgLiTT in both the hypothalamic hamartoma group (99 %) and the temporal lobe epilepsy group (59 %) achieved efficacy and low heterogeneity; patients with temporal lobe epilepsy and mesial temporal sclerosis (MTS) did not achieve better seizure control than non-MTS patients did (p=0.142). |
| seizures, brain tumors (pediatric) | 303 pediatric LITT procedures<br><br>35 studies | Visualase (89%), NeuroBlate (9%), Multilase 2100 (2%) | Zeller 2021 | ✓ Systematic review (not meta-analysis)<br>✓ Mean age of 10.5 years (range 0.5–21 years)<br>✓ Seizures (86%), followed by brain tumors (16%)<br>✓ Mean follow-up duration was 15.6 months<br>✓ The overall complication rate was 15.8%, which comprised transient neurological deficits, cognitive and electrolyte disturbances, hemorrhage, edema, and hydrocephalus.<br>✓ No deaths were reported. |

**Brain Neoplasms and Radiation Necrosis Literature**

| Diagnosis | Number of patients | Type of laser | Author / year | Key Points |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| high-grade gliomas, low-grade gliomas, metastatic brain tumors, nonglial tumors. | 826 | Both | Alkazemi 2023 | ✓ Meta-analysis including 35 Retrospective and 9 Prospective studies, of which 44 were case series and 1 was a matched cohort. 42 studies from the USA and 3 from France.<br>✓ A total of 121 children (<18 years).<br>✓ 829 lesions: 361 were classified as high-grade gliomas, 116 as low-grade gliomas, 337 as metastatic brain tumors, and 15 as nonglial tumors.<br>✓ Indications for LITT included:<br>○ inaccessible or deep tumor location,<br>○ salvage therapy after radiosurgery,<br>○ tumors in pediatrics age-groups in whom surgery was deemed less favorable,<br>○ after failures of ≥2 treatment options,<br>✓ One-year progression-free survival was 18.6% (11.3%-29.0%) in high-grade gliomas, 16.9% (11.6%-24.0%) among the grade 4 astrocytomas; and 51.2% (36.7%-65.5%) in brain metastases.<br>✓ One-year overall survival was 43.0% (36.0%-50.0%) in high-grade glioma, 45.9% (37.9%-54%) in grade 4 astrocytomas; 93.0% (42.3%-100%) in low-grade gliomas, and 56.3% (47.0%-65.3%) in brain metastases.<br>✓ Pooled incidence of all (minor or major) procedure-related AEs was 30% (27%-40%) for all tumors. Pooled incidence of neurologic deficits (minor or major) was 16% (12%-22%). |
| brain metastases with in-field recurrence following SRS | 470<br><br>14 studies | Not stated | Chen 2021 | ✓ Meta-analysis<br>✓ The 6-month (LC-6) and 12-month (LC-12) local control rates were 78.5% and 69.0%, separately.<br>✓ Pooled median OS was 17.15 months (13.27-24.8). The overall OS-6 and OS-12 rates were 76.0% (71.4-80.0%) and 63.4% (52.9-72.7%), separately.<br>✓ LITT provided more favorable local control efficacy in RN than BM recurrence (LC-6: 87.4% vs. 67.9%, p = 0.009; LC-12: 76.3% vs. 59.9%, p = 0.041). |
| Radiation necrosis (RN) in patients with previously radiated CNS neoplasms. | 337<br><br>24 studies | Not stated | Gecici 2024 | ✓ Meta-analysis compared the efficacy of bevacizumab and LITT in treating RN in patients with previously radiated CNS neoplasms.<br>✓ 24 studies were included with 210 patients in the bevacizumab group and 337 patients in the LITT group.<br>✓ Statistically significant differences favoring bevacizumab in symptomatic improvement/stability (p = 0.02), while no significant differences were observed in radiological improvement/stability (p = 0.27) or steroid wean-off (p = 0.90).<br>✓ The rates of adverse reactions were 11.2% for bevacizumab and 14.9% for LITT (p = 0.66), |

