

MEDICAL POLICY	Gastroesophageal Reflux: Magnetic Esophageal Ring	
Effective Date: 7/1/2020  7/1/2020	Section: SUR	Policy No: 229
	Technology Assessment Committee Approved Date: 9/12; 4/13; 3/14; 2/15; 3/16 Medical Policy Committee Approved Date: 5/17; 10/17; 1/19; 2/2020; 6/2020; 8/2020	
Medical Officer	Date	

See Policy CPT CODE section below for any prior authorization requirements

SCOPE:

Providence Health Plan, Providence Health Assurance, Providence Plan Partners, and Aycin Health Solutions as applicable (referred to individually as “Company” and collectively as “Companies”).

APPLIES TO:

All lines of business

BENEFIT APPLICATION

Medicaid Members

Oregon: Services requested for Oregon Health Plan (OHP) members follow the OHP Prioritized List and Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) as the primary resource for coverage determinations. Medical policy criteria below may be applied when there are no criteria available in the OARs and the OHP Prioritized List.

POLICY CRITERIA

An implantable magnetic esophageal ring (e.g., LINX® Reflux Management System) is considered **not medically necessary and is not covered** as a treatment of gastroesophageal reflux (GERD).

Link to [Policy Summary](#)

CPT CODES

All Lines of Business
Not Covered

MEDICAL POLICY	Gastroesophageal Reflux: Magnetic Esophageal Ring
-----------------------	--

43284	Laparoscopy, surgical, esophageal sphincter augmentation procedure, placement of sphincter augmentation device (ie, magnetic band), including cruroplasty when performed
43285	Removal of esophageal sphincter augmentation device
Unlisted Codes All unlisted codes will be reviewed for medical necessity, correct coding, and pricing at the claim level. If an unlisted code is billed related to services addressed in this policy then it will be denied as not covered .	
43289	Unlisted laparoscopy procedure, esophagus
43499	Unlisted procedure, esophagus
43999	Unlisted procedure, stomach

DESCRIPTION

The LINX® Reflux Management System is intended to treat chronic gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD). The device is composed of a series of titanium beads with magnetic cores connected by wires that are implanted around the outside of the esophagus at the lower esophageal sphincter (LES) (where the esophagus meets the stomach).^{1,2}

The magnetic attraction between the beads is designed to keep the LES closed, which helps prevent reflux of bile and acid from the stomach into the esophagus.^{3,4} The pressure of swallowing breaks the magnetic attraction, allowing for food and liquid to pass, and then the magnetic attraction between the beads re-closes the LES.^{3,4}

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

A review of the ECRI, Hayes, Cochrane, and PubMed databases was conducted regarding the use of the LINX® Reflux Management System as a treatment for Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease (GERD). Below is a summary of the available evidence identified through March 2020.

Systematic Reviews

- In 2018 (updated 2020), Hayes published an evidence review evaluating magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) (LINX® Reflux Management System) for the treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD).⁵ Hayes searched the literature through December 2019 according to predefined inclusion criteria, which excluded case series and studies with fewer than 50 participants. Seven studies were ultimately included for review: 1 manufacturer-funded RCT comparing MSA to twice-daily proton pump inhibitor (PPI) medication (omeprazole), and 6 cohort studies comparing MSA to laparoscopic fundoplication (LF) – gold standard GERD surgical treatment. Hayes judged the RCT to be “fair quality,” 4 of the 6 cohort studies to be “poor” quality, and 2 of the 6 cohort studies to be “very poor” quality. Sample sizes ranged from 66 to 415 patients and follow-up varied from 6 months to 44 months. The review’s primary outcomes of interest were GERD-

related symptom improvement, symptom improvement comparative with current standard treatments for GERD, adverse events and patient selection criteria.

Quality of Life

Each of the seven included studies assessed GERD health-related quality of life (GERD-HRQL) to measure GERD symptoms before and after treatment. While both MSA and LF were associated with substantial improvements in GERD-HRQL scores, these improvements were not significantly different between MSA and LF groups (all analyses; $p > 0.1$). One cohort study analyzed a minority of subjects at 7-years post-treatment and found no statistically significant difference in GERD-HRQL scores between treatment groups (OR=1.04 [95% CI, 0.89-1.27]; $p=0.578$), with both groups reporting continued improvements ($p < 0.001$). Follow-up among each of the six cohort studies for all subjects was brief, ranging from 6 months to 1 year.

The included RCT reported that MSA significantly improved GERD-HRQL scores compared to twice-daily PPI ($p < 0.002$). At baseline, MSA patients scored 24 points compared to 25 points for PPI-only patients, improving to 6 points compared 24 points at 6-month follow-up ($p < 0.002$). Furthermore, 81% of MSA patients experienced a $\geq 50\%$ reduction (i.e. improvement) in GERD-HRQL score compared with 8% of twice-daily PPI patients ($p < 0.001$).

PPI Use

All 7 studies reported substantial reductions in PPI use among MSA patients. In 4 of 6 studies, there was no statistically significant difference in PPI use between MSA and LF groups at follow-ups ranging from 6-months to 1-year. Across six cohort studies, 0% to 19% of MSA patients used PPI compared to 3% to 37% of LF patients at 1-year follow-up. One study reported higher PPI use among MSA patients versus LF patients at 1 year (24% versus 12% of patients; $p=0.02$) following a propensity score-matched analysis. Alternatively, a large, multicenter prospective cohort study ($n=249$) reported significantly lower PPI use among MSA patients versus LF patients (18.2% versus 37%; $p=0.009$), also at 1-year follow-up. In the RCT, PPI use decreased among MSA patients from 100% at baseline to 9% at 6-months post-surgery.

