

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.



Intraoperative Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) (for Louisiana Only)

Policy Number: CS141LA.#I
Effective Date: ~~February 1, 2023~~ TBD

[Instructions for Use](#)

Table of Contents	Page
Application	1
Coverage Rationale	1
Definitions	2
Applicable Codes	2
Description of Services	3
Benefit Considerations	3
Clinical Evidence	3
U.S. Food and Drug Administration	24
References	25
Policy History/Revision Information	32
Instructions for Use	32

Application

This Medical Policy only applies to the state of Louisiana.

Coverage Rationale

~~See Benefit Considerations~~

Note: This Medical Policy does not apply to normothermic (no hyperthermia is used) postoperative Intraperitoneal chemotherapy, delivered via an indwelling port or catheter, used to treat ovarian cancer.

When performed in conjunction with Cytoreductive Surgery (CRS), intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) is proven and medically necessary for treating the following conditions:

- Ovarian cancer following neoadjuvant chemotherapy
- Peritoneal mesothelioma
- Pseudomyxoma Peritonei (PMP) resulting from a mucus-producing tumor
- Peritoneal Carcinomatosis resulting from the following cancers, provided there are no extra-abdominal metastases:
 - Adenocarcinoma of the appendix or goblet cell carcinoma
 - Colon
 - Rectum

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

Due to insufficient evidence of efficacy, intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy HIPEC is unproven and not medically necessary for all other indications including, but not limited to, peritoneal Carcinomatosis resulting from the following cancers:

- Gastric
- Ovarian, except as noted above

Definitions

Carcinomatosis: A condition in which multiple tumors develop simultaneously, usually after dissemination from a primary source (Merriam-Webster). Peritoneal Carcinomatosis occurs on the surface of the Peritoneum.

Cytoreductive Surgery (CRS): Cytoreductive Surgery is surgery with the goal of removal of all tumors greater than 1 cm for ovarian cancer (Whitney and Spirtos, 2009) and greater than 2.5 mm for other forms of malignancy (Jacquet and Sugarbaker, 1996). Optimal cytoreductive surgery is done with a curative intent to leave no macroscopic disease (Tangiitgamol, et al 2014).

HIPEC: Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy.

Intraperitoneal: Within the Peritoneum.

Peritoneum: Tissue that lines the abdomen and organs in the abdomen.

Pseudomyxoma Peritonei (PMP): A rare disease characterized by slowly progressive tumors that spread throughout the peritoneal cavity producing large amounts of mucus (mucinous ascites). The tumors result from the rupture of a mucus-producing neoplasm (adenoma or adenocarcinoma) that typically arises from the appendix or bowel.

Applicable Codes

The following list(s) of procedure and/or diagnosis codes is provided for reference purposes only and may not be all inclusive. Listing of a code in this policy does not imply that the service described by the code is a covered or non-covered health service. Benefit coverage for health services is determined by federal, state or contractual requirements and applicable laws that may require coverage for a specific service. The inclusion of a code does not imply any right to reimbursement or guarantee claim payment. Other Policies and Guidelines may apply.

Coding Clarification: CPT codes 49418 and 96446 do not apply to intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. These codes represent procedures typically done postoperatively via an indwelling port or catheter.

CPT Code	Description
*96549	Unlisted chemotherapy procedure

CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association

Codes labeled with an asterisk (*) are not on the state of Louisiana Fee Schedule and therefore may not be covered by the State of Louisiana Medicaid Program.

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

Description of Services

Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) is a treatment used immediately following CRS for treating some cancers that have spread into the peritoneal cavity. Following surgery to remove as much of the tumor as possible, a solution of heated chemotherapy drugs is pumped into the abdomen to target any cancer cells that remain. Because the drugs are confined to the peritoneal cavity, a much higher concentration of chemotherapy can be used, minimizing adverse effects. Heating the drugs prior to administration is thought to enhance the therapeutic effect of the drugs. This method is often referred to as the Sugarbaker technique, named after the developer and advocate of this procedure.

Benefit Considerations

~~Some benefit documents allow coverage of experimental/investigational/unproven treatments for life-threatening illnesses when certain conditions are met. Benefit coverage for an otherwise unproven service for the treatment of serious rare diseases may occur when certain conditions are met. The benefit document must be consulted to make coverage decisions for these services.~~

~~Depending on the benefit document, coverage for some procedures may be available through participation in an eligible clinical trial.~~

Clinical Evidence

A systematic review by Auer et al. (2020) evaluated two RCTs with 184 and 245 patients with newly diagnosed, primary stage III epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube or primary peritoneal carcinoma. The authors concluded that HIPEC should be considered for those with partial or complete response following neoadjuvant chemotherapy and complete or optimal interval CRS; however, there is insufficient evidence to recommend the addition of HIPEC with primary CRS when performed outside of a clinical trial. For patients with recurrent ovarian cancer, colorectal or gastric peritoneal carcinomatosis, mesothelioma or disseminated mucinous neoplasms, there is insufficient evidence to recommend CRS with HIPEC outside of a clinical trial or research protocol. There are currently many ongoing RCTs evaluating the role of HIPEC with CRS in ovarian, colorectal, and gastric cancers with peritoneal dissemination; centers involved in treating patients with PM and disseminated mucinous neoplasms are encouraged to publish treatment data.

Glehen et al. (2010a) conducted a retrospective, multicenter ~~cohort~~ single-arm study to evaluate toxicity and prognostic factors after CRS and HIPEC and/or early postoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy (EPIC) for peritoneal carcinomatosis from non-gynecologic malignancies. The study included 1,290 patients from 25 institutions who underwent 1,344 procedures. HIPEC was performed in 1,154 procedures. The principal origins of peritoneal carcinomatosis were colorectal adenocarcinoma (n = 523), PMP (n = 301), gastric adenocarcinoma (n = 159), peritoneal mesothelioma (n = 88) and appendiceal adenocarcinoma (n = 50). The overall morbidity and mortality rates were 33.6% and 4.1%, respectively. The overall median survival was 34 months. The median survival was 30 months for patients with colorectal cancer, not reached for patients with PMP, 9 months for patients with gastric cancer, 41 months for patients with peritoneal mesothelioma and 77 months for patients with appendiceal adenocarcinoma. Patient age, extent of disease and institutional experience had a significant influence on toxicity. Prognostic indicators were institutional experience, origin of peritoneal carcinomatosis, completeness of CRS,

extent of disease and lymph node involvement. The findings are limited by lack of a contemporary comparison group undergoing a different treatment.

Peritoneal Mesothelioma (PM)

Due to the rare nature of peritoneal mesothelioma (PM), no randomized controlled trials comparing HIPEC to standard treatment protocols were identified in the clinical literature. However, results from observational studies suggest that HIPEC, in combination with CRS, improves survival when compared to standard treatment options. ~~NCCN clinical practice guidelines for malignant pleural mesothelioma have limited information on PM. However, the guidelines do state that although intraoperative adjuvant therapy, such as heated chemotherapy, is still under investigation, it may be considered as part of a reasonable multidisciplinary approach to locally aggressive disease (NCCN, 2021; updated 2022).~~

Hayes reviewed six retrospective cohort studies and eight retrospective uncontrolled studies examining the efficacy and safety of CRS plus HIPEC in patients with PM. Although the quality of evidence was low, it did suggest that HIPEC in addition to CRS may confer some benefits with respect to overall survival (OS) in select patients. While current evidence suggests that the rate of major complications is high (up to 39%), the most common major complications attributable to HIPEC were reported in $\leq 20\%$ of patients. Given the high likelihood of disease-related mortality in this patient population, the potential benefit of this treatment should be considered relative to the risk of harm. A lack of comparative studies and substantial variation across patient populations and treatment protocols underscore the need for additional studies to fill persisting evidence gaps and establish definitive patient selection criteria (Hayes, 2019a; updated ~~2021~~ **2023**).

Verma et al. (2018) performed a cohort study of 1,514 patients to evaluate management patterns, outcomes, and prognostic factors of malignant PM in the USA. 379 (25%) underwent observation, 370 (24%) received chemotherapy only, 197 (13%) CRS alone, 352 (23%) CRS/chemo, and 216 (14%) CRS/HIPEC. No major temporal trends in management were noted. Factors predictive of CRS administration included younger age, female gender, insurance status, residence in educated areas, living farther from treating institutions, and treatment at academic centers ($p < 0.05$ for all). Compared with epithelioid histology, those with sarcomatoid and biphasic histology were less and more likely to undergo CRS, respectively ($p < 0.05$ for both). In all CRS patients, 30- and 90-day mortality rates were 0.8 and 1.2%, respectively. At median follow-up of 50 months, median OS in the respective groups was 6, 17, 21, 52, and 61 months ($p < 0.001$). Poor prognostic factors included advanced age, male gender, uninsured/Medicaid insurance, and sarcomatoid/biphasic histology ($p < 0.05$ for all). While this study demonstrated significant differences in survival between those receiving CRS plus HIPEC and CRS alone, chemotherapy alone and observation, no significant differences were found when compared with those who received CRS with chemotherapy. There are no randomized trials currently ongoing in this patient population for the use of HIPEC. The authors acknowledged the challenges that exist in trying to obtain level 1 evidence for the use of HIPEC for this indication; however, standardized treatment approaches at high-volume centers engaged in multi-institutional collaborations will provide survival benchmarks and feasibility data for future comparative studies.

Helm et al. (2015) performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature evaluating CRS and HIPEC for treating malignant PM. Twenty studies reporting on 1,047 patients were included in the analysis. Complete cytoreduction was performed in 67% of patients. Pooled estimates of survival yielded a 1-, 3-, and 5-year survival of 84, 59,

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

and 42%, respectively. Patients receiving EPIC and those receiving cisplatin intraperitoneal chemotherapy alone or in combination had an improved 5-year survival. The authors concluded that HIPEC is a viable additional treatment option for patients with invasive epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC) and may extend life in selected groups; it warrants further study in randomized controlled trials (RCTs). (Publications by Yan 2009, Blackham 2010, and Chua 2011, which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this systematic review).

From a prospective database, Baratti et al. (2013) selected 108 patients with diffuse malignant PM undergoing complete cytoreduction and closed-abdomen HIPEC. Operative mortality was 1.9% and major morbidity 38.9%. Median follow-up was 48.8 months. Median overall (OS) and progression-free (PFS) survival were 63.2 months and 25.1 months, respectively. The survival curve reached a plateau after 7 years, representing 19 survivors of 39 patients (43.6%) with potential follow-up ≥ 7 years. Prognostic markers were mostly positive. Epithelial histological subtype, negative lymph-nodes and low Ki-67 markers correlated with both increased OS and PFS. The authors concluded that after complete cytoreduction and HIPEC, prognosis of diffuse malignant PM is primarily dependent on pathologic and biologic features. Patients with diffuse malignant PM surviving ≥ 7 years appeared to be cured. Cure rate was 43.6%.

~~Using a multicenter data registry, Chua et al. (2011b) identified 26 patients with multicystic PM treated by CRS and HIPEC. The primary endpoint was OS. A secondary endpoint was the incidence of treatment-related complications. There was no perioperative mortality. Six patients developed grade III or IV complications. After a median follow-up of 54 (range 5-129) months, all 26 patients were still alive.~~

~~Blackham et al. (2010) compared outcomes of HIPEC using mitomycin (n = 19) versus cisplatin (n = 15) following CRS in 34 patients with malignant PM. OS was 56% and 17% at 3 and 5 years, respectively. Patients receiving cisplatin were more likely to be alive at 1, 2, and 3 years. Median survival for mitomycin and cisplatin was 10.8 and 40.8 months, respectively. Median disease-free survival and progression-free survival were 10.3 and 9.1 months, respectively.~~

~~A multicenter registry evaluated CRS combined with HIPEC for diffuse, malignant, PM. Among 401 patients, 187 (46%) had complete or near-complete cytoreduction, and 372 (92%) received HIPEC. The median follow-up period was 33 months. One hundred twenty-seven patients (31%) had grades 3 to 4 complications. Nine patients (2%) died perioperatively. The mean length of hospital stay was 22 days. The overall median survival was 53 months, and 3- and 5-year survival rates were 60% and 47%, respectively. Four prognostic factors were independently associated with improved survival in the multivariate analysis: epithelial subtype, absence of lymph node metastasis, completeness of cytoreduction scores of CC-0 or CC-1 and receipt of HIPEC. The authors reported that these results suggest that CRS combined with HIPEC achieved prolonged survival in selected patients with diffuse malignant PM (Yan et al., 2009).~~

~~Yan et al. (2007a) conducted a systematic review to assess the efficacy of CRS combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for diffuse malignant PM. Seven prospective observational studies, involving 240 patients, were included. The median survival ranged from 34-92 months. The 1-, 3- and 5-year survival varied from 60% to 88%, 43% to 65%, and 29% to 59%, respectively. The perioperative morbidity varied from 25% to 40% and mortality ranged from 0% to 8%. The authors reported improved OS when compared to historical controls.~~

Clinical Practice Guidelines

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN)

NCCN clinical practice guidelines for malignant pleural mesothelioma have limited information on PM. However, the guidelines do state that although intraoperative adjuvant therapy, such as heated chemotherapy, is still under investigation, it may be considered as part of a reasonable multidisciplinary approach to locally aggressive disease (NCCN, 2023).

