MASSACHUSETTS

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts is an Independent Licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

Medical Policy

Confocal Laser Endomicroscopy

Table of Contents

Policy Number: 618

BCBSA Reference Number: 2.01.87
NCD/LCD: N/A

Related Policies

- Endoscopic Radiofrequency Ablation or Cryoablation for Barrett Esophagus, #218
- Chromoendoscopy as an Adjunct to Colonoscopy, #904
- Virtual Colonoscopy and CT Colonography, #179

Policy

Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, and Indemnity Medicare HMO Blue℠ and Medicare PPO Blue℠ Members

Use of confocal laser endomicroscopy is considered **INVESTIGATIONAL**.

Prior Authorization Information

Inpatient

- For services described in this policy, precertification/preauthorization **IS REQUIRED** for all products if the procedure is performed **inpatient**.

Outpatient

- For services described in this policy, see below for products where prior authorization **might be required** if the procedure is performed **outpatient**.

	Outpatient
Commercial Managed Care (HMO and POS)	This is **not** a covered service.
Commercial PPO and Indemnity	This is **not** a covered service.
Medicare HMO Blue℠	This is **not** a covered service.
Medicare PPO Blue℠	This is **not** a covered service.

CPT Codes / HCPCS Codes / ICD Codes

Inclusion or exclusion of a code does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage as it applies to an individual member.

Providers should report all services using the most up-to-date industry-standard procedure, revenue, and diagnosis codes, including modifiers where applicable.

The following codes are included below for informational purposes only; this is not an all-inclusive list.

The following CPT codes are considered investigational for Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, Indemnity, Medicare HMO Blue and Medicare PPO Blue:

CPT Codes

CPT codes:	Code Description
43206	Esophagoscopy flexible, transoral; with optical endomicroscopy
43252	Esophagogastroduodenoscopy, flexible, transoral; with optical endomicroscopy
88375	Optical endomicroscopic image(s), interpretation and report, real-time or referred, each endoscopic session
0397T	Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ercp), with optical endomicroscopy (list separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

Description

Confocal laser endomicroscopy (CLE), also known as confocal fluorescent endomicroscopy and optical endomicroscopy, allows in vivo microscopic imaging of the mucosal epithelium during endoscopy. The process uses light from a low-power laser to illuminate tissue and, subsequently, the same lens detects light reflected from the tissue through a pinhole. The term *confocal* refers to having both illumination and collection systems in the same focal plane. Light reflected and scattered at other geometric angles that is not reflected through the pinhole is excluded from detection, which dramatically increases the resolution of CLE images.

To date, 2 CLE systems have been cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). One is an endoscope-based system with a confocal probe incorporated onto the tip of a conventional endoscope. The other is a probe-based system; the probe is placed through the biopsy channel of a conventional endoscope. The depth of view is up to 250 µm with the endoscopic system and about 120 µm with the probe-based system. A limited area can be examined—no more than 700 µm in the endoscopic-based system and less with the probe-based system. As pointed out in systematic reviews, the limited viewing area emphasizes the need for careful conventional endoscopy to target areas for evaluation. Both CLE systems are optimized using a contrast agent. The most widely used agent is intravenous fluorescein, which is FDA-approved for ophthalmologic imaging of blood vessels when used with a laser scanning ophthalmoscope.

Unlike techniques such as chromoendoscopy (see policy #904), which are primarily intended to improve the sensitivity of colonoscopy, CLE is unique in that it is designed to characterize the cellular structure of lesions immediately. CLE can thus potentially be used to make a diagnosis of polyp histology, particularly in association with screening or surveillance colonoscopy, which could allow for small hyperplastic lesions to be overlooked rather than removed and sent for histologic evaluation. Using CLE would reduce risks associated with biopsy and reduce the number of biopsies and histologic evaluations.

Another potential application of CLE technology is targeting areas for biopsy in patients with Barrett esophagus undergoing surveillance endoscopy. This alternative to the current standard approach, recommended by the American Gastroenterological Association, is that patients with Barrett esophagus

who do not have dysplasia undergo endoscopic surveillance every 3 to 5 years.[1] The American Gastroenterological Association has further recommended that random 4-quadrant biopsies every 2 cm be taken with white-light endoscopy in patients without known dysplasia.