Patient-reported GERD Symptoms

Each of the 4 studies assessing patient-reported GERD symptoms reported a positive association between MSA and improved symptoms at 6-month and 1-year follow-ups. The largest, multicenter prospective cohort study ($n=249$) reported a significantly lower incidence of moderate or severe regurgitation at 1 year compared with LF (3.1% versus 13%; compared to 58.2% versus 60% of patients at baseline; $p=0.014$). Investigators reported no inter-group differences in proportion of patients with reflux affecting extraesophageal symptoms, sleep quality or sleep position ($p > 0.2$). A second cohort study found symptom improvement among 97.8% among both MSA and LF groups, with complete resolution in 51.1% of MSA patients and 48.9% of LF patients ($p=0.978$ between groups). A third cohort study reported significant improvement in GERD symptoms in both groups (e.g. heartburn, regurgitation, cough, aspiration, chest pain, or ear, nose and throat issues)

($P \leq 0.001$). In the RCT comparing MSA to twice-daily PPI, 89% of MSA patients experienced regurgitation resolution versus 10% in the PPI group ($p < 0.001$) at 6-month follow-up.

Esophageal pH

Two studies (one small, retrospective cohort and one RCT) evaluated esophageal pH parameters, with both reporting improvement following MSA surgery. In the retrospective cohort study, LF patients experienced significantly greater improvement in both DeMeester score and time spent with a pH < 4 ($p \leq 0.0001$) compared to MSA patients. In the RCT, MSA patients achieved more normal esophageal pH outcomes than PPI patients. The statistical significance of these findings was not reported.

Summary

Hayes ultimately assigned a “C” rating (potential but unproven benefit) for MSA in the treatment of GERD, concluding that the “low-quality body of consistent evidence suggest[ed] that MSA is associated with improved QOL and GERD symptoms, with similar effectiveness and potentially superior safety compared with laparoscopic fundoplication.”⁵ The report noted the lack of long-term data demonstrating safety and efficacy and undefined patient selection criteria. Limitations in reviewed studies included small sample sizes, a lack of long-term follow-up (6-months to 1-year), a lack of power analyses and significant differences in baseline characteristics between treatment groups.

- In 2020, ECRI published an evidence review evaluating the safety and effectiveness of magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) in the treatment of GERD.⁶ The review searched the published and gray literatures through March 2020 and included 4 studies for review (2 systematic reviews of nonrandomized studies, 1 RCT and 1 pre-post study and 2 economic studies) reporting on 13,437 patients. The primary outcomes evaluated were GERD symptoms, quality of life (QOL), proton-pump inhibitor (PPI) medication use, endoscopic or surgical retreatment for GERD symptoms and adverse events. One meta-analysis of 6 studies found no differences between LINX and fundoplication groups in PPI use, GERD-health-related quality of life (GERD-HQOL) scores, dysphagia, and retreatments up to 4 years.⁷ The same study reported PPI use in 13.2% of patients, LINX removal in 3.3%, and esophageal erosion in 0.3% at up to 5-year follow-up across 13 case series ($n = 11,598$). The review concluded, however, that there remains “an urgent need for randomized data directly comparing fundoplication with MSA for the treatment of GERD to truly evaluate the efficacy of this treatment approach.”⁷ Another systematic review found that patients receiving LINX experienced less bloating (OR: 0.34, 95% CI: 0.16 to 0.71) and better belching ability (OR: 12.34, 95% CI: 6.43 to 23.70), and improvements in GERD-HRQOL (mean 35.2 to 5.6 points) at 2-year follow-up in patients who underwent MSA after gastric surgery.⁸ One RCT reported greater patient satisfaction (81% versus 2%) and improvement in GERD-HRQOL scores (18 versus 1 points) with LINX at 6-month follow-up, and $>50\%$ GERD-HRQOL improvement with LINX in 81% of patients, less PPI use in 91%, less regurgitation in 96%, and less bloating in 25% at 6-month to 1-year follow-up.⁹

Results from the two systematic reviews were limited by reviewed studies’ small sample sizes, retrospective design, single-center focus and lack of randomization. Patient-reported outcomes of QOL and patient satisfaction were at also risk of bias as blinding was not feasible in patients or

clinicians. Despite these limitations, ECRI deemed evidence sufficient to support the safety and efficacy of MSA given the consistency of results across studies and their validation in a meta-analysis of controlled studies and an independent RCT. While indicating that studies with longer follow-up and comparisons of LINX with other GERD devices “would be useful,” ECRI concluded that evidence supporting MSA is overall “very favorable.”⁶