Peritoneal Surface Oncology Group International (PSOGI)

~~Peritoneal Surface Oncology Group International (PSOGI)~~/EURACAN clinical practice guidelines on peritoneal mesothelioma state that CRS plus HIPEC is recommended in patients with diffuse malignant PM ~~patients~~ rather than palliative systemic chemotherapy, provided that the patient has a sufficient clinical condition for a major operation, has resectable disease, and that the treatment is done in a specialized center. Level of evidence: B (moderate). Strength of recommendation: I (strong positive) (Kusamura et al. 2021a).

Pseudomyxoma Peritonei (PMP)

Due to the rare nature of PMP, no randomized controlled trials comparing HIPEC to standard treatment protocols were identified in the clinical literature. Although the evidence is limited in quality, results from retrospective ~~case-series~~ observational studies suggest that HIPEC, in combination with CRS, is safe and effective for PMP when compared to standard treatment options.

Kusamura et al. (2021b) analyzed data from the PSOGI registry to evaluate outcomes after CRS and HIPEC (n = 1,548) compared with CRS alone (n = 376) in patients with PMP. The data included 1,924 patients with histologically confirmed PMP due to an appendiceal mucinous neoplasm. Subset analyses included optimal cytoreduction, suboptimal cytoreduction, high- and low-grade histologic findings and different HIPEC drug regimens. HIPEC including oxaliplatin plus combined fluorouracil-leucovorin, cisplatin plus mitomycin, mitomycin, and other oxaliplatin-based regimens were used. Primary outcomes were OS, severe morbidity, return to operating room, and 30- and 90-day mortality. Patients with CRS alone were older, had less lymph node involvement, received more preoperative systemic chemotherapy and had higher proportions of high-grade disease and incomplete cytoreductions. HIPEC was not associated with a higher risk of worse surgical outcomes except with mitomycin, with higher odds of morbidity. HIPEC was associated with a significantly better OS in all subsets. The weighted 5-year OS was 57.8% versus 46.2% for CRS-HIPEC and CRS alone, respectively. Compared with the CRS alone group, the CRS-HIPEC group also had better 5-year OS in all subsets. Treatment with CRS-HIPEC was superior to CRS alone when the drug schedules were oxaliplatin plus fluorouracil-leucovorin or cisplatin plus mitomycin. No prognostic advantage was observed in subgroups receiving mitomycin and other oxaliplatin-based HIPEC. Within the entire series, incidence of 90-day mortality was 4.2%; 30-day mortality, 2.1%; return to the operating room, 9.3%; and severe morbidity, 32.0%.

Di Leo et al. (2020) conducted a single-~~institute outcomes~~ institution single-arm study following CRS and HIPEC in patients with PMP. This review prospectively collected data from 32 patients (11 men and 21 women) affected by PMP of appendiceal origin who underwent CRS and HIPEC from 2008 to 2016 in one institution. The median age of the patients was 53 years (range 25-77 years). After CRS, all patients underwent HIPEC (mitomycin C 3.3 mg/m²/L and cisplatin 25 mg/m²/L at 41° C for 60 min) with a closed

abdomen technique. The median follow-up time for surviving patients was 43 (18-119) months. The median peritoneal cancer index (PCI) was 17. Complete CRS (CC0) was achieved in 22 patients (69%). The majority of patients (88%) had grade I-II complications, three (9%) had grade III complications, and one (3%) patient had a grade IV complication. There were no perioperative mortalities. One year and 5-year OS were 90% and 58%, respectively. Regardless of histotype, disease-free survival was 95% at 1 year and 46% at 5 years. The authors concluded that CRS in combination with HIPEC is a feasible treatment strategy and can achieve a satisfactory outcome in patients with PMP of appendiceal origin. The findings are limited by lack of contemporary comparison group.

Shaib et al. (2015) evaluated the impact of HIPEC after CRS on survival in patients with appendiceal mucinous neoplasms (AMN). Patient data were collected from three tertiary care centers: Emory University, Ohio State University and Wayne State University. One of the three centers did not use HIPEC. Between 1990 and 2010, 163 AMN patients were identified. Histology showed 60 patients had diffuse peritoneal adenomucinosis, 88 had peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis (PMCA) and 15 had PMCA with indeterminate or discordant features. Complete surgical resection was achieved in 76 patients. HIPEC was used in 79 patients. The median OS was 77 months for patients who received HIPEC compared with 25 months for patients who did not. Histopathologic subtype, complete surgical resection and HIPEC were independent predictors for improved OS.

A systematic review and meta-analysis by McBride et al. (2013) reported ~~improved~~ survival in patients with PMP of appendiceal origin receiving intraperitoneal chemotherapy with CRS. Twenty-nine studies were identified, with 15 studies from different treatment centers that were specifically analyzed for differences in 5-year mortality and morbidity. Observed to expected (OE) ratios were calculated for both mortality and morbidity. Mean and median 3-year, 5-year, and 10-year survival rates were 77.18%/77.85%, 76.63%/79.5% and 57.3%/55.9%, respectively. Data analyses indicated that, despite differences in treatment regimens (use of HIPEC, duration of therapy, type of chemotherapy agent, size of the studies and experience of the centers, etc.), there was ~~not much of a~~ little difference in mortality and morbidity between the different centers. ~~Survival was improved regardless of treatment modality.~~ Although this treatment strategy is associated with an increased risk of morbidity, the increase in survival may be acceptable in proposing an alternative to debulking procedures alone. Additional research into chemotherapy regimens and patient selection could help demonstrate further ways to improve survival and reduce morbidity for this disease.

Chua et al. (2012) evaluated outcome and long-term survival after CRS and HIPEC in patients with PMP of appendiceal origin. The international, multicenter registry study included 2,298 patients from 16 specialized units. Treatment-related mortality was 2% and major operative complications occurred in 24% of patients. The median survival rate was 196 months (16.3 years), and the median ~~progression-free survival~~ PFS rate was 98 months (8.2 years), with 10 and 15-year survival rates of 63% and 59%, respectively. Multivariate analysis identified prior chemotherapy treatment, pathological subtype peritoneal mucinous carcinomatosis (PMCA), major postoperative complications, high peritoneal cancer index, debulking surgery (completeness of cytoreduction, 2 or 3) and not using HIPEC as independent predictors for a poorer ~~progression-free survival~~ PFS. Older age, major postoperative complications, debulking surgery (CCR 2 or 3), prior chemotherapy treatment and pathological subtype PMCA were independent predictors of a poorer OS. The authors noted that minimizing nondefinitive operative and systemic chemotherapy treatments before cytoreduction may improve outcomes. Optimal cytoreduction achieves the best outcomes.

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

~~A systematic review by Yan et al. (2007b) assessed the efficacy of CRS combined with HIPEC for patients with PMP. Ten studies showed 5-year survival ranging from 52-96%. The overall morbidity rate varied from 33 to 56%. The overall mortality rates ranged from 0 to 18%. Five studies were relatively large series (n ≥ 100). Two studies had relatively long-term follow-up (48 and 52 months). The median follow-up in the remaining studies was shorter than 3 years. The authors concluded that the observational studies available for evaluation demonstrated promising long-term results. Due to the rarity of the disease, further well-designed prospective multicenter studies would be beneficial.~~

~~In a 10-year prospective single center study, Murphy et al. (2007) evaluated 123 consecutive patients who underwent CRS for PMP. Complete cytoreduction was achieved in 67% of patients who went on to receive HIPEC. Of the patients who had complete tumor removal, the 5-year disease free survival was 75%. Postoperative mortality was 5%.~~

~~Several retrospective studies reported improved survival and noted surgeon experience, extent of disease and complete cytoreduction as significant prognostic factors (Elias et al., 2010b; Baratti et al., 2008; Smeenk et al., 2007).~~

Peritoneal Carcinomatosis Resulting from Colorectal Cancer, Small Bowel, and Adenocarcinoma of the Appendix

Accumulating data from several observational ~~case series and retrospective~~ studies has ~~demonstrated~~ shown that intraoperative HIPEC can be of benefit to patients with isolated peritoneal carcinomatosis (no extra-abdominal metastases) from colorectal cancer. Several prospective, randomized trials are ongoing.

Based on a clinical evidence assessment by ECRI (2022), the evidence for HIPEC and CRS for colorectal peritoneal metastases is inconclusive. Assessment of the evidence includes 12 systematic reviews which contain a large body of evidence that show that CRS with HIPEC works better than chemotherapy or CRS but carries a substantial risk of patient injury. There is a 3-year survival rate of 50% and a 5-year survival rate of 30% with serious complications reported in 30% of patients. There is also great variability in HIPEC protocols so outcomes may differ. Large RCTs are needed to compare and validate HIPEC treatments in specific patient groups as well as determine adjuvant chemotherapy's utility in CRS with HIPEC.

Chen et al. (2022) conducted a systematic review to assess the effectiveness of CRS with HIPEC for small bowel adenocarcinoma (SBA) with peritoneal metastasis (PM). Twelve studies that included 164 cases (accounting for the overlapping patients between single center and multicenter studies) were included. The majority of the patients had complete cytoreduction prior to HIPEC, and most used an open technique using mitomycin C or oxaliplatin. HIPEC duration ranged from 30-120 minutes, with the median being 60 minutes. Temperatures ranged between 40°-43°C (104°-109° F). Early postoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy (EPIC) was added as a supplement to microscopic tumor treatment in 12 patients in the included studies. The primary outcomes were PFS and OS. Secondary outcomes included overall and type of morbidity, treatment related deaths, mean length of stay and quality of life (QOL). The results showed, of the 164 patients, OS was 9-32 months with a 5-year OS rate between 25%-38%. Three treatment related deaths were reported. Between 20% and 50% of patients experienced a Clavien-Dindo grade III/IV complication. These included intraperitoneal abscess, septicemia, and intestinal fistula. None of the studies included QOL outcomes. Better outcomes were seen in well differentiated tumors, no lymph node involvement, lower PCI scores, complete cytoreduction, under the age of 70 and undergoing treatment within 6 months of diagnosis.

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

The authors concluded that CRS-HIPEC may result in increased survival for select patients. Furthermore, while CRS-HIPEC has the potential to improve survival, treatment failure is common and may not be better than chemotherapy alone, and the risks need to be evaluated with the potential OS. This study is limited by a small number of participants and heterogeneity of the included studies and retrospective data analysis; however, these limitations are due to the rare nature of this condition. (Publications by Liu 2016 and van Oudheusden 2015a, which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this systematic review).

Li et al. (2022, included in the ERCI report above) evaluated the impact of CRS with HIPEC on OS and provided reference for the treatment of patients with colorectal cancer and peritoneal metastasis. There were 10 studies included in the review with a total of 3200 patients. There were 788 patients in the CRS and HIPEC groups and 2412 patients in the control groups. Three of the studies were RCTs and 7 were cohort studies which were considered high quality by the authors. The OS of patients in the CRS with HIPEC group was higher than that of the control group noting large heterogeneity of the studies. Additionally, the authors noted a higher OS in patients who had OPEN HIPEC as compared to control group as well as patients who received HIPEC in the 60-100-minute timeframe when compared to control group. Limitations of the review include a higher number of cohort studies (7) as opposed to RCTs (3), subgroup analysis was limited to 3 studies comparing CRS which limits the evidence and conclusions drawn, and the hazard rate (HR) values of two of the RCTs included were 0.98 and 0.99 which did not show satisfactory for HR values. The authors noted that while the quality of evidence was high, further studies are needed to verify findings. (Publications by Quenet 2021, Franco 2010, Elias 2009, and Verwaal 2008, which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this systematic review).