Other potential uses of CLE under investigation include better diagnosis and differentiation of conditions such as gastric metaplasia, lung cancer, and bladder cancer.

As noted, limitations of CLE systems include a limited viewing area and depth of view. Another issue is standardization of systems for classifying lesions viewed with CLE devices. Although there is currently no internationally accepted classification system for colorectal lesions, 2 systems have been used in a number of studies conducted in different countries. They are the Mainz criteria for endoscopy-based CLE devices and the Miami classification system for probe-based CLE devices.[2] Lesion classification systems are less developed for non–gastrointestinal lesions viewed by CLE devices (eg, those in the lung or bladder). Another challenge is the learning curve for obtaining high-quality images and classifying lesions. Several recent studies, however, have found that the ability to acquire high-quality images and interpret them accurately can be learned relatively quickly; these studies were specific to colorectal applications of CLE.[3,4]

Summary

Confocal laser endomicroscopy (CLE), also known as confocal fluorescent endomicroscopy and optical endomicroscopy, allows in vivo microscopic imaging of cells during endoscopy. CLE is proposed for a variety of purposes, especially as a real-time alternative to biopsy/polypectomy and histopathologic analysis during colonoscopy and for targeting areas to undergo biopsy in patients with inflammatory bowel disease or Barrett esophagus.

For individuals who have suspected or known colorectal lesions who receive CLE as an adjunct to colonoscopy, the evidence includes multiple diagnostic accuracy studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, and resource utilization. While the reported sensitivity and specificity in these studies are high, it is uncertain whether the accuracy is sufficiently high to replace biopsy/polypectomy and histopathologic analysis. Moreover, issues remain concerning the use of this technology in clinical practice (eg, the learning curve, interpretation of lesions). The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have Barrett esophagus who are undergoing surveillance who receive CLE with targeted biopsy, the evidence includes several randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and a meta-analysis. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, and resource utilization. Evidence from RCTs has suggested CLE is more sensitive than standard endoscopy for identifying areas of dysplasia. However, a 2014 meta-analysis found that the pooled sensitivity, specificity, and negative predictive value of available studies were not sufficiently high to replace the standard surveillance protocol. National guidelines continue to recommend 4-quadrant random biopsies for patients with Barrett esophagus undergoing surveillance. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have gastrointestinal lesions and have had endoscopic treatment who receive CLE to assess adequacy of endoscopic treatment, the evidence includes an RCT and a systematic review. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, and resource utilization. The single RCT, which compared high-definition white-light endoscopy with high-definition white-light endoscopy plus CLE, was stopped early because an interim analysis did not find a between-group difference in outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have a suspicion of a condition diagnosed by identification and biopsy of lesions (eg, lung, bladder, or gastric cancer) who receive CLE, the evidence includes a small number of diagnostic accuracy studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, and resource utilization. There is limited evidence on the diagnostic accuracy of CLE for these other indications. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Policy History

Date	Action
1/2019	BCBSA National medical policy review. Description, summary and references updated. Policy statements unchanged.
12/2016	New references added from BCBSA National medical policy.
1/2016	New references added from BCBSA National medical policy.
1/2016	Clarified coding information.
3/2015	New references added from BCBSA National medical policy.
4/2014	New references added from BCBSA National medical policy. Coding information clarified.
1/2014	Coding information clarified.
7/2013	New medical policy describing non-coverage. Effective 7/1/2013.

Information Pertaining to All Blue Cross Blue Shield Medical Policies

Click on any of the following terms to access the relevant information:

Medical Policy Terms of Use
Managed Care Guidelines
Indemnity/PPO Guidelines
Clinical Exception Process
Medical Technology Assessment Guidelines