- In 2020, Schizas and colleagues conducted a systematic review evaluating the safety and efficacy of MSA for the treatment of GERD.¹⁰ Independent investigators systematically searched the literature through August 2019, identified eligible studies, assessed study quality and extracted data. In total, 35 studies assessing 2,511 patients were included for review. Median follow-up was 12 months. Post-operative proton-pump inhibitor (PPI) cessation rates reached 100%, with fewer bloating symptoms and a better ability to belch or vomit compared to patients receiving LF. Common complications included dysphagia, with rates ranging between 6% and 83%. Dilation due to dysphagia occurred in 8% of patients with typical inclusion criteria. Esophageal erosion may occur in up to 0.03% of patients. Investigators concluded that MSA may serve as a bridge treatment between conventional medical treatment and LF, yet called for additional studies with longer follow-up to validate results reported to date.
- In 2020, Kirkham and colleagues conducted a systematic review evaluating the safety and efficacy of MSA for the treatment of GERD.¹¹ Independent investigators systematically searched the literature through December 2019, identified eligible studies, assessed study quality and extracted data. In total, 39 full-text papers were included (1 RCT 5 cohort, 3 case-control, 25 case series, 5 case reports). Sample sizes ranged from 24 to 415. Follow-up ranged from 4 weeks to 5 years; however, in 14 studies, it was less than 1 year. Of the nine comparative studies, including one RCT, eight were limited by different selection criteria and unmatched patients at baseline. Information about ethical approval, patient consent and conflicts of interest was often missing. Investigators concluded that evidence is insufficient to support the use of MSA given the lack of information about patient selection, governance, expertise, techniques and outcomes. Authors called for additional, high-quality studies to validate positive results.
- In 2018, Stanak and colleagues performed a systematic review evaluating GERD-health-related quality of life (GERD-HRQL) among magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) patients.¹² Six studies (n=249) met pre-defined inclusion criteria (5 prospective case series and one prospective registry study). Patients were heterogeneous at baseline in terms of age, length of GERD symptoms, proton-pump inhibitor (PPI) (i.e. medication) resistance, and confirmation of reflux by pH monitoring. Only one study¹³ (discussed below) met inclusion criteria for effectiveness analysis of MSA. The study reported improvements in patients’ symptoms, GERD-HRQL scores, and PPI use at one year follow-up. Investigators concluded that the overall quality of evidence was “very low” due to the one included study’s case series design, and high risk of bias from potential confounders.
- In 2018, Aiolfi and colleagues performed a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) in the treatment of GERD compared to laparoscopic fundoplication (LF).¹⁴ The review included seven observational cohort studies, six of which were also included in Hayes’ systematic review above.⁵ Sample sizes ranged from 12 to 185 and follow-up was 1 year. Investigators calculated pooled effect measures, evaluated heterogeneity using I²-index and Cochrane Q-test, and addressed potential confounders via meta-regression. The meta-analysis

reported no statistically significant difference between MSA and LF in GERD health-related quality of life scores, proton-pump inhibitor (i.e. medication) use, and dysphagia requiring endoscopic dilation. However, MSA patients experienced significant lower incidence of gas/bloat symptoms (OR=0.39 [95% CI, 0.25-0.61]; $p < 0.001$); and improved ability to vomit (OR=10.10 [95% CI, 5.33-19.15]; $p < 0.001$) and belch (OR=5.53 [95% CI, 3.73-8.19]; $p < 0.001$). Investigators nonetheless concluded that “the difference in outcomes between the two patient groups need[s] to be interpreted with caution since no comparative randomized clinical trials exist to provide strong evidence [of comparative efficacy].”¹⁴

- In 2017, Hillman and colleagues published a systematic review of anti-reflux procedures for GERD.¹⁵ Reviewers searched the literature through 2015 according to pre-defined inclusion criteria and extracted data. Primary outcomes of interest were improvement in GERD symptoms, esophageal acid exposure (EAE), DeMeester score, reflux events and erosive esophagitis (EE) healing. In total, 6 studies evaluating magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) were included (5 prospective cohort studies and 1 observational comparison study, all of which are either included in the ECRI review⁶ above or evaluated elsewhere in this policy (i.e. Lipham et al.).¹⁶ Investigators concluded that MSA appeared to be an effective alternative to laparoscopic fundoplication (LF) in patients who previously failed to respond to proton-pump inhibitor medication, based on superior improvements to GERD symptoms relative to LF. Limitations of this review include the lack of reviewer assessment of individual study outcomes (e.g. no p -values or confidence intervals provided for reported results); the non-randomized design of studies included for review; and the lack of long-term follow-up among included studies.
- In 2017, Chen and colleagues conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis comparing magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) with laparoscopic fundoplication (LF) for short-term efficacy in treating GERD.¹⁷ Reviewers searched the literature through 2016 according to pre-defined inclusion criteria, assessed quality and extracted data. A total of 4 trials were included for review^{4,18-21} ($n = 624$), each of which was also evaluated in the ECRI review above.⁶ Pooled effect was calculated with either fixed- or random-effects models. Primary outcomes of interest included differences between MSA and LF in proton-pump inhibitor (i.e. medication) use, complications and adverse events. Investigators found no significant difference in PPI usage. There was no significant difference between the treatments in complications (RR = 1.16, 95% CI: 0.93–1.46, $p = 0.19$) or adverse events (RR=0.86, 95% CI: 0.55-1.22, and $p = 0.49$). While there was no significant difference in ability to belch (RR = 1.33, 95% CI: 0.92–1.94, $p = 0.13$), or vomit (RR=1.66, 95% CI: 0.54-5.08, $p = 0.38$), MSA patients trended toward less gas/bloating (RR = 0.71, 95% CI: 0.54–0.94, $p = 0.02$). Investigators concluded that MSA was an effective short-term alternative for the treatment of GERD, but noted that “it is very important and necessary to perform randomized controlled trials to describe the efficacy of MSA compared to [L]F in short term and long term.”¹⁷
- In 2017, Skubleny et al. published the first systematic review and meta-analysis comparing the LINX magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) to laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication (LNF) for Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease (GERD).²² Independent reviewers systematically identified eligible studies, assessed quality, and extracted data. The outcomes of interest were GERD-Health Related Quality of Life (GERD-HRQL), DeMeester score, operative time, ability to belch, ability to emesis, discontinuation of proton pump inhibitors, need for endoscopic dilation, procedural satisfaction, and presence of gas/bloating and dysphagia.