~~In the multicenter PRODICE 7 study, Quenet et al. (2021) randomized 265 patients with colorectal peritoneal metastases to CRS plus oxaliplatin-based HIPEC (n = 133) or CRS alone (n = 132). Patients had undergone complete macroscopic resection or surgical resection with less than 1 mm residual tumor tissue. The primary endpoint was OS. After median follow-up of 63.8 months, median OS was 41.7 months in the CRS plus HIPEC group and 41.2 months in the CRS alone group. At 30 days, grade 3 or worse adverse events were similar in frequency between groups; however, at 60 days, grade 3 or worse adverse events were more common in the CRS plus HIPEC group.~~

~~A National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guideline states that evidence on the safety of CRS with HIPEC for peritoneal carcinomatosis shows frequent and serious but well-recognized complications. Evidence on its efficacy is limited in quality. Patient selection should be done by an experienced multidisciplinary team, and the procedure should only be done in highly specialized centers by clinicians with specialist expertise and specific training in these procedures (NICE, 2021).~~

~~NCCN clinical practice guidelines for colon cancer state that complete CRS and/or intraperitoneal chemotherapy can be considered in experienced centers for select patients with limited peritoneal metastases for whom complete removal of all known tumor can be achieved (R0). The guidelines also note that the significant morbidity and mortality associated with HIPEC, as well as the conflicting data on clinical efficacy, make this approach controversial (NCCN, 2021; updated 2022).~~

~~NCCN clinical practice guidelines for small bowel adenocarcinoma state that HIPEC cannot be recommended as a treatment option until more robust data becomes available. Data supporting the use of HIPEC in small bowel adenocarcinoma patients with peritoneal~~

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

~~carcinomatosis is extremely limited, consisting entirely of small, retrospective studies. In addition, the recent phase III PRODIGE 7 study showed no benefit of oxaliplatin-based HIPEC in colorectal cancer patients compared to cytoreduction alone. Significant morbidity and mortality are associated with the procedure and recurrences are common (NCCN, 2021; updated 2022).~~

~~A systematic review of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) was performed by Dominic et al. (2021) to determine the prophylactic role of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in preventing and controlling peritoneal metastasis in patients with gastrointestinal malignancies. RCTs published between January 2019 to June 2021 were included. A total of five trials met the inclusion criteria. Two studies were on patients with gastric cancer, and the other three studies were on patients with colorectal cancer. HIPEC was given to a total of 116 gastric cancer patients and 308 colorectal cancer patients. In all the included studies on patients with gastric cancer, the peritoneal recurrence-free survival was higher in the group that received HIPEC. There was no improvement in peritoneal free survival in patients with colorectal cancer who received HIPEC. The authors concluded that HIPEC appears to be effective in preventing peritoneal metastasis in patients with locally advanced gastric cancer without minimal postoperative complications. However, in patients with advanced colorectal malignancy, HIPEC does not seem to play a crucial role in preventing and controlling peritoneal metastasis. The authors noted that HIPEC therapy is not available worldwide, and in the available places, only a few trained experts are available to do the procedure. Additional limitations include the type and number of studies chosen. The small sample size makes it difficult to decide whether these conclusions can be generalized to a larger population. There are currently many ongoing clinical trials evaluating the role of HIPEC colorectal and gastric cancers.~~

~~NICE guidelines on colorectal cancer recommends that people with metastatic colorectal cancer in the peritoneum be offered systemic anti-cancer therapy and after discussion with a multidisciplinary team, be referred to a surgery center specializing in CRS. Although the evidence on the effectiveness of CRS and HIPEC was mixed, the guidelines state these procedures should be considered (NICE, 2020).~~

The value of cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (CRS-HIPEC) for patients with peritoneally metastasized goblet cell carcinoids (GCCs) and mixed adeno-neuroendocrine carcinomas (MANECs) is currently unclear. Sluiter et al., (2020) compared outcomes of CRS-HIPEC to surgery alone for peritoneally metastasized GCCs and MANECs by evaluating two cohort studies for patients with peritoneally metastasized GCCs and MANECs treated with (1) CRS-HIPEC in Dutch and Belgian centers (n = 45) and (2) surgery alone, from the Netherlands Cancer Registry (n = 569). Primary outcome was OS and secondary outcomes were morbidity and hospital mortality. Following propensity score matching, OS was compared in univariate and multivariate analysis. The authors concluded that treatment with CRS-HIPEC for patients with PM of GCCs and MANECs in specialized HIPEC centers seems associated with substantially better outcome/survival rates compared to surgery without HIPEC at the expense of acceptable morbidity and mortality. These data support that care of patients with PM of GCCs and MANECs should be offered in expert centers that have the option for CRS-HIPEC.

~~Hall et al. (2017) noted that although historically, patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis secondary to colorectal cancer have a poor overall prognosis, recent data supports the use of CRS and heated intraperitoneal chemotherapy (CRS + HIPEC) to specifically address the peritoneal disease. Retrospective studies on CRS + HIPEC have been promising, showing significant improvements in OS compared with systemic chemotherapy alone. However, CRS + HIPEC carries morbidity similar to other advanced oncology procedures such as liver resection and pancreateoduodenectomy. It is hoped that~~

~~ongoing clinical trials will clarify its role in the treatment of patients with peritoneal metastatic colorectal cancer.~~

~~Two small studies evaluated CRS and HIPEC for treating peritoneal metastases from small bowel cancer. In 31 patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis, the median survival after CRS and HIPEC was 36 months, and the median survival after diagnosis was 50 months (Liu et al., 2016). van Oudheusden et al. (2015a) reported a median survival of 31 months in sixteen patients following CRS and HIPEC.~~

~~A consensus document from PSOGI makes the following recommendations (O'Dwyer et al., 2015):~~

- ~~• CRS, defined as removal of macroscopic peritoneal disease, combined with HIPEC, is the treatment that is indicated for selected patients with moderate to small volume peritoneal metastases secondary to colorectal cancer~~
 - ~~• CRS and HIPEC should be avoided in patients who are unlikely to undergo a complete or near complete resection, or who are unlikely to achieve a full recovery because of comorbidities~~
 - ~~• CRS and HIPEC should not be offered at institutions where there is insufficient knowledge or insufficient skill to achieve a complete cytoreduction and to manage the safe administration of perioperative chemotherapy so that morbidity and mortality are acceptable~~
 - ~~• Developing centers should seek support from established teams to assist in their development while gaining experience in these techniques~~
- ~~Integration of this treatment strategy into the total care of the patient with colorectal cancer has become a necessary matter of discussion for multidisciplinary teams.~~

~~Mirnezami et al. (2014a) conducted a meta-analysis comparing outcomes following CRS and HIPEC to systemic chemotherapy alone in patients with colorectal peritoneal metastases. Four studies provided comparative survival data for patients undergoing CRS and HIPEC (n = 187) versus systemic chemotherapy (n = 155). Pooled analysis demonstrated superior 2-year and 5-year survival with CRS and HIPEC compared with systemic chemotherapy.~~

~~In a systematic review, Chua et al. (2013) investigated the efficacy of systemic chemotherapy and radical surgical treatments in patients with peritoneal metastases from colorectal cancer. A total of 2,492 patients from 19 studies were reviewed. Patients were treated with complete CRS and HIPEC (n = 1,084) or palliative surgery and/or systemic chemotherapy (n = 1,408). Patients with residual tumors > 2.5 mm after CRS were classified as having an incomplete cytoreduction. For CRS and HIPEC, the OS ranged between 20 and 63 (median 33) months, and 5-year survival ranged between 17% and 51% (median 40%). For palliative surgery and/or systemic chemotherapy, the OS ranged between 5 and 24 (median 12.5) months, and 5-year survival ranged between 13% and 22% (median 13%). Several case-control studies have shown improved survival following CRS and HIPEC for treating peritoneal carcinomatosis resulting from colorectal cancer. Chua et al. (2011a) concluded that modern systemic therapies were associated with improved outcomes in patients with colorectal peritoneal carcinomatosis treated systemically alone or with CRS combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy. Franko et al. (2010) reported median survival of 34.7 months in the CRS and HIPEC group (n = 67) versus 16.8 months in the control group (n = 38). Elias et al. (2009) reported 2- and 5-year OS rates of 81% and 51% for the HIPEC group (n = 48), respectively, and 65% and 13% for the standard group (n = 48), respectively. Median survival was 23.9 months in the standard group versus 62.7 months in the HIPEC group.~~

~~In 2010a, Elias et al. published a retrospective multicenter study of 523 patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin treated with CRS and perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC or EPIC). The median follow up was 45 months.~~

~~Mortality and grades 3 to 4 morbidity at 30 days were 3% and 31%, respectively. Overall median survival was 30.1 months. Five-year OS was 27%, and five-year disease-free survival was 10%. Complete CRS was performed in 84% of the patients, and median survival was 33 months. Positive independent prognostic factors were complete CRS, limited extent of disease, no lymph node involvement and the use of adjuvant chemotherapy. Neither the grade of disease nor the presence of liver metastases had a significant prognostic impact.~~

~~Two earlier meta-analyses reported improved survival in colorectal cancer patients treated with CRS combined with HIPEC (Cao et al., 2009; Shen et al., 2009).~~

~~A systematic review by Yan et al. (2006) evaluated the efficacy of CRS combined with HIPEC for patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal carcinoma. Two randomized controlled trials, one comparative study, one multicenter registry study and 10 case-series studies were evaluated. The level of evidence was low in 13 of the 14 eligible studies. The median survival varied from 13 to 29 months, and 5 year survival rates ranged from 11% to 19%. Patients who received complete cytoreduction benefited most, with median survival varying from 28 to 60 months and 5-year survival ranging from 22% to 49%. The overall morbidity rate varied from 23% to 44%, and the mortality rate ranged from 0% to 12%. The authors reported that CRS combined with HIPEC is associated with improved survival, compared with systemic chemotherapy, for peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal carcinoma.~~

~~Additional systematic reviews of the same studies have been performed (Huang et al., 2017; Waite et al., 2017; van Oudheusden et al., 2015b; Mirnezami et al., 2014b; Williams et al., 2014; de Cuba et al., 2013).~~

~~In 2004, Glehen et al. published a retrospective multicenter study of 506 patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin treated with CRS and perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC and/or EPIC). The median follow-up was 53 months. The morbidity and mortality rates were 22.9% and 4%, respectively. The overall median survival was 19.2 months. In those patients who underwent complete cytoreduction, median survival was 32.4 months compared with 8.4 months for patients in who did not have complete cytoreduction. Positive independent prognostic indicators were complete cytoreduction, treatment by a second procedure, limited extent of disease, age less than 65 years and use of adjuvant chemotherapy. Complete CRS was the most important prognostic indicator. The use of neoadjuvant chemotherapy, lymph node involvement, presence of liver metastasis and poor histologic differentiation were negative independent prognostic indicators.~~

~~Verwaal et al. (2003) performed a randomized controlled trial to confirm findings from earlier uncontrolled studies that aggressive cytoreduction in combination with HIPEC is superior to standard treatment in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal cancer origin. A total of 105 patients were randomly assigned to receive either standard therapy of systemic chemotherapy with or without palliative surgery (n = 51), or experimental therapy of aggressive cytoreduction with HIPEC and the same systemic chemotherapy regime (n = 51). After a median follow-up period of 21.6 months, the median survival was 12.6 months in the standard therapy arm and 22.3 months in the experimental therapy arm. Treatment-related morbidity was high, and the mortality in the HIPEC group was 8%, mostly related to bowel leakage. Subgroup analysis of the HIPEC group showed that both the extent of disease prior to cytoreduction and the completeness of cytoreduction were predictive of long-term survival. To improve patient selection in the future, additional exploratory analyses were performed to identify potential prognostic factors.~~

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

Presentation (primary versus recurrence), site (appendix versus colon versus rectum), number of regions involved (less than 5 regions versus greater than 5 regions) and completeness of cytoreduction were analyzed. The analysis of prognostic factors in the HIPEC arm showed that patients with cancer deposits in six or seven regions of the abdomen do poorly, both in respect to direct postoperative complications and long-term survival. Complete or nearly complete resection seems to be a prerequisite for a favorable outcome.