References

1. American Gastroenterological Association, Spechler SJ, Sharma P, et al. American Gastroenterological Association medical position statement on the management of Barrett's esophagus. *Gastroenterology.* Mar 2011;140(3):1084-1091. PMID 21376940
2. Salvatori F, Siciliano S, Maione F, et al. Confocal laser endomicroscopy in the study of colonic mucosa in IBD patients: a review. *Gastroenterol Res Pract.* Apr 2012;2012:525098. PMID 22474440
3. Neumann H, Vieth M, Atreya R, et al. Prospective evaluation of the learning curve of confocal laser endomicroscopy in patients with IBD. *Histol Histopathol.* Jul 2011;26(7):867-872. PMID 21630216
4. Buchner AM, Gomez V, Heckman MG, et al. The learning curve of in vivo probe-based confocal laser endomicroscopy for prediction of colorectal neoplasia. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Mar 2011;73(3):556-560. PMID 21353852
5. Su P, Liu Y, Lin S, et al. Efficacy of confocal laser endomicroscopy for discriminating colorectal neoplasms from non-neoplasms: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Colorectal Dis.* Jan 2013;15(1):e1-12. PMID 23006609
6. Dong YY, Li YQ, Yu YB, et al. Meta-analysis of confocal laser endomicroscopy for the detection of colorectal neoplasia. *Colorectal Dis.* Sep 2013;15(9):e488-495. PMID 23810105
7. Wanders LK, East JE, Uitentuis SE, et al. Diagnostic performance of narrowed spectrum endoscopy, autofluorescence imaging, and confocal laser endomicroscopy for optical diagnosis of colonic polyps: a meta-analysis. *Lancet Oncol.* Dec 2013;14(13):1337-1347. PMID 24239209
8. Xie XJ, Li CQ, Zuo XL, et al. Differentiation of colonic polyps by confocal laser endomicroscopy. *Endoscopy.* Feb 2011;43(2):87-93. PMID 21038291
9. Buchner AM, Shahid MW, Heckman MG, et al. Comparison of probe-based confocal laser endomicroscopy with virtual chromoendoscopy for classification of colon polyps. *Gastroenterology.* Mar 2010;138(3):834-842. PMID 19909747
10. Shahid MW, Buchner AM, Raimondo M, et al. Accuracy of real-time vs. blinded offline diagnosis of neoplastic colorectal polyps using probe-based confocal laser endomicroscopy: a pilot study. *Endoscopy.* Apr 2012;44(4):343-348. PMID 22382851
11. Hlavaty T, Huorka M, Koller T, et al. Colorectal cancer screening in patients with ulcerative and Crohn's colitis with use of colonoscopy, chromoendoscopy and confocal endomicroscopy. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* Aug 2011;23(8):680-689. PMID 21602687
12. Xiong YQ, Ma SJ, Zhou JH, et al. A meta-analysis of confocal laser endomicroscopy for the detection of neoplasia in patients with Barrett's esophagus. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* Jun 2016;31(6):1102-1110. PMID 26676646