Three primary studies (2 retrospective case-controls and 1 prospective case-control) met inclusion criteria for review and meta-analysis; thus producing a sample size of n=688 (n=273 LNF, n=415 MSA). Mean follow-up duration ranged from 7 to 12 months for MSA and 7 to 16 months for LNF. The results of the systematic review indicated MSA was statistically better at maintaining the patient's ability to belch (95.2% vs. 65.9%, $p<0.00001$) and vomit (93.5% vs. 49.5%, $p<0.0001$). There was no statistically significant difference between the two procedures for gas/bloating (26.7% vs. 53.4%, $p=0.06$), postoperative dysphagia (33.9% vs. 47.1%, $p=0.43$), and proton pump inhibitor elimination (81.4 vs. 81.5%, $p=0.68$). MSA patients required more post-implant esophageal dilations compared to LNF patients (23.4% MSA vs. 3.3% LNF). Both MSA and LNF groups showed improvement in GERD-HRQL and DeMeester scores. Adverse events reported in the MSA group included pleural injury, two episode of intraoperative bleeding, one pneumothorax, and one gastroesophageal junction obstruction. Two MSA device removals were reported due to treatment failure and dysphagia secondary to device erosion.

Strengths of this study include the systematic review of literature following a pre-defined protocol and evaluation of methodological quality by two independent reviewers. Strength was also found in the assessment of heterogeneity to determine the appropriateness of conducting a meta-analysis. A significant limitation of this systematic review is the poor quality of selected studies and lack of randomized controlled trials. Also, there are very few studies with long-term follow-up data of MSA versus LNF. The study also indicated "the validity of many of the primary outcomes was decreased due to their subjective nature and lack of clear medical definition."²² The authors concluded MSA may be an effective treatment for GERD, but long-term comparative outcome data past 1 year is needed in order to further understand the efficacy of MSA.

Nonrandomized Studies

- In 2018, Louie and colleagues published preliminary results, at 1-year follow-up, from their multi-center, prospective, observational study to be conducted over five years.²³ This is the second of two post-approval studies,(the other being Ganz et al. (2016)),¹³ conducted as part of the FDA approval process to assess the long-term effectiveness and incidence of adverse events for magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA). A total of 200 patients (102 males, 98 females) were treated across 17 sites (mean age: 48.5 years old; mean body mass index: 27.4; average duration of GERD symptoms: 11.9 years; average proton-pump inhibitor (PPI) utilization: 8.5 years). GERD was confirmed via ambulatory esophageal pH testing. Outcomes of interest were GERD-Health related quality of life (GERD-HRQL), PPI use, esophageal pH level, regurgitation, extra-esophageal symptoms and serious adverse events. At one-year follow-up, data were available for 91% of patients (n=181). Median GERD-HRQL scores improved from 26.0 to 4.0 among patients. Post-surgery patient approval was also high: 80% reported "satisfaction" with their present condition, 15% reported "neutral" and 5% reported "dissatisfied." Predefined success criteria of 50% or greater reduction (i.e. improvement) in total GERD-HRQL score was achieved by 84.3% of patients (95% CI), with improvements in symptoms of gas/bloating, difficulty swallowing and painful swallowing. At 1-year follow up, 87.4% of patients no longer used PPIs, and moderate/severe regurgitation and extra-esophageal symptoms declined from 61.5% of patients at baseline to 5.4%. Post-surgery, 36.6% of patients (n=30) experienced difficulty swallowing (i.e. dysphagia), only 1 of whom experienced daily symptoms sufficient to affect daily activities. Five patients (2.5%) had the device removed.

Limitations of the study include the lack of control group receiving maximal medical therapy (e.g. PPI or LF) and short-term follow-up. Results at the five-year follow-up will better clarify MSA's efficacy and safety profile.