~~In 2008, Verwaal et al. published an 8-year follow-up to the previous study. In the standard arm, 4 patients were still alive, 2 with and 2 without disease. In the HIPEC arm, 5 patients were still alive, 2 with and 3 without disease. The median progression-free survival was 7.7 months in the control arm and 12.6 months in the HIPEC arm. The median disease specific survival was 12.6 months in the control arm and 22.2 months in the HIPEC arm. The 5-year survival was 45% for those patients in whom complete cytoreduction was achieved. The authors concluded that HIPEC does significantly add to survival in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer, with the possibility of long term survival in selected patients.~~

Clinical Practice Guidelines

American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO)

The 2022 ASCO guideline for metastatic colorectal cancer (Morris et al., 2022) states that oxaliplatin-based HIPEC is not recommended as an addition to cytoreductive surgery for treating patients with colorectal cancer (Evidence quality: Moderate; Strength of Recommendation: Strong).

American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons (ASCRS)

ASCRS practice guidelines (Vogel et al., 2017, ~~updated 2022~~) for the treatment of colon cancer state that the treatment of patients with isolated peritoneal carcinomatosis should be multidisciplinary and individualized and may include CRS with intraperitoneal chemotherapy. Grade of recommendation: 1B - strong recommendation based on moderate-quality evidence. ASCRS practice guidelines for the management of rectal cancer do not address HIPEC (You et al., 2020).

American Society of Peritoneal Surface Malignancies (ASPSM)

ASPSM consensus guidelines on standardizing the delivery of HIPEC in colorectal cancer patients support that the majority of the surgical oncologists favored the closed method of delivery with a standardized dual dose of mitomycin for a 90-minute chemoperfusion for patients undergoing CRS for peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin (Turaga et al., 2014).

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

A NICE guideline states that evidence on the safety of CRS with HIPEC for peritoneal carcinomatosis shows frequent and serious but well-recognized complications. Evidence on its efficacy is limited in quality. Patient selection should be done by an experienced multidisciplinary team, and the procedure should only be done in highly specialized centers by clinicians with specialist expertise and specific training in these procedures (NICE, 2021).

NICE guidelines on colorectal cancer recommends that people with metastatic colorectal cancer in the peritoneum be offered systemic anti-cancer therapy and after discussion with a multidisciplinary team, be referred to a surgery center specializing in CRS.

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

Although the evidence on the effectiveness of CRS and HIPEC was mixed, the guidelines state these procedures should be considered (NICE, 2020).

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN)

NCCN clinical practice guidelines for colon cancer state that complete CRS and/or intraperitoneal chemotherapy can be considered in experienced centers for select patients with limited peritoneal metastases for whom complete removal of all known tumor can be achieved (R0). The guidelines also note that the significant morbidity and mortality associated with HIPEC, as well as the conflicting data on clinical efficacy, make this approach controversial (NCCN, 2023).

NCCN clinical practice guidelines for small bowel adenocarcinoma state that HIPEC cannot be recommended as a treatment option until more robust data becomes available. Data supporting the use of HIPEC in small bowel adenocarcinoma patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis is extremely limited, consisting entirely of small, retrospective studies. In addition, the recent phase III PRODIGE 7 study showed no benefit of oxaliplatin-based HIPEC in colorectal cancer patients compared to cytoreduction alone. Significant morbidity and mortality are associated with the procedure and recurrences are common (NCCN, 2023).

Peritoneal Surface Oncology Group International (PSOGI)

A consensus document from PSOGI makes the following recommendations (O'Dwyer et al., 2015):

- CRS, defined as removal of macroscopic peritoneal disease, combined with HIPEC, is the treatment that is indicated for selected patients with moderate- to small-volume peritoneal metastases secondary to colorectal cancer
- CRS and HIPEC should be avoided in patients who are unlikely to undergo a complete or near-complete resection, or who are unlikely to achieve a full recovery because of comorbidities
- CRS and HIPEC should not be offered at institutions where there is insufficient knowledge or insufficient skill to achieve a complete cytoreduction and to manage the safe administration of perioperative chemotherapy so that morbidity and mortality are acceptable
- Developing centers should seek support from established teams to assist in their development while gaining experience in these techniques
- Integration of this treatment strategy into the total care of the patient with colorectal cancer has become a necessary matter of discussion for multidisciplinary teams.

Gastric Cancer

There is limited but conflicting ~~some~~ evidence suggesting ~~demonstrating~~ improved survival in gastric cancer patients with limited peritoneal carcinomatosis and complete cytoreduction with HIPEC. However, ~~its-the~~ role of HIPEC is still evolving and currently it cannot be recommended outside of a clinical trial protocol. ~~Many of the studies included patients who were almost exclusively of Asian descent.~~ Additional studies are needed to validate these results in Western-various populations. Further randomized clinical trials comparing CRS and HIPEC to standard treatment protocols are needed. GASTRICHIP (NCT01882933) and GASTRIPEC (NCT02158988) are two randomized, multicenter phase III studies in progress to validate results ~~in European and Caucasian patients.~~ (Accessed May 16, 2022).

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

~~NCCN clinical practice guidelines for gastric cancer state that HIPEC or laparoscopic HIPEC may be a therapeutic alternative for carefully selected stage IV patients in the setting of ongoing clinical trials and is under further clinical investigation (NCCN, 2021; updated 2022).~~

Deng et al. (2022) evaluated the short- and long-term survival of HIPEC in the patients with advanced gastric cancer (AGC). A search of RCTs was conducted using Pub Med, Cochrane Library, Embase and other databases. A total of 13 trials with 1091 patients was found; 556 patients were randomized to the HIPEC group while 535 patients were randomized to the control group. The quality assessment of the articles was based on the Cochrane bias risk standard and independently assessed by two reviewers. The main end point was OS and safety endpoints such as nausea, vomiting and intestinal leakage were evaluated as well. Upon completion of the study analysis, the authors' concluded no significant differences between the AGC group and the control group were noted in either the survival rate or safety risks. Limitations included omission of several baseline characteristics which may have led to mixed bias, RCTs did not describe blinding method used, the five-year data obtained was prior to 2001, studies were geographically limited, and heterogeneity was high. Future studies to further evaluate the efficacy of HIPEC should include large RCTs with long-term outcomes. (Publications by Yang 2011 and Rudloff 2014 which were previously cited in this policy are included in this systematic review).

In another systematic review, Martins et al. (2022) also evaluated OS comparison in GCPC patients. A literature search returned forty-three articles for eligibility, but only nine fit the criteria; five studies were included in the qualitative synthesis and four studies in the quantitative synthesis. Studies used included individuals over the age of 18 years old with GCPC which compared CRS+HIPEC to CRS alone. Generally, the results revealed the OS rate after one year to be 3.65 times higher for CRS+HIPEC than for the CRS group only (RR = 3.65, 95% CI = 1.01-13.26, p=0.050), however, severe heterogeneity was observed. After reviewing each of the studies individually, the authors found if the last study was removed from the analysis, the OS rate increased to 6.42 times higher for CRS+HIPEC than for CRS alone. At 3 years, the authors did not find anything statistically significant, but the OS rate after 5 years was three times higher for the CRS+HIPEC group than for CRS alone. Complications appeared to be similar amongst the two groups and recurrence rates appeared to be lower for the CRS + HIPEC group. The authors concluded treatment of CRS+HIPEC for patients with GCPC appears to be more beneficial than when compared to CRS alone. Limitations included lack of RCTs, small sample sizes within studies for evaluation and lack of studies. Furthermore, the wide confidence interval and heterogeneity in findings decrease the confidence in the results. Due to the lack of available studies, additional robust studies should be conducted on OS and the efficacy of HIPEC in the treatment of GCPC.

Zhang et al. (2022) assessed the effectiveness and safety of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) combined with surgery for different stages of advanced gastric cancer (AGC). A search was conducted using the Web of Science (WOS), Medline, PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) websites. Based on the inclusion criteria, the authors were able to utilize 23 of the 40 articles found; ten of which were RCTs. The RCTs were assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool and non-RCTs used the MINORs score. The studies were divided into two groups: AGC without carcinomatosis group and gastric cancer with peritoneal carcinomatosis (GCPC). The meta-analysis involved 1892 patients: 1201 patients in the AGC group and 691 patients in the GCPC. Treatment consisted of HIPEC + radical surgery, radical surgery alone, HIPEC + cytoreductive surgery, and cytoreductive surgery or systemic chemotherapy alone. In the AGC group, the RCT and non-RCT analyses were reviewed separately. The authors found in

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

the RCT studies, the HIPEC technique was favored, and the 5-year survival rate of this group was substantially higher than that of the control group. In the GCPC group, again the RCT and non-RCT analysis were reviewed separately, but the RCT analyses showed no significant difference between the two groups in the 1-, 2- and 3-year survival rate. For the AGC group, the authors found the OS rate was increased and recurrence rates were decreased. In the GCPC group, the authors found the results indicated that HIPEC with surgery is the most favorable treatment method. The authors concluded standard surgical management when combined with preventive HIPEC can prolong an individual's survival and reduce the recurrence rate. Limitations included low number of RCTs, particularly for the GCPC group and the inability to generalize the results to Western populations; future RCTs are warranted.

~~A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) was performed by Granieri et al. (2021) to assess the impact of cytoreductive surgery (CRS) plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) on survival of gastric cancer patients, with or without peritoneal metastasis (PM), and to identify variables with a prognostic impact on overall survival (OS). A systematic review of RCTs was conducted according to PRISMA guidelines. Of 50 articles assessed, 12 studies with 1,376 patients were selected for qualitative and quantitative analysis. A survival benefit for patients treated with CRS plus HIPEC at all time points was highlighted. However, difference in survival was significant at all time points for patients treated for prophylaxis of PM, but no difference was found when considering resection with a curative intent. The 1, 2, 3 and 5-year survival rates (SR) for patients undergoing CRS plus HIPEC were 86.9%, 70.5%, 63.7% and 55.7% respectively. CRS plus HIPEC for the treatment rather than prophylaxis of PM was the only predictor of a reduced 3-year SR. The authors concluded that CRS plus HIPEC may lead to improved prognosis for patients suffering from locally advanced gastric cancer in both prophylactic and curative settings. However, due to postoperative morbidity and mortality rates, a strict patient selection is crucial to achieve the best results. The presence of extraperitoneal disease strongly limits the indication of this kind of surgery. No high-risk bias was detected. Limitations include unblinding and the small number of studies included making it difficult to determine if these conclusions can be generalized to a larger population. Further investigation is needed before clinical usefulness of this procedure is proven [Authors Yang et al. (2011), and Rudloff et al. (2014), which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this systematic and meta-analysis review].~~

Brenkman et al. (2019) noted that survival after potentially curative treatment of GC remains low, mostly due to peritoneal recurrence. This systematic review gave an overview of available comparative studies concerning prophylactic HIPEC for patients with GC with neither clinically evident metastases nor positive peritoneal cytology who undergo potentially curative gastrectomy. After a thorough review of the literature, a total of 11 studies were included comparing surgery plus prophylactic HIPEC versus surgery alone: three RCTs and eight nonrandomized comparative studies, involving 1,145 patients. Risk of bias was high in most of the studies. Morbidity after prophylactic HIPEC was 17 to 60% compared to 25 to 43% after surgery alone; OS was 32 to 35 months after prophylactic HIPEC and 22 to 28 months after SA. The 5-year survival rates were 39 to 87% after prophylactic HIPEC and 17 to 61% after SA, which was statistically significant in three studies. Peritoneal recurrence occurred in 7 to 27% in the HIPEC group, compared to 14 to 45% after surgery alone. This review tended to demonstrate suggested that prophylactic HIPEC for GC could be performed safely, may prevent peritoneal recurrence, and may prolong survival. However, studies were heterogeneous and outdated, which emphasized the need for well-designed trials conducted according to current standards.