| Diagnosis | Number of patients | Type of laser | Author / year | Key Points |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | with the majority being grade 2 or lower (72.2% for bevacizumab and 62.5% for LITT). |
| Mixed Epilepsy and brain mass | 223 | NeuroBlate and Visualase | Lagman 2017 | ✓ Quantitative analysis of case reports and case series<br>✓ Head-to-head comparison of these systems was difficult given the variance in indications (and therefore patient population) and disparate literature<br>✓ LITT procedures have demonstrated effectiveness in the treatment of a variety of epilepsy etiologies and tumor pathologies but long-term outcomes have yet to be fully elucidated. |
| Brain tumor Gliomas (70.2%), radiation necrosis (21.0%), and metastasis (8.8%) | 207 | NeuroBlate | Shao 2020 | ✓ Retrospective case series<br>✓ Median follow-up was 8.4 months, and 52% had progression during follow-up.<br>✓ Temporary complications occurred in 30.2% of patients, and permanent deficits occurred in 10.8% of patients.<br>✓ There was a significant decrease in permanent motor deficits over time (15.5 vs. 4.4%; p=0.005)<br>✓ 30-day mortality (4.1% vs. 1.5%) decreased (not statistically significant) in the recent cohort.<br>✓ Poor preoperative Karnofsky Performance Status (≤70) were significantly correlated with increased permanent deficits (p=0.001) and decreased overall survival (p < 0.001 for all time points). |
| recurrent glioblastoma (rGBM | 134<br><br>(11 studies) | mixed | Munoz-Casabella 2021 | ✓ Literature review<br>✓ 5 studies used NeuroBlate; 3 studies used the Visualase; 2 studies used neodymium-yttrium aluminum garnet laser (Nd:YAG laser); and 1 study used both the NeuroBlate and Visualase<br>✓ A total of 8 studies with 107 patients had available data for overall median survival. The pooled overall survival was found to be 18.6 months (16.2- 21.1).<br>✓ A total of 6 studies with 93 patients had available data for post-LITT survival. The pooled post-LITT survival was found to be 10.1 months (8.8-11.6).<br>✓ A total of 8 studies with 119 patients had available data for progression-free survival. Pooled progression free survival was found to be 6 months (5.3-6.7). |
| Mixed | 120 | NeuroBlate | Kamath 2017 | ✓ Retrospective evaluation<br>✓ Glioblastomas, metastases, WHO grade III gliomas, WHO grade II gliomas, epilepsy foci, WHO grade I gliomas, radiation necrosis, teratoma and encephalocele<br>✓ Median follow-up was 9.5 months, with 18 patients lost to follow-up. |

| Diagnosis | Number of patients | Type of laser | Author / year | Key Points |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ✓ The rate of complications/unexpected readmission was 6.0%, and the mortality rate was 2.2%.<br>✓ Progression-free survival reported by tumor grade<br>✓ There were 8 perioperative complications (6.0%) and 8 unplanned readmissions (6.0%). Of these, there were 3 perioperative mortalities (2.2%). |
| newly diagnosed glioblastoma (nGBM) | 111<br><br>11 studies | NeuroBlate | Viozzi 2021 | ✓ Systematic review<br>✓ All included studies were conducted in the US, with a great majority using the Neuroblate–Monteris system (81%).<br>✓ All papers suffered from serious or critical risk of bias, and the quality of evidence was graded as very low according to the GRADE criteria. None of the studies was randomized and reporting of confounders and other parameters was poor.<br>✓ Median overall survival (OS) ranged from 4.1 to 32 months and progression free survival (PFS) from 2 to 31 months.<br>✓ The mean complication rate was 33.7%.<br>✓ The low quality of evidence shows the need for a well-designed prospective multicenter randomized controlled trial. |
| Mixed | 102 | Visualase | Patel 2016 | ✓ Retrospective analysis<br>✓ intracranial tumors (n=87), chronic pain syndrome (cingulotomy, five patients), or epilepsy (ten patients).<br>✓ 27 cases of morbidity, including new-onset neurological deficits, and two perioperative deaths.<br>✓ Fourteen patients (13.7%) developed new deficits after the MRgLITT procedure, and of those 14 patients, 64.3% (n = 9) had complete resolution of deficits within 1 month.<br>✓ Authors warn thermal damage to critical and eloquent structures can occur despite MRI guidance. Once the learning curve is overcome, the overall procedural complication rate is low. |