- In 2018, an expert panel of 14 esophagologists applied the RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method to evaluate management options for patients with GERD refractory to medication (PPIs).²⁴ The majority of panelists agreed that the LINX device would be an inappropriate management strategy in seven of the nine hypothetical scenarios. There was "equivocal" agreement among panelists in the setting of breakthrough acid (esophageal acid exposure > 6.0%) with large hiatal hernia (> 3cm); and majority agreement (77%) that LINX would be appropriate for patients with breakthrough acid with a small/absent hiatal hernia (< 3cm). Limitations include a lack of any evidence in support of these determinations and industry support from LINX's manufacturer to half (n=7) of the panelists. The panel concluded that randomized control trials with long-term follow-up and were necessary before clinicians should consider the LINX device over fundoplication.
- In 2016, Ganz and colleagues reported safety and efficacy outcomes for 85 patients receiving MSA for the treatment of GERD at 5-year follow-up.¹³ Outcomes of interest included quality of life, reflux control, use of proton-pump inhibitors (PPIs) and side effects. At follow-up, no device erosions, migrations, or malfunctions were reported. Median GERD-related quality of life score improved significantly from baseline among patients not already on PPIs, although it is unclear if this improvement was significant among patients already on PPIs. Bothersome gas-bloat decreased significantly from 52% at baseline to 8.3%, as did rates of regurgitation, constipation and nausea/vomiting. Rates of bothersome dysphagia, difficulty swallowing and diarrhea did not significantly improve. Limitations included the study's lack of a comparator group receiving gold-standard treatment (i.e. laparoscopic fundoplication), high attrition (15%) and authors' conflicts of interest with the device manufacturer.
- In 2015, Reynolds et al. conducted a retrospective matched-pair analysis of 100 patients to evaluate laparoscopic magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) (e.g., LINX) versus laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication (LNF).¹⁹ A prospectively collected database was used to identify patients who had a confirmed diagnosis of GERD (defined by an abnormal pH study), underwent MSA or NSF between April 2007 and October 2013, Barrett's esophagus or esophagitis grade B or greater (confirmed with biopsy), documented history of PPI therapy for at least 6 months, and normal esophageal motility. MSA and LNF patients were matched 1:1 using the best-fit model, resulting in 50 MSA patients and 50 LNF patients. Postoperative one year follow-up data was collected for the outcomes of GERD-Health Related Quality of Life (GERD-HRQL), symptom improvement, and complications.

Follow-up data was not available for 6% of patients in each group. Of the MSA group, 97.8% reported improved symptoms and 51.1% reported complete resolution of symptoms. The LNF group also showed similar rates of improved symptoms (97.8%) and complete resolution of symptoms (48.9%) resulting in no statistically significant difference between groups. There were also no statistically significant differences between groups for improvement in GERD-HRQL and Proton Pump Inhibitor use at 1-year follow-up. In regards to complications, both groups reported gas bloat, dysphagia, inability to belch, inability to vomit, and endoscopic dilation; however, only inability to vomit resulted in a statistically significant difference between groups (4% MSA, 21% LNF). No MSA patients experienced device erosions or removals and no LNF patients required reoperation.

Strengths of this study include the comparison of MSA to LNF and the use of best-fit analysis for matching patients. Significant methodological limitations and potential for selection bias exist in the retrospective design with lack of randomization. Other limitations include the small sample size, short follow-up period, no objective outcome measures (e.g., esophageal pH measurements), and high attrition with 12% of patients lost to follow-up. Also, there are potential conflicts of interest due to authors being consultants for the device manufacturer (Torax Medical Inc.). The authors concluded “the results support the use of MSA as first-line therapy in patients with mild to moderate GERD”¹⁹; however, the reliability and validity of these results is questionable due to substantial study limitations.

In 2015, Saino and colleagues reported on the 5 year results of a pilot study evaluating magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) for the treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD).²⁵ The prospective, multicenter, single-arm study enrolled 44 patients with diagnosed GERD to undergo MSA. Outcomes of interest included GERD-Health Related Quality of Life (GERD-HRQL) score, esophageal pH, PPI use, and complications. Of the 44 patients who underwent MSA, 33 patients (75%) had 5-year follow-up data. All patients had significant reductions in esophageal pH and significant improvements in GERD-HRQL scores. Complete discontinuation of PPIs at 5 years was achieved by 87.8% of patients. During the course of 5-year follow-up, 6.8% of patients reported serious adverse events requiring hospitalizations. The most common adverse event was dysphagia reported by 43% of MSA patients. Three devices required removal due to persistent dysphagia, magnetic resonance imaging, and ongoing GERD symptoms. Although the long-term results of this study are encouraging, significant limitations are present in the very small sample size, lack of a comparator group, and very high attrition (25% of patients were lost to follow-up by 5 years). Due to the lack of high-quality long-term data, there is insufficient evidence to support the long-term clinical utility and safety of MSA compared to LNF.

- Six additional observational studies comparing magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) using the LINX technology to the gold-standard laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication (LNF) for the treatment of Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease (GERD) were identified.^{3,4,13,18,19,21} All of the comparison studies had significant methodological limitations including but not limited to the following:
 - short follow-up periods,
 - small sample sizes,
 - highly selective inclusion criteria,
 - significant losses to follow-up,
 - retrospective nonrandomized study designs,
 - significant between-group differences at baseline,
 - lack of objective outcome measures (i.e., pH evaluation at follow-up).

Also of note, 5 of the 7 comparative studies disclosed conflicts of interest involving the device manufacturer, Torax Medical Inc., calling into question the reliability of the study results. No severe adverse events or deaths were reported in the studies; however, some did report high rates of dysphagia in MSA patients (44%-68%) which frequently resulted in post-implantation endoscopic esophageal dilation (19%-50%).