Desiderio et al. (2017) performed a meta-analysis of studies comparing HIPEC and standard oncological management for the treatment of advanced stage gastric cancer with and without peritoneal carcinomatosis. The primary outcomes were OS and disease recurrence. Secondary outcomes were overall complications, type of complications and sites of recurrence. A total of 11 randomized controlled trials and 21 non-randomized control trials (2,520 patients) were included. For patients without the presence of peritoneal carcinomatosis, the OS rates between the HIPEC and control groups at 3 or 5 years resulted in favor of the HIPEC group. No difference in the 3-year OS but a prolonged median survival of 4 months in favor of the HIPEC group was seen in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis. HIPEC was associated with significantly higher risk of complications (drug toxicity) for both patients with and without peritoneal carcinomatosis. The results demonstrate a survival advantage of HIPEC as a prophylactic strategy and suggest that patients whose disease burden is limited to positive cytology and limited nodal involvement may benefit the most from HIPEC. For patients with extensive carcinomatosis, the completeness of CRS is a critical prognostic factor for survival. The Authors noted limitations reiterated the difficulty in applying results in Asia to Western populations and identifying the role and timing of adjuvant chemotherapy and its impact. Future randomized controlled trials should better define patient selection criteria.

~~Seshadri and Glehen (2016) stated that peritoneal metastasis, either synchronous or metachronous, is commonly seen in gastric cancer. It is associated with a poor prognosis, with a median survival of less than 1 year. The outcomes are not significantly improved by the use of systemic chemotherapy. These investigators reviewed evidence from randomized trials, predominantly from Asian countries, on the role of HIPEC in gastric cancer. CRS and HIPEC has been used in three situations in gastric cancer. Besides its role as a definitive treatment in patients with established peritoneal metastasis (PM), it has been used as a prophylaxis against peritoneal recurrence after curative surgery and also as a palliative treatment in advanced peritoneal metastasis with intractable ascites. While prophylactic HIPEC has been shown to reduce peritoneal recurrence and improve survival in many randomized trials, palliative HIPEC can reduce the need for frequent paracentesis in selected patients. The authors concluded that although CRS with HIPEC has shown promise in increasing the survival of selected patients with established PM from gastric cancer, larger studies are needed before this can be accepted as a standard of care. Its role is still evolving and currently it cannot be recommended outside of a clinical trial protocol. Selection of patients is critical to achieve good results in the clinical setting due to the associated risks for morbidity and mortality.~~

~~Rudloff et al. (2014) conducted a small prospective randomized trial to compare the impact of systemic chemotherapy versus multi-modality therapy (complete CRS, HIPEC and systemic chemotherapy) on OS in patients with gastric carcinomatosis. Patients with measurable metastatic gastric adenocarcinoma involving the peritoneum, and resectable to "no evidence of disease", were randomized to gastrectomy, metastasectomy, HIPEC and systemic FOLFOXIRI (CYMS arm) or FOLFOXIRI alone (SA arm). Seventeen patients were enrolled (16 evaluable). Median OS was 11.3 months in the CYMS arm and 4.3 months in the SA arm. Four patients in the CYMS arm survived > 12 months, two patients close to 2 years at last follow-up and one patient more than 4 years. No patient in the SA arm lived beyond 11 months. The authors concluded that maximal CRS combined with regional HIPEC and systemic chemotherapy in selected patients with gastric carcinomatosis and limited disease burden can achieve prolonged survival. However, the small number of patients did not allow for statistical comparison. Larger studies are needed to confirm these results in Western populations.~~

~~Mi et al. (2013) performed a meta-analysis of 16 randomized controlled trials (n = 1,906) to assess the effectiveness and safety of adjuvant intraoperative HIPEC for patients with resectable locally advanced gastric cancer. Compared with surgery alone, combination therapy (surgery plus HIPEC) was associated with a significant improvement in survival rate at 1, 2, 3, 5, and 9 years. Compared with surgery alone, combination therapy was associated with a significant reduction in recurrence rate at 2, 3, and 5 years. The authors concluded that surgery combined with HIPEC may improve survival rate and reduce the recurrence rate, with acceptable safety, compared to surgery alone.~~

~~Sun et al. (2012) performed a meta-analysis of 10 randomized controlled trials to evaluate the effectiveness and safety of HIPEC for patients with advanced gastric cancer. A total of 1,062 patients were divided into the HIPEC group (n = 518) and control group (n = 544). A significant improvement in survival was observed in the HIPEC group compared to the control group. Findings indicated that there was a lower peritoneal recurrence rate in the HIPEC group compared to the control group. Results of the analysis suggest that HIPEC may improve the OS rate for patients who receive resection for advanced gastric cancer and help to prevent peritoneal local recurrence among patients with serosal invasion in gastric cancer.~~

~~Gill et al. (2011) performed a systematic review of the literature regarding the efficacy of CRS and HIPEC in patients with gastric cancer with peritoneal carcinomatosis. Overall median survival was 7.9 months and improved to 15 months for patients with completeness of cytoreduction scores of 0 or 1. The 30-day mortality rate was 4.8%.~~

~~In a prospective, randomized phase III clinical trial, Yang et al. (2011) evaluated the efficacy and safety of CRS plus HIPEC for the treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis from gastric cancer. Sixty-eight patients were randomized to receive CRS alone (n = 34) or CRS plus HIPEC (n = 34). Median survival was 11 months in the CRS plus HIPEC group compared to 6.5 months in the group receiving CRS alone. After complete macroscopic cytoreduction (CC 0/1), median survival increased to 13.5 months in the CRS plus HIPEC group.~~

~~A multicenter, retrospective nonrandomized study by Glehen et al. (2010b) evaluated outcomes in 159 patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis from gastric cancer who underwent CRS followed by HIPEC (n = 150) and/or EPIC (n = 12). The median follow-up was 20.4 months. Postoperative mortality and grade 3-4 morbidity rates were 6.5 and 27.8%, respectively. The overall median survival was 9.2 months and 1-, 3-, and 5-year survival rates were 43, 18, and 13%, respectively. The only independent prognostic indicator was the completeness of CRS. For patients treated by complete CRS, the median survival was 15 months with a 1-, 3-, and 5-year survival rate of 61, 30, and 23%, respectively.~~

Clinical Practice Guidelines

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN)

NCCN clinical practice guidelines for gastric cancer state that HIPEC or laparoscopic HIPEC may be a therapeutic alternative for carefully selected stage IV patients in the setting of ongoing clinical trials and is under further clinical investigation (NCCN, 2023).

Ovarian Cancer

Note: This Medical Policy does not apply to normothermic (no hyperthermia is used) postoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy, delivered via an indwelling port or catheter, used to treat ovarian cancer. Postoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy has been

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

demonstrated to improve OS and is recommended based on high-level evidence (NCCN, 2021~~2023~~; updated 2022).

Filis et al. (2022) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to assess the available level I evidence for use versus non-use of HIPEC in advanced primary and recurrent ovarian cancer. The primary outcome being measured was OS with a secondary outcome of disease-free survival (DFS) for primary ovarian cancer and PFS for recurrent ovarian cancer. The review included six RCT's four of which evaluated primary ovarian cancer (519 patients) and two which evaluated recurrent ovarian cancer (218 patients). For primary ovarian cancer, the combination of HIPEC with interval CRS and neoadjuvant chemotherapy significantly improved the 5-year OS and DFS when compared to standard treatment alone. In the absence of neoadjuvant chemotherapy, the use of HIPEC combined with CRS showed no advantage to survival. For recurrent ovarian cancer, the use of HIPEC was not associated with any survival advantage. Limitations of the review include lack of information for survival and PFS directly reported in the studies examined, potential bias with neoadjuvant chemotherapy given to selected patients, and designs were not homogenous as different chemotherapy drugs were administered. (Publications by van Driel 2018 and Spiliotis 2015, which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this systematic review).

~~A systematic review by Classe et al. (2022) was performed to assess the level of scientific proof of survival benefits for hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in the treatment of first ovarian cancer relapse. This treatment, combining heavy abdominal surgery and intraperitoneal heated chemotherapy is associated with a risk of post operative death and severe morbidity. Previous systematic reviews of the scientific literature concluded that HIPEC was effective for improving patient survival following a first relapse of ovarian cancer. For this systematic review, of 469 articles identified, 23 were included; 15 based on series of patients treated with HIPEC without a control group, and 8 case control series of patients treated with or without HIPEC. The series without a control group showed median overall survival (OS) ranged from 23.5 to 63 months, highlighting a broad standard deviation. Considering the case control series, OS was better in the HIPEC group in 5 studies, and similar in 1. The current review showed heterogeneity and biases including retrospective patient collection, small number of included patients, and no statistical hypothesis. There is an Oxford Level of Evidence grading of 4 for 22 selected series and 2 for one. The authors concluded that there is no strong evidence to suggest efficacy of HIPEC in improving survival of patients treated for a first relapse of ovarian cancer due to the low quality of the data. The authors also stated that HIPEC must remain an experimental procedure in patients with relapsed ovarian cancer until there are positive results from ongoing clinical trials.~~

~~NCCN clinical practice guidelines for ovarian cancer state that HIPEC with cisplatin (100 mg/m²) can be considered at the time of interval debulking surgery (IDS) following neoadjuvant chemotherapy for stage III ovarian disease (NCCN, 2021; updated 2022).~~

~~A systematic review by Auer et al. (2020) evaluated two RCTs with 184 and 245 patients with newly diagnosed, primary stage III epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube or primary peritoneal carcinoma. The authors concluded that HIPEC should be considered for those with partial or complete response following neoadjuvant chemotherapy and complete or optimal interval CRS; however, there is insufficient evidence to recommend the addition of HIPEC with primary CRS when performed outside of a clinical trial. For patients with recurrent ovarian cancer, colorectal or gastric peritoneal carcinomatosis, mesothelioma or disseminated mucinous neoplasms, there is insufficient evidence to recommend CRS with HIPEC outside of a clinical trial or research protocol. There are currently many ongoing~~

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

~~RCTs evaluating the role of HIPEC with CRS in ovarian, colorectal, and gastric cancers with peritoneal dissemination; centers involved in treating patients with PM and disseminated mucinous neoplasms are encouraged to publish treatment data.~~

Bouchard-Fortier et al. (2020) performed a systematic review and meta-analysis to assess outcomes and perioperative morbidity following HIPEC in patients (n = 2,252) with primary epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC). Thirty-five studies were included. The timing, temperature and chemotherapeutic agents used for HIPEC differed across studies. Reported OS was highly variable (3-year OS range: 46-77%). Three comparative cohort studies and one randomized trial reported statistically significant survival benefits for HIPEC over surgery alone, while two comparative cohort studies did not. The pooled proportions for grade III-IV morbidity and postoperative death at 30 days were 34% and 0% respectively. One RCT suggested that HIPEC at the time of interval CRS should be considered in patients with primary EOC. However, there is significant heterogeneity in the literature regarding an appropriate HIPEC regimen and short- and long-term outcomes. High-quality prospective RCTs are needed to clarify the role of HIPEC in the first-line treatment of primary EOC. (Publications by Deraco 2011, Helm 2010 and van Driel 2018, which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this systematic review).

Lei et al. (2020) conducted a cohort study (n = 584) at five high-volume centers in China to compare survival outcomes between CRS with HIPEC (n = 425) versus CRS alone (n = 159) for patients with stage III EOC. The median follow-up period was 42 months. Primary outcomes were median survival time and 3-year OS. The median survival time was 49.8 months for patients undergoing CRS plus HIPEC and 34 months for patients undergoing CRS alone. The 3-year OS rate was 60.3% for patients undergoing CRS plus HIPEC and 49.5% for patients undergoing CRS alone. Participants were further stratified into complete and incomplete surgery subgroups. In the complete surgery subgroup, the median OS was 53.9 months for the CRS plus HIPEC group and 42.3 months for the CRS alone group. The 3-year OS rate was 65.9% in the CRS plus HIPEC group and 55.4% in the CRS alone group. In the incomplete surgery subgroup, the median OS was 29.2 months for the CRS plus HIPEC group and 19.9 months with CRS alone. The 3-year OS rate was 44.3% in the CRS plus HIPEC group and 36.7% in the CRS alone group, but the difference was not statistically significant. These results are limited by the retrospective and observational study design. Due to this and other limitations, the authors have launched a prospective, multicenter, large-scale RCT to compare CRS followed by HIPEC with CRS alone for stage III EOC.