**UpToDate**

An UpToDate posting on delayed complications of cranial irradiation (Dietrich et al. 2023) notes under Brain tissue necrosis that in patients who do not achieve symptomatic response to glucocorticoids, or when glucocorticoids cannot be tapered without return of symptoms, a variety of other treatment options have been explored, including bevacizumab and laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT). Under Summary, Role of Surgery,
Dietrich et al. notes that surgical resection of the necrotic tissue is sometimes required, particularly in cases in which there is diagnostic uncertainty as to whether the radiographic changes are indicative of tumor progression or tissue necrosis, or in patients with severe necrosis who have contraindications to bevacizumab. Laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT) is an option in this context but is less preferred in patients with preoperative neurologic deficits.

An UpToDate posting on the treatment of brain metastases (Loeffler et al. 2023) notes under 'Recurrent disease' section that local techniques, such as laser interstitial thermal therapy, are also under investigation for recurrent brain metastases as well as radiation necrosis.

**Professional Societies/Organizations**
A review of National Comprehensive Cancer Network® (NCCN) Clinical Guidelines in Oncology™ Central Nervous System (CNS) cancers, Principles of Brain Tumor Surgery, includes a 2B recommendation that addresses MRI-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT), noting that it may be considered for patients who are poor surgical candidates (craniotomy or resection). Potential indications include relapsed brain metastases, radiation necrosis and glioblastomas, and other gliomas (NCCN CNS, Version 1.2024 — May 31, 2024).

The American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) guideline on Treatment for Brain Metastases (Vogelbaum, et al., 2022) noted that 'No recommendation can be made for or against LITT' (Type: informal consensus; Evidence quality: low; Strength of recommendation: none). The ASCO noted that 'No studies were identified to inform recommendations on this issue'.

The Congress of Neurological Surgeons/American Association of Neurological Surgeons (CNS/AANS):
A Position Statement on MR-guided Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy (LITT) for Brain Tumors and Radiation Necrosis (September 2021) states the following indications for use:

> "LITT is a neurosurgical tool FDA indicated for use to ablate, necrotize, or coagulate intracranial soft tissue, including brain structures (e.g., brain tumor, radiation necrosis and epileptogenic foci as identified by non-invasive and invasive neurodiagnostic testing, including imaging), through interstitial irradiation or thermal therapy in the discipline of neurosurgery with laser technology."
>
> The CNS/AANS notes "there is consensus that intracranial LITT should be considered as a potential option for patients with recurrent or progressive malignant tumor (primary or metastatic), lesion(s) inaccessible to surgical resection, or when the patient is unable to tolerate surgical resection due to medical comorbidities" (Barnett, et al., 2021).

The Congress of Neurological Surgeons Systematic review and Evidence-based guidelines update on the role of cytoreductive surgery in the management of progressive glioblastoma in adults (Patrick, et al., 2022) states:
"Younger patients with better functional status based on KPS scores are more likely to undergo reoperation, such that some authors have argued that the survival benefit seen in reoperation is blurred by selection bias. These patients with more favorable prognostic factors are better surgical candidates, but also have better survival outcomes independent of reoperation. Alternatively, the emergence of techniques such as laser interstitial thermal therapy and photodynamic therapy present further options for cytoreductive surgery in recurrent malignant gliomas. These minimally invasive techniques can provide cytoreduction with low operative morbidity, and with further investigation can widen the population considered for repeat surgery, when open surgery is otherwise not amenable due to poor surgical candidacy."

