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**DISCLAIMER/INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE**

Medical Policy provides general guidance for applying Blue Cross of Idaho benefit plans (for purposes of Medical Policy, the terms “benefit plan” and “member contract” are used interchangeably). Coverage decisions must reference the member specific benefit plan document. The terms of the member specific benefit plan document may be different than the standard benefit plan upon which this Medical Policy is based. If there is a conflict between a member specific benefit plan and the Blue Cross of Idaho’s standard benefit plan, the member specific benefit plan supersedes this Medical Policy. Any person applying this Medical Policy must identify member eligibility, the member specific benefit plan, and any related policies or guidelines prior to applying this Medical Policy. Blue Cross of Idaho Medical Policies are designed for informational purposes only and are not an authorization, explanation of benefits or a contract. Receipt of benefits is subject to satisfaction of all terms and conditions of the member specific benefit plan coverage. Blue Cross of Idaho reserves the sole discretionary right to modify all its Policies and Guidelines at any time. This Medical Policy does not constitute medical advice.

**POLICY**

Unilateral or bilateral nerve graft is considered **investigational** in patients who have had resection of one or both neurovascular bundles as part of a radical prostatectomy.

**POLICY GUIDELINES**

None.

**BENEFIT APPLICATION**

**BLUECARD/NATIONAL ACCOUNT ISSUES**

State or federal mandates (eg, Federal Employee Program) may dictate that certain U.S. Food and Drug Administration–approved devices, drugs, or biologics may not be considered investigational, and thus these devices may be assessed only by their medical necessity.

Nerve grafting with radical prostatectomy is a specialized procedure that may require out-of-network referral. In some cases, the nerve-harvesting procedure may be performed by a plastic surgeon or a neurosurgeon; in other cases, a urologist may perform both the nerve-harvesting, graft, and radical prostatectomy.

Specific contractual exclusions regarding treatment of impotence may apply.

**BACKGROUND**

**Erectile Dysfunction**

Erectile dysfunction is a common problem after radical prostatectomy. In particular, spontaneous...
erections are usually absent in men whose prostate cancer required bilateral resection of the neurovascular bundles as part of the radical prostatectomy procedure.

Treatment

A variety of noninvasive treatments are available, including vacuum constriction devices and intracavernosal injection therapy. However, spontaneous erectile activity is preferred by patients. Studies have reported results from bilateral and unilateral nerve grafts, the latter involving resection of 1 neurovascular bundle.

There has been interest in sural nerve grafting to replace cavernous nerves resection during prostatectomy. The sural nerve is considered expendable and has been extensively used in other nerve grafting procedures, such as brachial plexus and peripheral nerve injuries. As applied to prostatectomy, a portion of the sural nerve is harvested from 1 leg and then anastomosed to the divided ends of the cavernous nerve. Reports also indicate the use of other nerves (eg, genitofemoral nerve) for grafting.

Regulatory Status

A nerve graft with radical prostatectomy is a surgical procedure and, as such, is not subject to regulation by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

Several nerve cuff products have been cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. FDA product code: JXI. An example of a human tissue nerve graft product, the Avance® nerve graft (AxoGen), is regulated by FDA under 21 CFR, Part 1271 regulations for Human Cellular and Tissue-based Products (HCT/P).

RATIONALE

This evidence review was created in November 2001 and has been updated regularly with searches of the MEDLINE database. The most recent literature update was performed through February 5, 2019.

Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of a technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are length of life, quality of life, and ability to function—including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and to managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

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

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of nerve grafting in patients who have radical prostatectomy is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.
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The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does nerve grafting improve the net health outcome in patients who have radical prostatectomy with resection of neurovascular bundles?

The following PICO(s) were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients

The relevant population(s) of interest are men who have radical prostatectomy with resection of neurovascular bundles.

Interventions

The therapy being considered is nerve grafting in association with radical prostatectomy.

Comparators

The relevant comparator is prostatectomy without nerve grafting.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity.

Nerve Grafting

One randomized controlled trial evaluating nerve grafting to reduce the risk of erectile dysfunction has been published; findings were reported by Davis et al (2009). The trial included men age 65 years or younger with normal self-reported baseline erectile function selected for a unilateral nerve sparing radical prostatectomy with preservation of 1 neurovascular bundle. All patients had unilateral neurovascular bundle removal, and patients were randomized to receive or not sural nerve grafting after removal. The primary outcome was potency 2 years postsurgery, defined as the ability to have intercourse with or without erectile dysfunction medication. All patients received the same early erectile dysfunction therapy, including medication and mechanical devices. The investigators sought to detect an absolute difference of 20% between groups (graft, 60% potency rate vs no graft, 40% potency rate). A sample of 200 men was originally planned to provide 80% power. However, after 107 men were randomized, a preplanned interim analysis of evaluable patients found similar potency rates between groups. The data monitoring committee stopped the trial based on its estimate of less than a 5% chance that additional recruitment would result in a significant difference between groups. End point data were available for 66 patients. Potency was achieved in 32 (71%) of 45 sural nerve graft patients and 14 (67%) of 21 control patients (p=0.78). Trialists concluded that unilateral sural nerve graft did not result in an absolute improvement of 20% between groups, but that a smaller effect could not be ruled out. A limitation of the trial was that it was unblinded, which, because men knew the procedure they received, could have impacted self-report of potency.

The literature also includes 2 retrospective cohort studies and 3 case series. The cohort studies are described below.