A Hayes report analyzed ~~one~~ two randomized controlled trial (RCT), one prospective cohort study, and eight retrospective cohort studies examining the efficacy and safety of CRS plus HIPEC compared with CRS alone for PC due to ovarian cancer in patients with PM. Although the quality of evidence was low, it did suggest that HIPEC in addition to CRS may be more effective than CRS alone in improving OS in some patients. The current evidence suggests that the rate of major complications is high (up to 34.5%); however, these rates are likely due to CRS rather than HIPEC per se. The most common complications attributable to HIPEC include hematological toxicity and renal insufficiency/failure, occurring in < 20% of patients (Hayes, 2019b; updated ~~2020~~2022).

In a meta-analysis, Kim et al. (2019) identified patients with ovarian cancer who could obtain survival benefit from HIPEC. A total of 13 case-control studies and two RCTs were included in this meta-analysis. These investigators examined the effect of HIPEC on disease-free survival (DFS) and OS, and performed subgroup analyses based on the study design, adjustment of confounding variables, and quality of the study. HIPEC improved both DFS (HR, 0.603; 95% CI: 0.513 to 0.709) and OS (HR, 0.640; 95% CI: 0.519 to 0.789). In cases of primary disease, HIPEC improved DFS (HR, 0.580; 95% CI: 0.476 to 0.706) and

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

OS (HR, 0.611; 95% CI: 0.376 to 0.992). Sub-group analyses revealed that HIPEC did not improve OS but improved DFS of patients with residual tumors of less than or equal to 1 cm or no visible tumors. In cases of recurrent disease, HIPEC was associated with better OS (HR, 0.566; 95% CI: 0.379 to 0.844) but not with DFS. Sub-group analyses also revealed similar tendencies. However, HIPEC improved DFS of patients with residual tumors of less than or equal to 1 cm or no visible tumors, while it improved OS of only those with residual tumors of less than or equal to 1 cm. The authors concluded that HIPEC may improve DFS of patients with ovarian cancer when residual tumors were less than or equal to 1 cm or not visible. It may also improve OS of only patients with recurrent disease whose residual tumors were less than or equal to 1 cm. The researchers noted that additional relevant clinical trials are needed to select the appropriate patients and to demonstrate the effect of HIPEC on their prognosis in the near future. (Publications by Cascales-Campos 2014, Spiliotis 2015, and van Driel 2018, which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this systematic review).

Wang et al. (2019) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to investigate whether CRS plus HIPEC in ovarian cancer patients improved OS, disease free survival and adverse effects when compared to CRS alone. Thirteen studies were included in the analysis: two randomized controlled trials and 11 observational studies. Studies included participants with a mix of primary and recurrent cancer. For primary ovarian cancer patients, HIPEC significantly improved OS and disease-free survival compared with the CRS group. For recurrent ovarian cancer patients, HIPEC significantly improved OS but not disease-free survival. In a subgroup analysis, improved OS and disease-free survival were observed in patients who received HIPEC based on the following factors: studies published before 2015, studies with ≥ 100 patients, a single drug protocol, 90-minute HIPEC duration and a regimen of CRS plus HIPEC followed by chemotherapy. Tolerable toxicity, morbidity, mortality, and quality of life outcomes were reported. The authors noted that further studies based on individual data or multicenter RCTs are needed to confirm and update these findings.

~~van Driel et al. (2018) investigated whether the addition of HIPEC to interval CRS would improve outcomes among patients who were receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy for stage III EOC. In a multicenter, open-label, phase III trial, 245 patients, who had stable disease after three cycles of carboplatin and paclitaxel, were randomized to undergo interval CRS either with or without HIPEC with cisplatin. These patients were not eligible for primary cytoreduction due to extensive abdominal disease. Randomization was performed at the time of surgery for patients with complete cytoreduction (no visible disease) or after surgery in patients with one or more residual tumors measuring 10 mm or less in diameter (optimal cytoreduction). Three additional cycles of carboplatin and paclitaxel were administered after surgery. The primary end point was recurrence-free survival. Secondary end points included OS, side-effects, and health-related quality of life. In the intention-to-treat analysis, events of disease recurrence or death occurred in 110 of the 123 patients (89%) who underwent CRS without HIPEC (surgery group) and in 99 of the 122 patients (81%) who underwent CRS with HIPEC (surgery plus HIPEC group). The median recurrence-free survival was 10.7 months in the surgery group and 14.2 months in the surgery plus HIPEC group. At a median follow-up of 4.7 years, 76 patients (62%) in the surgery group and 61 patients (50%) in the surgery plus HIPEC group had died. The median OS was 33.9 months in the surgery group and 45.7 months in the surgery plus HIPEC group. The percentage of patients who had adverse events of grade 3 or 4 was similar in the two groups (25% in the surgery group and 27% in the surgery plus HIPEC group). The overall percentage of bowel resections performed was similar in the two groups, but the percentage of patients who underwent a colostomy or an ileostomy after surgery was significantly higher in the surgery plus HIPEC group than in the surgery group (72% versus 43%). The authors concluded that among women with advanced ovarian cancer, HIPEC plus complete or optimal~~

~~interval CRS resulted in longer survival than CRS alone. Additional trials are needed to determine the ways in which HIPEC differs from postoperative intravenous or intraperitoneal chemotherapy and whether HIPEC is also effective after primary CRS.~~

~~A systematic review and meta-analysis by Huo et al. (2015) assessed the safety and efficacy of HIPEC with CRS for epithelial ovarian carcinoma. Nine comparative studies and 28 studies examining HIPEC plus CRS for primary and/or recurrent ovarian cancer were included. Only one study was a randomized controlled trial. Pooled data showed that the addition of HIPEC to CRS and chemotherapy improved OS rates for both primary and recurrent EOC. The authors reported that there is an emerging body of evidence supporting the use of HIPEC with CRS and systemic chemotherapy for primary (stage III) and recurrent epithelial ovarian carcinoma compared to CRS and chemotherapy alone. Maximal cytoreduction remains essential for OS rates, even when HIPEC is used. Eligibility criteria varied across studies, the total number of patients in each study was small and disease-free survival was often poorly reported. Ongoing randomized controlled trials will further clarify the role of HIPEC for patients with advanced and recurrent ovarian cancer.~~

~~Spiliotis et al. (2015) evaluated the use of HIPEC for treating recurrent EOC. In an 8-year period (2006-2013), 120 women with advanced ovarian cancer who experienced disease recurrence after initial treatment with conservative or debulking surgery and systemic chemotherapy were randomized into two groups. Group A was comprised of 60 patients treated with CRS followed by HIPEC and then systemic chemotherapy. Group B was comprised of 60 patients treated with CRS only and systemic chemotherapy. The mean survival for group A was 26.7 versus 13.4 months in group B. Three year survival was 75% for group A versus 18% for group B. In the HIPEC group, the mean survival was not different between patients with platinum-resistant disease versus platinum-sensitive disease (26.6 versus 26.8 months). In the non-HIPEC group, there was a statistically significant difference between platinum-sensitive versus platinum-resistant disease (15.2 versus 10.2 months). The authors concluded that the use of HIPEC, extent of disease and extent of cytoreduction play an important role in the survival of patients with recurrence in an initially advanced ovarian cancer. While these results are promising, additional randomized controlled trials are needed to conclude that HIPEC + CRS + chemotherapy is superior to CRS + chemotherapy alone for ovarian cancer.~~

~~Several retrospective studies have reported similar results (Cascales Campos et al., 2014; Robella et al., 2014; Bakrin et al., 2013; Bakrin et al., 2012; Deraco et al., 2012; Parson et al., 2011). Completeness of cytoreduction was the most statistically significant factor related to ovarian cancer survival.~~

~~In a prospective phase II study, Ansaloni et al. (2012) analyzed the results of CRS and HIPEC in 39 patients with advanced EOC. Thirty patients (77%) had recurrent EOC and 9 (23%) had primary EOC. For HIPEC, cisplatin and paclitaxel were used for 11 patients (28%), cisplatin and doxorubicin for 26 patients (66%), paclitaxel and doxorubicin for one patient (3%) and doxorubicin alone for one patient (3%). Microscopically complete cytoreduction was achieved for 35 patients (90%), macroscopic cytoreduction was achieved for three patients (7%) and a gross tumor debulking was performed for one patient (3%). Postoperative complications occurred in seven patients (18%) and reoperations in three patients (8%). There was one postoperative death. Recurrence was seen in 23 patients (59%) with a mean recurrence time of 14.4 months (range, 1-49 months). The authors concluded that HIPEC after extensive CRS for advanced EOC is feasible with acceptable morbidity and mortality. Additional follow-up and further studies are needed to determine the effects of HIPEC on survival.~~

~~Deraco et al. (2011) conducted a multicenter phase II trial to assess OS after CRS and HIPEC in treatment-naïve EOC with advanced peritoneal involvement. Twenty-six women with stage III-IV EOC underwent CRS and closed-abdomen HIPEC with cisplatin and doxorubicin followed by systemic chemotherapy with carboplatin and paclitaxel. Macroscopically complete cytoreduction was achieved in 15 patients and minimal residual disease (≤ 2.5 mm) remained in 11. Major complications occurred in four patients and postoperative death in one. After a median follow-up of 25 months, 5-year OS was 60.7% and 5-year progression-free survival 15.2% (median 30 months). The authors reported that in select patients with advanced stage EOC, upfront CRS and HIPEC provided promising results in terms of outcome. Morbidity was comparable to aggressive cytoreduction without HIPEC. Postoperative recovery delayed the initiation of adjuvant systemic chemotherapy but not sufficiently to impact negatively on survival. These data warrant further evaluation in a randomized clinical trial.~~

~~Helm et al. (2010) published initial data from a U.S. registry (HYPER O) collecting data on surgical and gynecologic oncologists' experience with HIPEC for invasive EOC. Borderline and nonepithelial cancers were excluded. A total of 141 women were eligible for analysis treated at the following time points: frontline (n = 26), interval debulking (n = 19), consolidation (n = 12) and recurrence (n = 83). Treatment was with a platinum agent (n = 72), mitomycin (n = 53) or a combination (n = 14). Median follow up was 18 months (range, 0.3-140.5 months) and median OS 30.3 months with 2-, 5- and 10-year OS probabilities of 49.1%, 25.4%, and 14.3%, respectively. Of the 141 patients, 110 (78%) experienced recurrence of ovarian cancer and 87 died, 3 (0.5%) dying within 30 days of surgery. In the multivariable analysis, the factors significant for increased survival were sensitivity to platinum response, completeness of cytoreduction scores of 1 or 0, carboplatin alone or a combination of two or more chemotherapy agents used and duration of hospital stays of 10 days or less. These results warrant further study in randomized controlled trials.~~

~~Chua et al. (2009) performed a systematic review of 19 studies reporting the efficacy of CRS and HIPEC for ovarian cancer peritoneal carcinomatosis. Patients with both advanced and recurrent ovarian cancer were included. All studies were uncontrolled, observational case series. The overall rate of severe perioperative morbidity ranged from 0 to 40% and mortality rate varied from 0 to 10%. The overall median survival following treatment with HIPEC ranged from 22 to 64 months with a median disease-free survival ranging from 10 to 57 months. In patients with optimal cytoreduction, a 5-year survival rate ranging from 12 to 66% could be achieved. The authors acknowledge that the HIPEC protocol varied in each study but note that the evidence suggests that complete CRS and HIPEC may have benefits that are comparable to the current standard of care. A randomized trial is required to establish the role of HIPEC in ovarian cancer.~~

~~Bijelic et al. (2007) performed a systematic review of 14 studies to evaluate CRS combined with HIPEC in the treatment of ovarian cancer. A wide variety of drug doses, methods of intraperitoneal chemotherapy administration and volume of chemotherapy solution were used. Seven studies showed that patients with complete cytoreduction had the greatest benefit. The median OS for primary and recurrent disease ranged from 22 to 54 months and the median disease-free survival from 10 to 26 months. The rates of significant morbidity associated with this combined treatment were low, ranging from 5% to 36%. The median mortality was 3% (range 0%-10%). The authors concluded that CRS combined with HIPEC is a treatment option for patients with ovarian cancer that is worthy of further investigation.~~

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

Clinical Practice Guidelines

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN)

NCCN clinical practice guidelines for ovarian cancer state that HIPEC with cisplatin (100 mg/m²) can be considered at the time of interval debulking surgery (IDS) following neoadjuvant chemotherapy for stage III ovarian disease (NCCN, 2023).