The American Society for Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery (ASSFN) Position Statement on Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for the Treatment of Drug-Resistant Epilepsy (DRE) lists the following indications for the use of MRgLITT as a treatment option for patients with DRE:

1. Failure to respond to, or intolerance of, at least 2 appropriately chosen medications at appropriate doses for disabling, localization-related epilepsy AND
2. Well-defined epileptogenic foci or critical pathways of seizure propagation accessible by MRgLITT

Contraindication to Use of MRgLITT:

1. Inability to identify the epileptogenic focus (or foci) or critical pathways within epileptogenic networks.
2. Inability to undergo magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) because of medical reasons.
3. Medical contraindications to surgery, eg, unstable cardiac or respiratory conditions, anticoagulants that cannot be stopped, and bleeding diatheses. (Wu, et al., 2021/2022)

The Congress of Neurological Surgeons Systematic review and Evidence-based guidelines update on the role of emerging developments in the management of newly diagnosed glioblastoma (Farrell, et al., 2020) does not make any Recommendations specific to LITT.

The Guideline on the Role of Emerging and Investigational Therapies for the Treatment of Adults With Metastatic Brain Tumors (Chapter 9; Elder, et al., 2019) states "There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation regarding the routine use of laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT), aside from use as part of approved clinical trials.

The CNS/AANS Guidelines on the Management of Patients with Vestibular Schwannoma (Chapter 9; Van Gompel, et al., 2018) does not address LITT. The AANS/CNS Joint Guidelines Committee document 'The role of cytoreductive surgery in the management of progressive glioblastoma: a systematic review and evidence-based clinical practice guideline' (Ryken, et al. 2014) does not address LITT. The AANS/CNS Joint Guidelines Committee document 'The role of targeted therapies in the management of progressive glioblastoma: a systematic review and evidence-based clinical practice guideline' (Olson, et al., 2014) does not address LITT.
The CNS/AANS guidelines do not address epilepsy.

The American Academy of Neurology (AAN) has several guidelines addressing epilepsy, none of which address LITT. The American Epilepsy Society lists several Evidence-based Guidelines and Practice Parameters; none address laser interstitial thermal therapy.

The American Academy of Neurology, in Association with the American Epilepsy Society and the American Association of Neurological Surgeons Practice Parameter 'Temporal lobe and localized neocortical resections for epilepsy' (Engel, et al., 2003) does not address LITT.

## Medicare Coverage Determinations

| | Contractor | Determination Name/Number | Revision Effective Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| NCD | | No Determination found | |
| LCD | | No Determination found | |

Note: Please review the current Medicare Policy for the most up-to-date information.
(NCD = National Coverage Determination; LCD = Local Coverage Determination)

## Coding Information

**Notes:**

1. This list of codes may not be all-inclusive since the American Medical Association (AMA) and Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) code updates may occur more frequently than policy updates.
2. Deleted codes and codes which are not effective at the time the service is rendered may not be eligible for reimbursement.

**Considered Medically Necessary when criteria in the applicable policy statements listed above are met:**

| CPT®* Codes | Description |
|---|---|
| 61736 | Laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT) of lesion, intracranial, including burr hole(s), with magnetic resonance imaging guidance, when performed; single trajectory for 1 simple lesion |
| 61737 | Laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT) of lesion, intracranial, including burr hole(s), with magnetic resonance imaging guidance, when performed; multiple trajectories for multiple or complex lesion(s) |



## References

1. Ahluwalia M, Barnett GH, Deng D, Tatter SB, Laxton AW, et al. Laser ablation after stereotactic radiosurgery: a multicenter prospective study in patients with metastatic brain tumors and radiation necrosis. J Neurosurg. 2018 May 4;130(3):804-811.

2. Alkazemi M, Lo YT, Hussein H, Mammi M, Saleh S, et al. Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for the Treatment of Primary and Metastatic Brain Tumors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. World Neurosurg. 2023 Mar;171:e654-e671.