The cohort study by Kung et al (2015) included 38 patients who underwent nerve grafting after radical prostatectomy and a random sample of 53 control patients who had open prostatectomy without nerve grafting. Control patients had unilateral or bilateral nerve sparing prostatectomy or non-nerve sparing prostatectomy. Complete urinary incontinence, no erectile capacity at baseline, and follow-up data less than 12 months were study exclusion criteria. Unilateral nerve grafting (n=29) and unilateral nerve sparing (n=10) patients did not differ significantly between groups (p>0.05) on various outcomes, including urinary continence, erections sufficient for sex, spontaneous erections, and use of erectile
dysfunction medications. Bilateral nerve grafting (n=9) and bilateral non-nerve sparing (n=10) patients had similar outcomes (p>0.05). This study lacked randomization and blinding, and subgroup analyses included small numbers of patients.

The second cohort study, published by Namiki et al (2007), included 113 patients: 19 had unilateral nerve sparing plus sural nerve graft, 60 patients had unilateral nerve sparing with no grafting, and 34 patients had bilateral nerve sparing surgery. Function was assessed using validated questionnaires and, at 2 years, no difference in sexual function scores was found between the unilateral nerve graft and bilateral nerve sparing patients. At 3 years, similar percentages of patients in the unilateral nerve graft (25%) and bilateral nerve sparing (28%) groups considered their sexual function as fair or good. Urinary function returned to baseline continence in the unilateral nerve graft and bilateral nerve sparing groups at 6 months and in the unilateral nerve sparing group at 12 months. Baseline sexual function differed between groups, which could have biased study findings: the nerve grafted and bilateral nerve sparing patients reported higher baseline function than the unilateral nerve sparing group.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have radical prostatectomy with resection of neurovascular bundles who receive nerve grafting, the evidence includes a randomized controlled trial, cohort studies, and case series. Relevant outcomes are functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The randomized controlled trial did not find that unilateral nerve grafting was associated with a statistically significant improvement in potency rates at 2 years postsurgery. Cohort studies also did not result in better outcomes with nerve grafting. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Clinical Input From Physician Specialty Societies and Academic Medical Centers

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

In response to requests, input was received from 4 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2008; no input was received from physician specialty societies. Input from the 4 centers agreed that this procedure is considered investigational.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines on the treatment of prostate cancer (v.2.2018) states: “Replacement of resected nerves with nerve grafts has not been shown to be beneficial” for recovery of erectile function after radical prostatectomy.2

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
A currently unpublished trial that might influence this review is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Key Trials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCT No.</th>
<th>Trial Name</th>
<th>Planned Enrollment</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Nerve Grafting With an Allograft During Radical Prostatectomy - Extended Follow-up in a Prospective Randomized Trial</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Jan 2019 (unknown)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCT: national clinical trial.

ESSENTIAL HEALTH BENEFITS

The Affordable Care Act (ACA) requires fully insured non-grandfathered individual and small group benefit plans to provide coverage for ten categories of Essential Health Benefits (“EHBs”), whether the benefit plans are offered through an Exchange or not. States can define EHBs for their respective state.

States vary on how they define the term small group. In Idaho, a small group employer is defined as an employer with at least two but no more than fifty eligible employees on the first day of the plan or contract year, the majority of whom are employed in Idaho. Large group employers, whether they are self-funded or fully insured, are not required to offer EHBs, but may voluntarily offer them.

The Affordable Care Act requires any benefit plan offering EHBs to remove all dollar limits for EHBs.
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CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Nerve Graft With Radical Prostatectomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64999</td>
<td>Unlisted procedure, nervous system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55840-55845</td>
<td>Radical retropubic prostatectomy, code range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64910</td>
<td>Nerve repair; with synthetic conduit or vein allograft (eg, nerve tube), each nerve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64911</td>
<td>Nerve repair; with autogenous vein graft (includes harvest of vein graft), each nerve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64912</td>
<td>Nerve repair; with nerve allograft, each nerve, first strand (cable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64913</td>
<td>Nerve repair; with nerve allograft, each additional strand (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCPCS</th>
<th>ICD-10-CM</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investigational for all relevant diagnoses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C61</td>
<td>Malignant neoplasm of prostate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N52.01-N52.9</td>
<td>Male erectile dysfunction code range (includes N52.31 Erectile dysfunction following radical prostatectomy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD-10-PCS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0VT00ZZ</td>
<td>Surgical, male reproductive system, resection, prostate, open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01UH0KZ</td>
<td>Supplement peroneal nerve with nonautologous tissue substitute, open approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01UH47Z</td>
<td>Supplement peroneal nerve with autologous tissue substitute, percutaneous endoscopic approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>Place of service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>Inpatient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POLICY HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/11/14</td>
<td>Replace policy</td>
<td>Policy updated with literature review through November 11, 2014; reference 4 added. No change in policy statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/16</td>
<td>Replace policy</td>
<td>Policy updated with literature review through February 12, 2016; reference 2 added. Policy statement unchanged; “undergone” changed to “had” in the statement. Title changed to “Nerve Graft With Radical Prostatectomy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/17</td>
<td>Replace policy</td>
<td>Policy updated with literature review through March 31, 2017; reference 6 added. Policy statement unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/18</td>
<td>Replace policy</td>
<td>Blue Cross of Idaho adopted changes as noted. Policy updated with literature review through February 5, 2018; no references added; reference 7 updated. Policy statement unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/19</td>
<td>Replace policy</td>
<td>Blue Cross of Idaho adopted changes as noted, effective 04/18/2019. Policy updated with literature review through February 5, 2019; no references added. Policy statement unchanged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>