Evaluation of Safety

- Each of the studies included in the 2018 Hayes review reported technology-related complications (i.e. inability to belch or vomit, dysphagia, endoscopic dilation for dysphagia, gas bloat, and explanations/reoperations). Hayes also analyzed adverse events reported to the U.S. FDA's Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) database from August 1, 2017 (the final cutoff date of the Alicuben et al. (2018) analysis discussed below²⁶) through October 30, 2018.⁵ During this timeframe, the FDA database received reports of 228 injuries, 5 malfunctions and 0 deaths.²⁷
- A continuation of the magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) safety evaluation was conducted using the FDA Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) database from October 30, 2018 (the final cutoff date of the Hayes review) through December 19, 2018.²⁷ The FDA database received 16 safety reports within these dates, all of which resulted in device explant.
- In 2018, Alicuben and colleagues retrospectively assessed the risk of esophageal erosion among magnetic sphincter augmentation devices implanted worldwide.²⁶ Investigators analyzed 9453 implantation cases that were reported to the database of either the manufacturer or the U.S. FDA's Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) between February 2007 to July 2017. In total, there were 29 reported cases of erosion (0.3%), presenting between 1 to 4 years (median, 26 months) after device implantation. Dysphagia and chest pain were the most common presenting symptoms. Investigators also found a higher rate of erosion among smaller devices compared to larger devices (18/365 [4.93%] for 12-bead versus 0/674 [0%] for 17-bead devices). Investigators assessed risk of erosion over time to be 0.05% at 1 year, increasing to 0.3% at 4 years. Investigators hypothesized that patients with connective tissue disorders, poorly controlled diabetes and immunosuppression may be more predisposed to esophageal erosion.
- In 2017, Smith and colleagues assessed magnetic sphincter augmentation-related reports in the FDA's Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) database from March 22, 2012 (the date of FDA approval) to May 31, 2016.²⁸ In total, investigators found 89 device removals among an estimated 3283 implantations (2.7%), with most devices (57%) explanted in the first year of implantation. Dysphagia and persistent GERD symptoms were the most common reasons for removal. No deaths, serious adverse events or device malfunctions were reported.
- In 2015, Lipham et al., conducted a safety review of the first patients implanted with the magnetic sphincter augmentation device (MSA) through July 1, 2013.¹⁶ The authors evaluated safety events from clinical research studies, the FDA's Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) database, and the manufacturer's database of the first 1000 patients implanted with MSA. The analysis of events included complications during or after surgery, the inability to complete the implantation of the device, a device malfunction causing harm to the patient, a device-related event that required an intervention, and a hospital readmission or reoperation. A total of 111 adverse events were identified, including 36 device removals, 59 esophageal dilations, 14 hospital readmissions, 1 device erosion, and 1 intra/perioperative complication. Hospital readmissions were most commonly due to dysphagia, pain, nausea, and vomiting. The most common reason for device removal was persistent dysphagia.

CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES

Oregon Health Evidence Review Commission (HERC)

In 2019, HERC included magnetic sphincter augmentation (CPT: 43284) among its list of “unproven interventions,” citing “insufficient evidence of effectiveness.”²⁹

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

In 2017, NICE published an interventional procedures guidance (IPG575) evaluating laparoscopic insertion of a magnetic titanium ring for GERD.³⁰ The guidance does not specifically mention the LINX device. NICE concluded that while there were no major safety concern associated with comparable devices, long-term efficacy data remained limited in quantity and quality.

Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES)

In 2017, SAGES updated its 2013 safety and effectiveness analysis, publishing a consensus opinion regarding the use of the LINX Reflux Management System as a treatment of GERD.³¹ The statement suggested that “ the LINX® device is reasonably safe and efficacious for the management of medically refractory GERD.”³¹ However, this guideline is an expert panel recommendation, which was not based in a systematic review of evidence and was not published in a peer-reviewed journal.

American College of Gastroenterology (ACG)

The 2013 ACG guidelines regarding the LINX® Reflux Management System concluded that more data is required before widespread usage can be recommended.³² This recommendation was based on a systematic evaluation of available evidence.

American Society of General Surgeons (ASGS)

The 2014 ASGS position statement regarding the LINX® Reflux Management System “supports the use of the device as a mechanism for controlling GERD when performed by properly trained laparoscopic surgeons with experience in foregut surgery and the management of GERD patients.”³³ However, this recommendation was based on poor quality evidence that was not obtained through a systematic review process. In addition, the ASGS recommendation was not published in a peer-reviewed journal.

CENTERS FOR MEDICARE & MEDICAID

As of 7/23/2020, no Centers for Medicare & Medicaid (CMS) guidance documents were identified addressing the esophageal sphincter augmentation procedure.