Other Cancers

NCCN clinical practice guidelines on cervical cancer (2021, ~~updated 2022~~), uterine neoplasms (2021, ~~updated 2022~~), hepatobiliary cancers (2021, ~~updated 2022~~), neuroendocrine and adrenal tumors (2021, ~~updated 2022~~) and soft tissue sarcoma (2021, ~~updated 2022~~) do not mention HIPEC as a management tool.

Hayes analyzed one retrospective cohort study, three prospective uncontrolled studies, and five retrospective uncontrolled studies examining the efficacy and safety of CRS plus HIPEC in patients with sarcomas and peritoneal involvement. The overall quality of the body of evidence was rated as very low for CRS plus HIPEC for the treatment of sarcomas with peritoneal involvement. A lack of comparative studies and substantial variation across patient populations and treatment protocols underscore the need for additional studies to fill persisting evidence gaps and establish definitive patient selection criteria (Hayes, 2019c; updated ~~2021~~2023).

Frassini et al. (2022) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to provide an overview of the effectiveness and safety of intraperitoneal treatments in the management of pancreatic cancer. Eleven studies (212 patients) were included in the analysis. The patients were placed into three groups, HIPEC (64 patients), pressurized intraperitoneal aerosol chemotherapy (PIPAC) (55 patients), and normothermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (NIPEC) (93 patients). The primary outcome measured was survival rate. For patients in the HIPEC group who had surgical treatment along with HIPEC, the survival rate at three years was 24% compared to 5.3% in PIPAC and 7.9% in NIPEC. The authors conducted further subgroup analysis on patients who underwent HIPEC along with surgical resection following neoadjuvant chemotherapy without evidence of peritoneal disease location and noted the 3-year SR was 25.5%. Limitations of the review include lack of any RCTs on this topic, small sample sizes with included studies, and unclear staging within the included studies. Additionally, because of the non-randomized design of the included studies, there was moderate to serious risk of bias in all domains that were measured. The authors note that RCTs with a strict selection of patients are necessary to support this treatment.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

This section is to be used for informational purposes only. FDA approval alone is not a basis for coverage.

CRS plus HIPEC is a procedure and, therefore, not subject to FDA regulation. However, there are many surgical instruments approved for use in pelvic and abdominal surgery. Refer to the following website to search for specific products. Devices used for performing hyperthermic therapy have been identified under the product codes LOC and MLW. Available at: <http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm> (Accessed ~~May 16, 2022~~ **August 14, 2023**).

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

References

- ~~Ansaloni L, Agnoletti V, Amadori A, et al. Evaluation of extensive cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in patients with advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. Int J Gynecol Cancer. 2012 Jun;22(5):778-85.~~
- Auer RC, Siajohanathan D, Biagi J, et al. Indications for hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy with cytoreductive surgery: a systematic review. Eur J Cancer. 2020 Mar; 127:76-95.
- ~~Bakrin N, Bereder JM, Decullier E, et al; FROGHI (French Oncologic and Gynecologic HIPEC) Group. Peritoneal carcinomatosis treated with cytoreductive surgery and Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) for advanced ovarian carcinoma: a French multicentre retrospective cohort study of 566 patients. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2013 Dec;39(12):1435-43.~~
- ~~Bakrin N, Cotte E, Golfier F, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) for persistent and recurrent advanced ovarian carcinoma: a multicenter, prospective study of 246 patients. Ann Surg Oncol. 2012 Dec;19(13):4052-8.~~
- Baratti D, Kusamura S, Cabras AD, et al. Diffuse malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: long-term survival with complete cytoreductive surgery followed by hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC). Eur J Cancer. 2013 Oct;49(15):3140-8.
- Baratti D, Kusamura S, Nonaka D, et al. Pseudomyxoma peritonei: clinical pathological and biological prognostic factors in patients treated with cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC). Ann Surg Oncol. 2008 Feb;15(2):526-34.
- ~~Bijelic L, Jonson A, Sugarbaker PH. Systematic review of cytoreductive surgery and heated intraoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis in primary and recurrent ovarian cancer. Ann Oncol. 2007 Dec;18(12):1943-50.~~
- Blackham AU, Shen P, Stewart JH, et al. Cytoreductive surgery with intraperitoneal hyperthermic chemotherapy for malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: mitomycin versus cisplatin. Ann Surg Oncol. 2010 Oct;17(10):2720-7.
- Bouchard-Fortier G, Cusimano MC, Fazlizada R, et al. Oncologic outcomes and morbidity following heated intraperitoneal chemotherapy at cytoreductive surgery for primary epithelial ovarian cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Gynecol Oncol. 2020 Jul;158(1):218-228.
- Brenkman HJF, Paeva M, van Hillegersberg R, et al. Prophylactic hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) for gastric cancer - A systematic review. J Clin Med. 2019 Oct 15;8(10):1685.
- ~~Cao C, Yan TD, Black D, Morris DL. A systematic review and meta-analysis of cytoreductive surgery with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin. Ann Surg Oncol. 2009 Aug;16(8):2152-65.~~
- Cascales Campos P, Gil J, Parrilla P. Morbidity and mortality outcomes of cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in patients with primary and recurrent advanced ovarian cancer. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2014 Aug;40(8):970-5.
- Chen V, Jones M, Cohen L, et al. Cytoreductive surgery (CRS) and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in small bowel adenocarcinoma with peritoneal metastasis: a systematic review. Pleura Peritoneum. 2022 Nov 18;7(4):159-167.
- Chua TC, Esquivel J, Pelz JO, Morris DL. Summary of current therapeutic options for peritoneal metastases from colorectal cancer. J Surg Oncol. 2013 May;107(6):566-73.

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

Chua TC, Moran BJ, Sugarbaker PH, et al. Early- and long-term outcome data of patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei from appendiceal origin treated by a strategy of cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012 Jul 10;30(20):2449-56.

Chua TC, Morris DL, Saxena A, et al. Influence of modern systemic therapies as adjunct to cytoreduction and perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for patients with colorectal peritoneal carcinomatosis: a multicenter study. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2011a Jun;18(6):1560-7.

Chua TC, Yan TD, Deraco M, et al.; Peritoneal Surface Oncology Group. Multi-institutional experience of diffuse intra-abdominal multicystic peritoneal mesothelioma. *Br J Surg*. 2011b Jan;98(1):60-4.

~~Chua TC, Robertson C, Liauw W, et al. Intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy after cytoreductive surgery in ovarian cancer peritoneal carcinomatosis: systematic review of current results. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol*. 2009 Dec;135(12):1637-45.~~

~~Classe JM, Asselain B, Campion L, et al. Survival outcomes after hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for a first ovarian cancer relapse: a systematic evidence-based review. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2021 Dec 30;14(1):172.~~

~~de Cuba EM, Kwakman R, Knol DL, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC for peritoneal metastases combined with curative treatment of colorectal liver metastases: Systematic review of all literature and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Cancer Treat Rev*. 2013 Jun;39(4):321-7.~~

Deng H, Li B, Qin X. The short- and long-term survival of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in the advanced gastric cancer with/without peritoneal carcinomatosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Updates Surg*. 2022 Dec;74(6):1805-1816.

Deraco M, Kusamura S, Virzi S, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy as upfront therapy for advanced epithelial ovarian cancer: multi-institutional phase-II trial. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2011 Aug;122(2):215-20.

~~Deraco M, Virzi S, Iusco DR, et al. Secondary cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for recurrent epithelial ovarian cancer: a multi-institutional study. *BJOG*. 2012 Jun;119(7):800-9.~~

Desiderio J, Chao J, Melstrom L, et al. The 30-year experience - a meta-analysis of randomised and high-quality non-randomised studies of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in the treatment of gastric cancer. *Eur J Cancer*. 2017 Jul;79:1-14.

Di Leo A, Corasce A, Weindelmayer J, et al. Cytoreductive surgery (CRS) and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in pseudomyxoma peritonei of appendiceal origin: Result of a single centre study. *Updates Surg*. 2020 Dec;72(4):1207-1212.

~~Dominic JL, Kannan A, Tara A, et al. Prophylactic hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) for the prevention and control of peritoneal metastasis in patients with gastrointestinal malignancies: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *EXCLI J*. 2021 Aug 19;20:1328-1345.~~

~~ECRI Institute. Clinical Evidence Assessment. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy and cytoreductive surgery for colorectal peritoneal metastases. Updated October 2019.~~
ECRI. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy and cytoreductive surgery for colorectal peritoneal metastases. Clinical Evidence Assessment. 2022 Sept.

~~Elias D, Gilly F, Boutitie F, et al. Peritoneal colorectal carcinomatosis treated with surgery and perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy: retrospective analysis of 523 patients from a multicentric French study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010a Jan 1;28(1):63-8.~~

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

Elias D, Gilly F, Quenet F, et al.; Association Française de Chirurgie. Pseudomyxoma peritonei: a French multicentric study of 301 patients treated with cytoreductive surgery and intraperitoneal chemotherapy. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2010b May;36(5):456-62.

Elias D, Lefevre JH, Chevalier J, et al. Complete cytoreductive surgery plus intraperitoneal chemohyperthermia with oxaliplatin for peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin. J Clin Oncol. 2009 Feb 10;27(5):681-5.

Filis P, Mauri D, Markozannes G, et al. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) for the management of primary advanced and recurrent ovarian cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. ESMO Open. 2022 Oct;7(5):100586.

Franko J, Ibrahim Z, Gusani NJ, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemoperfusion versus systemic chemotherapy alone for colorectal peritoneal carcinomatosis. Cancer. 2010 Aug 15;116(16):3756-62.

Frassini S, Calabretto F, Granieri S, et al. Intraperitoneal chemotherapy in the management of pancreatic adenocarcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2022 Sep;48(9):1911-1921.

~~Gill RS, Al-Adra DP, Nagendran J, et al. Treatment of gastric cancer with peritoneal carcinomatosis by cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC: a systematic review of survival, mortality, and morbidity. J Surg Oncol. 2011 Nov 1;104(6):692-8.~~

Glehen O, Gilly FN, Boutitie F, et al. Toward curative treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis from nonovarian origin by cytoreductive surgery combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy: a multi-institutional study of 1,290 patients. Cancer. 2010a Dec 15;116(24):5608-18.

~~Glehen O, Gilly FN, Arvieux C, et al. Peritoneal carcinomatosis from gastric cancer: a multi-institutional study of 159 patients treated by cytoreductive surgery combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy. Ann Surg Oncol. 2010b Sep;17(9):2370-7.~~

~~Glehen O, Kwiattkowski F, Sugarbaker PH, et al. Cytoreductive surgery combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for the management of peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer: a multi-institutional study. J Clin Oncol. 2004 Aug 15;22(16):3284-92.~~

~~Granieri S, Bonomi A, Frassini S, et al. Prognostic impact of cytoreductive surgery (CRS) with hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in gastric cancer patients: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2021 Nov;47(11):2757-2767.~~

~~Hall B, Padussis J, Foster J. Cytoreduction and hypertermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in the management of colorectal peritoneal metastasis. Surg Clin North Am. 2017 Jun;97(3):671-682.~~

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Assessment. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis resulting from peritoneal mesothelioma. Lansdale, PA: Hayes, Inc.; November 2019a. Updated January 2023 ~~March 2021~~.

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Assessment. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis resulting from ovarian cancer. Lansdale, PA: Hayes, Inc.; August 2019b. Updated September 2022 ~~October 2020~~.

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Assessment. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for sarcoma with peritoneal involvement. Lansdale, PA: Hayes, Inc.; December 2019c. Updated March 2023 ~~May 2021~~.

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

Helm JH, Miura JT, Glenn JA, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2015 May;22(5):1686-93.

Helm CW, Richard SD, Pan J, et al. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in ovarian cancer: first report of the HYPER-O registry. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*. 2010 Jan;20(1):61-9.