3. American Academy of Neurology. Policy and Guidelines. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.aan.com/policy-and-guidelines/guidelines/ https://www.aan.com/guidelines/home/allguidelines

4. American Association of Neurological Surgeons (See Congress of Neurological Surgeons.)

5. American Association of Neurological Surgeons. Position Statements. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.aans.org/About-Us/Position-Statements https://www.aans.org/en/Advocacy/Position-Statements

6. American Epilepsy Society. Guidelines. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://cms.aesnet.org/clinical-care/clinical-guidance/guidelines https://cms.aesnet.org/clinical-care/clinical-guidance/practice-parameters https://cms.aesnet.org/about/about-aes/position-statements

7. American Society for Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery (ASSFN). American Society and Joint Section of Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery. Guidelines (and Position Statements). Member only access.

8. Arocho-Quinones EV, Lew SM, Handler MH, Tovar-Spinoza Z, Smyth M, Pediatric Stereotactic Laser Ablation Workgroup, et al. Magnetic resonance-guided stereotactic laser ablation therapy for the treatment of pediatric brain tumors: a multiinstitutional retrospective study. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2020 Mar 27;26(1):13-21.

9. Arocho-Quinones EV, Lew SM, Handler MH, Tovar-Spinoza Z, Smyth MD, Pediatric Stereotactic Laser Ablation Workgroup, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging-guided

stereotactic laser ablation therapy for the treatment of pediatric epilepsy: a retrospective multiinstitutional study. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2023 Mar 3:1-14.

10. Barnett GH, Voigt JD, Alhuwalia MS. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Studies Examining the Use of Brain Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy versus Craniotomy for the Treatment of High-Grade Tumors in or near Areas of Eloquence: An Examination of the Extent of Resection and Major Complication Rates Associated with Each Type of Surgery. Stereotact Funct Neurosurg. 2016;94(3):164-73.

11. Barnett G, Leuthardt E, Rao G, Fecci P, Sloan A. Position Statement on MR-guided Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy (LITT) for Brain Tumors and Radiation Necrosis. September 7, 2021. (From the Congress of Neurological Surgeons/American Association of Neurological Surgeons)

12. Barot N, Batra K, Zhang J, Klem ML, Castellano J, et al. Surgical outcomes between temporal, extratemporal epilepsies and hypothalamic hamartoma: systematic review and meta-analysis of MRI-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy for drug-resistant epilepsy. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2022 Feb;93(2):133-143.

13. Bastos DCA, Rao G, Oliva ICG, Loree JM, Fuentes DT, et al. Predictors of Local Control of Brain Metastasis Treated With Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy. Neurosurgery. 2020 Jul 1;87(1):112-122.

14. Belykh E, Yagmurlu K, Martirosyan NL, Lei T, Izadyyazdanabadi M, Malik KM, et al. Laser application in neurosurgery. Surg Neurol Int. 2017 Nov 9;8:274.

15. Chan M, Tatter S, Chiang V, Fecci P, Strowd R, et al. Efficacy of laser interstitial thermal therapy for biopsy-proven radiation necrosis in radiographically recurrent brain metastases. Neurooncol Adv. 2023 Mar 28;5(1):vdad031.

16. Chen C, Guo Y, Chen Y, Li Y, Chen J. The efficacy of laser interstitial thermal therapy for brain metastases with in-field recurrence following SRS: systemic review and meta-analysis. Int J Hyperthermia. 2021;38(1):273-281.

17. Chen JS, Lamoureux AA, Shlobin NA, Elkaim LM, Wang A, et al. Magnetic resonance-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy for drug-resistant epilepsy: A systematic review and individual participant data meta-analysis. Epilepsia. 2023 Aug;64(8):1957-1974.

18. Clinicaltrials.gov. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://clinicaltrials.gov/

19. Congress of Neurological Surgeons. Guidelines. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.cns.org/guidelines/browse-guidelines and https://www.cns.org/guidelines/guidelines-overview

20. Curry DJ, Raskin J2, Ali I, Wilfong AA. MR-guided laser ablation for the treatment of hypothalamic hamartomas. Epilepsy Res. 2018 May;142:131-134.

21. de Groot JF, Kim AH, Prabhu S, Rao G, Laxton AW, Fecci PE, et al. Efficacy of laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT) for newly diagnosed and recurrent IDH wild-type glioblastoma. Neurooncol Adv. 2022 Apr 6;4(1):vdac040.