POLICY SUMMARY

Current evidence is insufficient to establish the clinical utility and safety of magnetic sphincter augmentation (MSA) relative to other established treatments of GERD. Although shows comparable results to laparoscopic fundoplication (LF) for GERD-Health Related Quality of Life scores and esophageal pH, the comparability and superiority of MSA to LF has yet to be demonstrated. To date, the only study with long-term follow-up was of poor-quality due to significant methodological limitations, including but not limited to, small sample size, lack of a comparator group, and high attrition.²⁵ The few randomized controlled trials conducted to date are limited by a lack of long-term follow-up. Results from an ongoing five-year study may better clarify LINX's efficacy and safety profile, although this study also lacks a comparator group.²³ Dysphagia is the most common adverse event following MSA and has been reported in as many as 83% of study patients. While recent studies have reported low risk of device erosion,^{5,26,28} additional studies are required to evaluate the long-term safety and reliability of MSA. Evidence-based clinical practice guidelines continue to call for additional studies evaluating MSA.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

Company Medical Policies serve as guidance for the administration of plan benefits. Medical policies do not constitute medical advice nor a guarantee of coverage. Company Medical Policies are reviewed annually and are based upon published, peer-reviewed scientific evidence and evidence-based clinical practice guidelines that are available as of the last policy update. The Companies reserve the right to determine the application of Medical Policies and make revisions to Medical Policies at any time. Providers will be given at least 60-days notice of policy changes that are restrictive in nature.

The scope and availability of all plan benefits are determined in accordance with the applicable coverage agreement. Any conflict or variance between the terms of the coverage agreement and Company Medical Policy will be resolved in favor of the coverage agreement.

REGULATORY STATUS

[U.S. Food and Drug Administration Indications/Contraindications/Warnings/Precautions³⁴](#)

Indications for Use:

- Patients with diagnosed Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease (GERD) as defined by abnormal pH testing, and who continue to have chronic GERD symptoms despite maximum medical therapy for the treatment of reflux.

Contraindications:

- Patients with suspected or known allergies to titanium, stainless steel, nickel, or ferrous materials.

Warnings:

- The LINX Implant is considered MR Unsafe. After implantation, the patient should not be exposed to an MRI environment. The MRI environment could cause serious injury to the patient and/or interfere with the magnetic strength and the function of the device. A recommendation should be made to patients receiving the LINX device to register their implant with the

MediAlert Foundation (www.medicalert.org) or equivalent organization. In the event alternative diagnostic procedures cannot be used and MRI is required, the LINX device can be safely removed utilizing a laparoscopic technique that does not compromise the option for traditional anti-reflux procedures.

Precautions:

- The LINX device has not been evaluated in patients with a hiatal hernia larger than 3 cm. Use of LINX device in patients with a hiatal hernia larger than 3cm should be considered on the basis of each patient's medical history and severity of symptoms.
- The safety and effectiveness of the LINX device has not been evaluated in patients with Barrett's esophagus or Grace C or D (LA classification) esophagitis.
- The safety and effectiveness of the LINX device has not been evaluated in patients with electrical implants such as pacemakers and defibrillators, or other metallic, abdominal implants.
- The safety and effectiveness of the LINX device has not been evaluated in patients with major motility disorders.
- The safety and effectiveness of the LINX Reflux Management System has not been established for the following conditions:
 - Scleroderma
 - Suspected or confirmed esophageal or gastric cancer
 - Prior esophageal or gastric surgery or endoscopic intervention
 - Distal esophageal motility less than 35 mmHg peristaltic amplitude on wet swallows or <70% (propulsive) peristaltic sequences or a known motility disorder such as Achalasia, Nutcracker Esophagus, and Diffuse Esophageal Spasm or Hypertensive LES.
 - Symptoms of dysphagia more than once per week within the last 3 months.
 - Esophageal stricture or gross esophageal anatomic abnormalities (Schatzki's ring, obstructive lesions, etc.)
 - Esophageal or gastric varices.
 - Lactating, pregnant or plan to become pregnant.
 - Morbid obesity (BMI>35)
 - Age <21

Mental Health Parity Statement

Coverage decisions are made on the basis of individualized determinations of medical necessity and the experimental or investigational character of the treatment in the individual case.

REFERENCES

1. Gutschow CA, Holscher AH. Surgical treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Langenbeck's archives of surgery*. 2013;398(5):661-667
2. Hershcovici T, Fass R. Gastro-Oesophageal Reflux Disease. *Drugs*. 2011;71(18):2381-2389
3. Riegler M, Schoppman SF, Bonavina L, Ashton D, Horbach T, Kemen M. Magnetic sphincter augmentation and fundoplication for GERD in clinical practice: one-year results of a multicenter, prospective observational study. *Surgical endoscopy*. 2015;29(5):1123-1129