13. Gupta A, Attar BM, Koduru P, et al. Utility of confocal laser endomicroscopy in identifying high-grade dysplasia and adenocarcinoma in Barrett's esophagus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* Apr 2014;26(4):369-377. PMID 24535597
14. Canto MI, Anandasabapathy S, Brugge W, et al. In vivo endomicroscopy improves detection of Barrett's esophagus-related neoplasia: a multicenter international randomized controlled trial (with video). *Gastrointest Endosc.* Feb 2014;79(2):211-221. PMID 24219822
15. Sharma P, Meining AR, Coron E, et al. Real-time increased detection of neoplastic tissue in Barrett's esophagus with probe-based confocal laser endomicroscopy: final results of an international multicenter, prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Sep 2011;74(3):465-472. PMID 21741642
16. Dunbar KB, Okolo P, 3rd, Montgomery E, et al. Confocal laser endomicroscopy in Barrett's esophagus and endoscopically inapparent Barrett's neoplasia: a prospective, randomized, double-blind, controlled, crossover trial. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Oct 2009;70(4):645-654. PMID 19559419
17. Ypsilantis E, Pissas D, Papagrigoriadis S, et al. Use of confocal laser endomicroscopy to assess the adequacy of endoscopic treatment of gastrointestinal neoplasia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech.* Feb 2015;25(1):1-5. PMID 24910941
18. Wallace MB, Crook JE, Saunders M, et al. Multicenter, randomized, controlled trial of confocal laser endomicroscopy assessment of residual metaplasia after mucosal ablation or resection of GI neoplasia in Barrett's esophagus. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Sep 2012;76(3):539-547 e531. PMID 22749368
19. Sorokina A, Danilevskaya O, Averyanov A, et al. Comparative study of ex vivo probe-based confocal laser endomicroscopy and light microscopy in lung cancer diagnostics. *Respirology.* Aug 2014;19(6):907-913. PMID 24909555
20. Wellikoff AS, Holladay RC, Downie GH, et al. Comparison of in vivo probe-based confocal laser endomicroscopy with histopathology in lung cancer: A move toward optical biopsy. *Respirology.* Aug 2015;20(6):967-974. PMID 26094505
21. Fuchs FS, Zirlik S, Hildner K, et al. Confocal laser endomicroscopy for diagnosing lung cancer in vivo. *Eur Respir J.* Jun 2013;41(6):1401-1408. PMID 22997220
22. Sonn GA, Jones SN, Tarin TV, et al. Optical biopsy of human bladder neoplasia with in vivo confocal laser endomicroscopy. *J Urol.* Oct 2009;182(4):1299-1305. PMID 19683270
23. Liu JJ, Droller MJ, Liao JC. New optical imaging technologies for bladder cancer: considerations and perspectives. *J Urol.* Aug 2012;188(2):361-368. PMID 22698620
24. Nathan CA, Kaskas NM, Ma X, et al. Confocal laser endomicroscopy in the detection of head and neck precancerous lesions. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Apr 3 2014;151(1):73-80. PMID 24699456
25. Moore C, Mehta V, Ma X, et al. Interobserver agreement of confocal laser endomicroscopy for detection of head and neck neoplasia. *Laryngoscope.* Mar 2016;126(3):632-637. PMID 26372409
26. Liu J, Li M, Li Z, et al. Learning curve and interobserver agreement of confocal laser endomicroscopy for detecting precancerous or early-stage esophageal squamous cancer. *PLoS One.* Jun 2014;9(6):e99089. PMID 24897112
27. Guo J, Li CQ, Li M, et al. Diagnostic value of probe-based confocal laser endomicroscopy and high-definition virtual chromoendoscopy in early esophageal squamous neoplasia. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Jun 2015;81(6):1346-1354. PMID 25680899
28. Liu T, Zheng H, Gong W, et al. The accuracy of confocal laser endomicroscopy, narrow band imaging, and chromoendoscopy for the detection of atrophic gastritis. *J Clin Gastroenterol.* May-Jun 2015;49(5):379-386. PMID 25485568
29. He XK, Liu D, Sun LM. Diagnostic performance of confocal laser endomicroscopy for optical diagnosis of gastric intestinal metaplasia: a meta-analysis. *BMC Gastroenterol.* Sep 05 2016;16:109. PMID 27596838
30. Qian W, Bai T, Wang H, et al. Meta-analysis of confocal laser endomicroscopy for the diagnosis of gastric neoplasia and adenocarcinoma. *J Dig Dis.* Jun 2016;17(6):366-376. PMID 27129127
31. Karia K, Waxman I, Konda VJ, et al. Needle-based confocal endomicroscopy for pancreatic cysts: the current agreement in interpretation. *Gastrointest Endosc.* May 2016;83(5):924-927. PMID 26382051
32. Napoleon B, Lemaistre AI, Pujol B, et al. In vivo characterization of pancreatic cystic lesions by needle-based confocal laser endomicroscopy (nCLE): proposition of a comprehensive nCLE classification confirmed by an external retrospective evaluation. *Surg Endosc.* Jun 2016;30(6):2603-2612. PMID 26428198

33. De Palma GD, Esposito D, Luglio G, et al. Confocal laser endomicroscopy in breast surgery: a pilot study. *BMC Cancer.* Apr 10 2015;15:252. PMID 25885686
34. Slivka A, Gan I, Jamidar P, et al. Validation of the diagnostic accuracy of probe-based confocal laser endomicroscopy for the characterization of indeterminate biliary strictures: results of a prospective multicenter international study. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Feb 2015;81(2):282-290. PMID 25616752
35. ASGE Technology Committee. Confocal laser endomicroscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Dec 2014;80(6):928-938. PMID 25442092
36. Hirota WK, Zuckerman MJ, Adler DG, et al. ASGE guideline: the role of endoscopy in the surveillance of premalignant conditions of the upper GI tract. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Apr 2006;63(4):570-580. PMID 16564854
37. Lin JS, Piper MA, Perdue LA, et al. Screening for colorectal cancer: updated evidence report and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA.* Jun 21 2016;315(23):2576-2594. PMID 27305422