22. Dietrich J, Gondi V, Mehta M. Delayed complications of cranial irradiation. In: UpToDate, Wen PY (Ed). UpToDate, Waltham, MA. Literature review current through June 2024. Topic last updated May 13, 2024.

23. Elder JB, Nahed BV, Linskey ME, Olson JJ. Congress of Neurological Surgeons Systematic Review and Evidence-Based Guidelines on the Role of Emerging and Investigational Therapies for the Treatment of Adults With Metastatic Brain Tumors.Neurosurgery. 2019 Mar 1;84(3):E201-E203. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.cns.org/guidelines/browse-guidelines-detail/role-of-emerging-investigational-therapies-treatme https://www.cns.org/guidelines/browse-guidelines

24. Engel J Jr, Wiebe S, French J, Sperling M, Williamson P, et al. Practice parameter: temporal lobe and localized neocortical resections for epilepsy. Epilepsia. 2003 Jun;44(6):741-51. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.aan.com/Guidelines/home/ByTopic?topicId=23 https://www.aesnet.org/clinical-care/clinical-guidance/practice-parameters

25. Farrell C, Shi W, Bodman A, Olson JJ. Congress of neurological surgeons systematic review and evidence-based guidelines update on the role of emerging developments in the management of newly diagnosed glioblastoma. J Neurooncol. 2020 Nov;150(2):269-359.

26. Gecici NN, Gurses ME, Kaye B, Jimenez NLF, Berke C, Gökalp E, Lu VM, Ivan ME, Komotar RJ, Shah AH. Comparative analysis of bevacizumab and LITT for treating radiation necrosis in previously radiated CNS neoplasms: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Neurooncol. 2024 May;168(1):1-11.

27. Grewal SS, Alvi MA, Lu VM, Wahood W, Worrell GA, et al. Magnetic Resonance-Guided Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy Versus Stereotactic Radiosurgery for Medically Intractable Temporal Lobe Epilepsy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Seizure Outcomes and Complications. World Neurosurg. 2019 Feb;122:e32-e47.

28. Johns Hopkins. Treatments, Tests and Therapies. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/health/treatment-tests-and-therapies/laser-interstitial-thermal-therapy

29. Kamath AA, Friedman DD, Hacker CD, Smyth MD, Limbrick DD Jr, Kim AH, Hawasli AH, et al. MRI-Guided Interstitial Laser Ablation for Intracranial Lesions: A Large Single-Institution Experience of 133 Cases. Stereotact Funct Neurosurg. 2017;95(6):417-428.

30. Kerezoudis P, Parisi V, Marsh WR, Kaufman TJ, Lehman VT, et al. Surgical Outcomes of Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for Temporal Lobe Epilepsy: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. World Neurosurg. 2020 Nov;143:527-536.e3.

31. Kim AH, Tatter S, Rao G, Prabhu S, Chen C, et al. Laser Ablation of Abnormal Neurological Tissue Using Robotic NeuroBlate System (LAANTERN): 12-Month Outcomes and Quality of Life After Brain Tumor Ablation. Neurosurgery. 2020 Sep 1;87(3):E338-E346.

32. Kohlhase K, Zöllner JP, Tandon N, Strzelczyk A, Rosenow F. Comparison of minimally invasive and traditional surgical approaches for refractory mesial temporal lobe epilepsy: A systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes. Epilepsia. 2021 Apr;62(4):831-845.

33. Lagman C, Chung LK, Pelargos PE, Ung N, Bui TT, Lee SJ, et al. Laser neurosurgery: A systematic analysis of magnetic resonance-guided laser interstitial thermal therapies. J Clin Neurosci. 2017 Feb;36:20-26.