~~Huang CQ, Min Y, Wang SY, et al. Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy improves survival for peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of current evidence. *Oncotarget*. 2017 Apr 27;8(33):55657-55683.~~

~~Huo YR, Richards A, Liauw W, Morris DL. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) and cytoreductive surgery (CRS) in ovarian cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2015 Dec;41(12):1578-89.~~

Jacquet P, Sugarbaker PH. Clinical research methodologies in diagnosis and staging of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis. *Cancer Treat Res*. 1996; 82:359-74.

Kim SI, Cho J, Lee EJ, et al. Selection of patients with ovarian cancer who may show survival benefit from hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2019;98(50):e18355.

Kusamura S, Kepenekian V, Villeneuve L, et al.; PSOGI. Peritoneal mesothelioma: PSOGI/EURACAN clinical practice guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2021a Jan;47(1):36-59.

Kusamura S, Barretta F, Yonemura Y, et al.; Peritoneal Surface Oncology Group International (PSOGI) and the French National Registry of Rare Peritoneal Surface Malignancies (RENAPE). The role of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in pseudomyxoma peritonei after cytoreductive surgery. *JAMA Surg*. 2021b Mar 1;156(3):e206363.

Lei Z, Wang Y, Wang J, et al.; Chinese Peritoneal Oncology Study Group (Gynecologic Oncology Study Group). Evaluation of cytoreductive surgery with or without hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for stage III epithelial ovarian cancer. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020 Aug 3;3(8):e2013940.

Li J, Wang AR, Chen XD, et al. Effect of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in combination with cytoreductive surgery on the prognosis of patients with colorectal cancer peritoneal metastasis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *World J Surg Oncol*. 2022 Jun 14;20(1):200.

Liu Y, Ishibashi H, Takeshita K, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal dissemination from small bowel malignancy: results from a single specialized center. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2016 May;23(5):1625-31.

Martins M, Santos-Sousa H, Araújo F, et al. Impact of cytoreductive surgery with hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in the treatment of gastric cancer with peritoneal carcinomatosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2022 Nov;29(12):7528-7537.

McBride K, McFadden D, Osler T. Improved survival of patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei receiving intraperitoneal chemotherapy with cytoreductive surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Surg Res*. 2013 Jul;183(1):246-52.

Merriam-Webster online dictionary. <https://www.merriam-webster.com>. Accessed April 12, 2023 ~~May 16, 2022~~.

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

~~Mi DH, Li Z, Yang KH, et al. Surgery combined with intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (IHIC) for gastric cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. Int J Hyperthermia. 2013;29(2):156-67.~~

Mirnezami R, Mehta AM, Chandrakumaran K, et al. Cytoreductive surgery in combination with hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy improves survival in patients with colorectal peritoneal metastases compared with systemic chemotherapy alone. Br J Cancer. 2014a Oct 14;111(8):1500-8.

~~Mirnezami R, Moran BJ, Harvey K, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and intraperitoneal chemotherapy for colorectal peritoneal metastases. World J Gastroenterol. 2014b Oct 14;20(38):14018-32.~~

Morris VK, Kennedy EB, Baxter NN, et al. Treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer: ASCO Guideline. J Clin Oncol. 2023 Jan 20;41(3):678-700.

~~Murphy EM, Sexton R, Moran BJ. Early results of surgery in 123 patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei from a perforated appendiceal neoplasm. Dis Colon Rectum. 2007 Jan;50(1):37-42.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Cervical cancer. v1.2023 ~~v1.2021. Updated v1.2022.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Colon cancer. v1.2023 ~~v2.2021. Updated v1.2022.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Gastric cancer. v1.2023 ~~v2.2021. Updated v2.2022.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Hepatobiliary cancers. v3.2021. ~~Updated v1.2022.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Mesothelioma: Pleural ~~Malignant pleural mesothelioma. v2.2021. Updated V1.2023 v1.2022.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Neuroendocrine and adrenal tumors. ~~v1.2021. Updated v2.2022 v1.2022.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Ovarian cancer including fallopian tube cancer and primary peritoneal cancer. ~~v1.2021. Updated v1.2023 v1.2022.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Small bowel adenocarcinoma. ~~v1.2021. Updated v1.2023 v1.2022.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Soft tissue sarcoma. v1.2023 ~~v2.2021. Updated v2.2022.~~

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Uterine neoplasms. v1.2023 ~~v3.2021. Updated v1.2022.~~

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Cytoreduction surgery with hyperthermic intraoperative peritoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis. IPG688. March 2021.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Colorectal cancer. NG151. January 2020.

O'Dwyer S, Verwaal VJ, Sugarbaker PH. Evolution of treatments for peritoneal metastases from colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2015 Jun 20;33(18):2122-3.

~~Parson EN, Lentz S, Russell G, et al. Outcomes after cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal surface dissemination from ovarian neoplasms. Am J Surg. 2011 Oct;202(4):481-6.~~

Quénet F, Elias D, Roca L, et al.; UNICANCER-GI Group and BIG Renape Group. Cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy versus cytoreductive surgery alone for colorectal peritoneal metastases (PRODIGE 7): a multicentre, randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2021 Feb;22(2):256-266.

~~Robella M, Vaira M, Marsanic P, et al. Treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis from ovarian cancer by surgical cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC). *Minerva Chir.* 2014 Feb;69(1):27-35.~~

Rudloff U, Langan RC, Mullinax JE, et al. Impact of maximal cytoreductive surgery plus regional heated intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) on outcome of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of gastric origin: results of the GYMSSA trial. *J Surg Oncol.* 2014 Sep;110(3):275-84.

~~Seshadri RA, Glehen O. The role of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in gastric cancer. *Indian J Surg Oncol.* 2016;7(2):198-207.~~

Shaib WL, Martin LK, Choi M, et al. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy following cytoreductive surgery improves outcome in patients with primary appendiceal mucinous adenocarcinoma: a pooled analysis from three tertiary care centers. *Oncologist.* 2015 Aug;20(8):907-14.

~~Shen P, Stewart JH 4th, Levine EA. The role of cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for metastatic colorectal cancer with peritoneal surface disease. *Curr Probl Cancer.* 2009 May-Jun;33(3):154-67.~~

Sluitor N, van der Bilt J, Croll D, et al. Cytoreduction and HIPEC versus surgery without HIPEC for goblet cell carcinoids and mixed adeno-neuroendocrine carcinomas: a propensity score matched analysis of centers in the Netherlands and Belgium. *Clin Colorectal Cancer.* 2020 Sep;19(3):e87-e99.

Smeenk RM, Verwaal VJ, Antonini N, Zoetmulder FA. Survival analysis of pseudomyxoma peritonei patients treated by cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *Ann Surg.* 2007 Jan;245(1):104-9.

Spiliotis J, Halkia E, Lianos E, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC in recurrent epithelial ovarian cancer: a prospective randomized phase III study. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2015 May;22(5):1570-5.

~~Sun J, Song Y, Wang Z, et al. Benefits of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for patients with serosal invasion in gastric cancer: a meta-analysis of the randomized controlled trials. *BMC Cancer.* 2012 Nov 16;12:526.~~

Tangiitgamol S, Manuirivithaya S, Laopaiboon M, et al. Interval debulking surgery for advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst R.* 2013;4:CD006014.

Turaga K, Levine E, Barone R, et al. Consensus guidelines from The American Society of Peritoneal Surface Malignancies on standardizing the delivery of hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in colorectal cancer patients in the United States. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2014 May;21(5):1501-5.

van Driel WJ, Koole SN, Sikorska K, et al. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in ovarian cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2018 Jan 18;378(3):230-240.

van Oudheusden TR, Lemmens VE, Braam HJ, et al. Peritoneal metastases from small bowel cancer: Results of cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in The Netherlands. *Surgery.* 2015a Jun;157(6):1023-7.

~~van Oudheusden TR, Nienhuijs SW, Luyer MD, et al. Incidence and treatment of recurrent disease after cytoreductive surgery and intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneally~~

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

~~metastasized colorectal cancer: A systematic review. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2015b Oct;41(10):1269-77.~~

Verma V, Sleightholm RL, Rusthoven CG, et al. Malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: national practice patterns, outcomes, and predictors of survival. Ann Surg Oncol. 2018 Jul;25(7):2018-2026.

Verwaal VJ, van Ruth S, de Bree E, et al. Randomized trial of cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy versus systemic chemotherapy and palliative surgery in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2003 Oct 15;21(20):3737-43.

Verwaal VJ, Bruin S, Boot H, et al. 8-year follow-up of randomized trial: cytoreduction and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy versus systemic chemotherapy in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal cancer. Ann Surg Oncol. 2008 Sep;15(9):2426-32.

Vogel JD, Eskicioglu C, Weiser MR, et al. The American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons clinical practice guidelines for the treatment of colon cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 2017 Oct;60(10):999-1017. Updated 2022.

~~Waite K, Youssef H. The role of neoadjuvant and adjuvant systemic chemotherapy with cytoreductive surgery and heated intraperitoneal chemotherapy for colorectal peritoneal metastases: a systematic review. Ann Surg Oncol. 2017 Mar;24(3):705-720.~~

Wang Y, Ren F, Chen P, et al. Effects of cytoreductive surgery plus hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) versus cytoreductive surgery for ovarian cancer patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2019 Mar;45(3):301-309.

Whitney CW, Spirtos N. Gynecologic Oncology Group Surgical Procedures Manual. Philadelphia: Gynecologic Oncology Group; 2009.

~~Williams BH, Alzahrani NA, Chan DL, et al. Repeat cytoreductive surgery (CRS) for recurrent colorectal peritoneal metastases: yes or no? Eur J Surg Oncol. 2014 Aug;40(8):943-9.~~

Yan TD, Deraco M, Baratti D, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: multi-institutional experience. J Clin Oncol. 2009 Dec 20;27(36):6237-42.

~~Yan TD, Welch L, Black D, Sugarbaker PH. A systematic review on the efficacy of cytoreductive surgery combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for diffuse malignancy peritoneal mesothelioma. Ann Oncol. 2007a May;18(5):827-34.~~

~~Yan TD, Black D, Savady R, Sugarbaker PH. A systematic review on the efficacy of cytoreductive surgery and perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for pseudomyxoma peritonei. Ann Surg Oncol. 2007b Feb;14(2):484-92.~~

~~Yan TD, Black D, Savady R, Sugarbaker PH. Systematic review on the efficacy of cytoreductive surgery combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal carcinoma. J Clin Oncol. 2006 Aug 20;24(24):4011-9.~~

Yang XJ, Huang CQ, Suo T, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy improves survival of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis from gastric cancer: final results of a phase III randomized clinical trial. Ann Surg Oncol. 2011 Jun;18(6):1575-81.

You YN, Hardiman KM, Bafford A, et al.; On Behalf of the Clinical Practice Guidelines Committee of the American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons. The American Society of

UnitedHealthcare, Inc. ("UHC") Proprietary and Confidential Information: The information contained in this document is confidential, proprietary and the sole property of UHC. The recipient of this information agrees not to disclose or use it for any purpose other than to facilitate UHC's compliance with applicable State Medicaid contractual requirements. Any other use or disclosure is strictly prohibited and requires the express written consent of UHC.

Colon and Rectal Surgeons clinical practice guidelines for the management of rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 2020 Sep;63(9):1191-1222.

Zhang JF, Lv L, Zhao S, et al. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) combined with surgery: a 12-year meta-analysis of this promising treatment strategy for advanced gastric cancer at different stages. Ann Surg Oncol. 2022 May;29(5):3170-3186.

Policy History/Revision Information

Date	Summary of Changes
<u>TBD</u>	<u>Supporting Information</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Removed Benefit Considerations section</u>• <u>Updated Clinical Evidence and References sections to reflect the most current information</u>• <u>Archived previous policy version CS141LA.H</u>

Instructions for Use

This Medical Policy provides assistance in interpreting UnitedHealthcare standard benefit plans. When deciding coverage, the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage must be referenced as the terms of the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage may differ from the standard benefit plan. In the event of a conflict, the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage govern. Before using this policy, please check the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage. UnitedHealthcare reserves the right to modify its Policies and Guidelines as necessary. This Medical Policy is provided for informational purposes. It does not constitute medical advice.

UnitedHealthcare may also use tools developed by third parties, such as the InterQual® criteria, to assist us in administering health benefits. The UnitedHealthcare Medical Policies are intended to be used in connection with the independent professional medical judgment of a qualified health care provider and do not constitute the practice of medicine or medical advice.