34. Landazuri P, Shih J, Leuthardt E, Ben-Haim S, Neimat J, Tovar-Spinoza Z, Chiang V, Spencer D, Sun D, Fecci P, Baumgartner J. A prospective multicenter study of laser ablation for drug resistant epilepsy - One year outcomes. Epilepsy Res. 2020 Nov;167:106473. (LAANTERN [Laser Ablation of Abnormal Neurological Tissue Using Robotic NeuroBlate System] trial)

35. Loeffler JS. Overview of the treatment of brain metastases. In: UpToDate, Wen PY (Ed). UpToDate, Waltham, MA. Literature review current through June 2024. Topic last updated Nov 29, 2023.

36. MD Anderson. Brain Tumor Treatment. Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.mdanderson.org/treatment-options/laser-interstitial-thermal-therapy.html

37. Munoz-Casabella A, Alvi MA, Rahman M, Burns TC, Brown DA. Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for Recurrent Glioblastoma: Pooled Analyses of Available Literature. World Neurosurg. 2021 Jun 1:S1878-8750(21)00809-3.

38. National Comprehensive Cancer Network® (NCCN). NCCN GUIDELINES™ Clinical Guidelines in Oncology™. National Comprehensive Cancer Network, Inc. 2024, All Rights Reserved. Central Nervous System Cancers. NCCN CNS Version 1.2024 — May 31, 2024. Accessed July 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.nccn.org/guidelines/category_1

39. NeuroBlate® System. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.monteris.com/healthcare-professionals/clinical-research-and-evidence/

40. Olson JJ, Nayak L, Ormond DR, Wen PY, AANS/CNS Joint Guidelines Committee et al. The role of targeted therapies in the management of progressive glioblastoma: a systematic review and evidence-based clinical practice guideline. J Neurooncol. 2014 Jul;118(3):557-99.

41. Palmisciano P, Haider AS, Nwagwu CD, Wahood W,et al. Bevacizumab vs laser interstitial thermal therapy in cerebral radiation necrosis from brain metastases: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Neurooncol. 2021 Aug;154(1):13-23.

42. Patrick HH, Sherman JH, Elder JB, Olson JJ. Congress of neurological surgeons systematic review and evidence-based guidelines update on the role of cytoreductive surgery in the management of progressive glioblastoma in adults. J Neurooncol. 2022 Jun;158(2):167-177.

43. Rennert RC, Khan U, Bartek J, Tatter SB, Field M, et al. Laser Ablation of Abnormal Neurological Tissue Using Robotic Neuroblate System (LAANTERN): Procedural Safety and Hospitalization. Neurosurgery. 2020 Apr 1;86(4):538-547.

44. Riordan M, Tovar-Spinoza Z. Laser induced thermal therapy (LITT) for pediatric brain tumors: case-based review. Transl Pediatr. 2014 Jul;3(3):229-35.

45. Ryken TC, Kalkanis SN, Buatti JM, Olson JJ; AANS/CNS Joint Guidelines Committee. The role of cytoreductive surgery in the management of progressive glioblastoma: a systematic

review and evidence-based clinical practice guideline. J Neurooncol. 2014 Jul;118(3):479-88.

46. Shah AH, Semonche A, Eichberg DG, Borowy V, Luther E, et al. The Role of Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy in Surgical Neuro-Oncology: Series of 100 Consecutive Patients. Neurosurgery. 2020 Aug 1;87(2):266-275.

47. Shao J, Radakovich NR, Grabowski M, Borghei-Razavi H, Knusel K, et al. Lessons Learned in Using Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for Treatment of Brain Tumors: A Case Series of 238 Patients from a Single Institution. World Neurosurg. 2020 Jul;139:e345-e354.

48. Shukla ND, Ho AL, Pendharkar AV, Sussman ES, Halpern CH. Laser interstitial thermal therapy for the treatment of epilepsy: evidence to date. Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat. 2017 Sep 26;13:2469-2475.

49. Sperling MR, Gross RE, Alvarez GE, McKhann GM, Salanova V, Gilmore J. Stereotactic Laser Ablation for Mesial Temporal Lobe Epilepsy: A prospective, multicenter, single-arm study. Epilepsia. 2020 Jun;61(6):1183-1189. (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02844465; Title: Stereotactic Laser Ablation for Temporal Lobe Epilepsy [SLATE] trial)

50. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Monteris Medical NeuroBlate™ System (K162762). October 26, 2016. June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf16/k162762.pdf https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf22/K222983.pdf (March 15, 2023)

51. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Visualase® Thermal Therapy System (K071328). August 31, 2007. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf7/k071328.pdf

52. Van Gompel JJ, Agazzi S, Carlson ML, Adewumi DA, Hadjipanayis CG, et al. Congress of Neurological Surgeons Systematic Review and Evidence-Based Guidelines on Emerging Therapies for the Treatment of Patients With Vestibular Schwannomas. Neurosurgery. 2018 Feb 1;82(2):E52-E54. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.cns.org/guidelines/browse-guidelines-detail/9-emerging-therapies-treatment-of-patients-with-ve

53. Viozzi I, Guberinic A, Overduin CG, Rovers MM, Ter Laan M. Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy in Patients with Newly Diagnosed Glioblastoma: A Systematic Review. J Clin Med. 2021 Jan 19;10(2):355.

54. Visualase MRI-Guided Laser Ablation. Last Updated Aug 2022. Accessed June 2024. Available at URL address: https://www.medtronic.com/us-en/healthcare-professionals/products/neurological/laser-ablation/visualase.html

55. Vogelbaum MA, Brown PD, Messersmith H, Brastianos PK, Burri S, Cahill D, Dunn IF, Gaspar LE, Gatson NTN, Gondi V, Jordan JT, Lassman AB, Maues J, Mohile N, Redjal N, Stevens G, Sulman E, van den Bent M, Wallace HJ, Weinberg JS, Zadeh G, Schiff D. Treatment for Brain Metastases: ASCO-SNO-ASTRO Guideline. J Clin Oncol. 2022 Feb 10;40(5):492-516. Erratum in: J Clin Oncol. 2022 Apr 20;40(12):1392.

56. Wang R, Beg U, Padmanaban V, Abel TJ, Lipsman N, Ibrahim GM, Mansouri A. A Systematic Review of Minimally Invasive Procedures for Mesial Temporal Lobe Epilepsy: Too Minimal, Too Fast? Neurosurgery. 2021 Jul 15;89(2):164-176

57. Wang Y, Xu J, Liu T, Chen F, Chen S, Xie Z, Fang T, Liang S. Magnetic resonance-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy versus stereoelectroencephalography-guided radiofrequency thermocoagulation for drug-resistant epilepsy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Epilepsy Res. 2020 Oct;166:106397.

58. Williams D, Loshak H. Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for Epilepsy and/or Brain Tumours: A Review of Clinical Effectiveness and Cost-Effectiveness [Internet]. Ottawa (ON): Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health; 2019 Jun. CADTH Rapid Response Reports.

59. Wu C, Jermakowicz WJ, Chakravorti S, Cajigas I, Sharan AD, et al. Effects of surgical targeting in laser interstitial thermal therapy for mesial temporal lobe epilepsy: A multicenter study of 234 patients. Epilepsia. 2019 Jun;60(6):1171-1183.

60. Wu C, Schwalb JM, Rosenow JM, McKhann GM 2nd, Neimat JS; American Society for Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgeons. The American Society for Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery Position Statement on Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for the Treatment of Drug-Resistant Epilepsy. Neurosurgery. 2022 Feb 1;90(2):155-160.

61. Xue F, Chen T, Sun H. Postoperative Outcomes of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)-Guided Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy (LITT) in the Treatment of Drug-Resistant Epilepsy: A Meta-Analysis. Med Sci Monit. 2018 Dec 21;24:9292-9299.

62. Zeller S, Kaye J, Jumah F, Mantri SS, Mir J, Raju B, Danish SF. Current applications and safety profile of laser interstitial thermal therapy in the pediatric population: a systematic review of the literature. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2021 Jul 2:1-8.

## Revision Details

| Type of Revision | Summary of Changes | Date |
|---|---|---|
| Annual Review | • No clinical policy statement changes. | 8/15/2024 |