4. Sheu EG, Nau P, Nath B, Kuo B, Rattner DW. A comparative trial of laparoscopic magnetic sphincter augmentation and Nissen fundoplication. *Surgical endoscopy*. 2015;29(3):505-509
5. Hayes Inc. Magnetic Sphincter Augmentation (LINX Reflux Management System) for Treatment of Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease. 2018 (updated 2020); <https://evidence.hayesinc.com/report/htb.linx2659>. Accessed 4/22/2020.
6. ECRI Institute. LINX Reflux Management System (Ethicon US, LLC) for Treating Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease. 2020; <https://www.ecri.org/components/ProductBriefs/Pages/22983.aspx>. Accessed 4/22/2020.
7. Guidozi N, Wiggins T, Ahmed AR, Hanna GB, Markar SR. Laparoscopic magnetic sphincter augmentation versus fundoplication for gastroesophageal reflux disease: systematic review and pooled analysis. *Dis Esophagus*. 2019;32(9)
8. Riva CG, Asti E, Lazzari V, Aquilino K, Siboni S, Bonavina L. Magnetic Sphincter Augmentation After Gastric Surgery. *Jsls*. 2019;23(4)
9. Bell R, Lipham J, Louie BE, et al. Magnetic Sphincter Augmentation Superior to Proton Pump Inhibitors for Regurgitation in a 1-Year Randomized Trial. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2019
10. Schizas D, Mastoraki A, Papoutsis E, et al. LINX((R)) reflux management system to bridge the "treatment gap" in gastroesophageal reflux disease: A systematic review of 35 studies. *World J Clin Cases*. 2020;8(2):294-305
11. Kirkham EN, Main BG, Jones KJB, Blazeby JM, Blencowe NS. Systematic review of the introduction and evaluation of magnetic augmentation of the lower oesophageal sphincter for gastro-oesophageal reflux disease. *Br J Surg*. 2020;107(1):44-55
12. Stanak M, Erdos J, Hawlik K, Birsan T. Novel Surgical Treatments for Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease: Systematic Review of Magnetic Sphincter Augmentation and Electric Stimulation Therapy. *Gastroenterology research*. 2018;11(3):161. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5997468/pdf/gr-11-161.pdf>
13. Ganz RA, Edmundowicz SA, Taiganides PA, et al. Long-term outcomes of patients receiving a magnetic sphincter augmentation device for gastroesophageal reflux. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology*. 2016;14(5):671-677
14. Aiolfi A, Asti E, Bernardi D, et al. Early results of magnetic sphincter augmentation versus fundoplication for gastroesophageal reflux disease: systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Surgery*. 2018
15. Hillman L, Yadlapati R, Whitsett M, Thuluvath AJ, Berendsen MA, Pandolfino JE. A review of anti-reflux procedures for PPI non-responsive gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Diseases of the esophagus: official journal of the International Society for Diseases of the Esophagus*. 2017;30(9):1. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/mid/NIHMS933487/pdf/nihms933487.pdf>
16. Lipham J, Taiganides P, Louie B, Ganz R, DeMeester T. Safety analysis of first 1000 patients treated with magnetic sphincter augmentation for gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Diseases of the Esophagus*. 2015;28(4):305-311
17. Chen M-y, Huang D-y, Wu A, et al. Efficacy of magnetic sphincter augmentation versus nissen fundoplication for gastroesophageal reflux disease in short term: a meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology*. 2017;2017. <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/cjgh/2017/9596342/abs/>
18. Louie BE, Farivar AS, Shultz D, Brennan C, Vallières E, Aye RW. Short-term outcomes using magnetic sphincter augmentation versus Nissen fundoplication for medically resistant gastroesophageal reflux disease. *The Annals of thoracic surgery*. 2014;98(2):498-505

19. Reynolds JL, Zehetner J, Wu P, Shah S, Bildzukewicz N, Lipham JC. Laparoscopic magnetic sphincter augmentation vs laparoscopic nissen fundoplication: a matched-pair analysis of 100 patients. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2015;221(1):123-128
20. Reynolds JL, Zehetner J, Nieh A, et al. Charges, outcomes, and complications: a comparison of magnetic sphincter augmentation versus laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication for the treatment of GERD. *Surgical endoscopy*. 2016;30(8):3225-3230
21. Warren HF, Reynolds JL, Lipham JC, et al. Multi-institutional outcomes using magnetic sphincter augmentation versus Nissen fundoplication for chronic gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Surgical endoscopy*. 2016;30(8):3289-3296
22. Skubleny D, Switzer NJ, Dang J, et al. LINX® magnetic esophageal sphincter augmentation versus Nissen fundoplication for gastroesophageal reflux disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surgical endoscopy*. 2017;31(8):3078-3084
23. Louie BE, Smith CD, Smith CC, et al. Objective Evidence of Reflux Control After Magnetic Sphincter Augmentation: One Year Results From a Post Approval Study. *Annals of surgery*. 2018.https://journals.lww.com/annalsofsurgery/Abstract/publishahead/Objective_Evidence_of_Reflux_Control_After.95635.aspx
24. Yadlapati R, Vaezi MF, Vela MF, et al. Management options for patients with GERD and persistent symptoms on proton pump inhibitors: recommendations from an expert panel. *The American journal of gastroenterology*. 2018:1
25. Saino G, Bonavina L, Lipham JC, Dunn D, Ganz RA. Magnetic sphincter augmentation for gastroesophageal reflux at 5 years: final results of a pilot study show long-term acid reduction and symptom improvement. *Journal of Laparoendoscopic & Advanced Surgical Techniques*. 2015;25(10):787-792
26. Alicuben ET, Bell RC, Jobe BA, et al. Worldwide Experience with Erosion of the Magnetic Sphincter Augmentation Device. *Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*. 2018:1-6.http://www.esophagealinstituteatlanta.com/client_files/File/linx-erosions.pdf
27. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) Database. Manufacturer: TORAX. Brand Name: LINX. . 2018; <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfmaude/search.cfm>. Accessed 4/22/2020.
28. Smith CD, Ganz RA, Lipham JC, Bell RC, Rattner DW. Lower esophageal sphincter augmentation for gastroesophageal reflux disease: the safety of a modern implant. *Journal of Laparoendoscopic & Advanced Surgical Techniques*. 2017;27(6):586-591.<https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/lap.2017.0025>
29. Oregon Health Authority. Prioritized List of Health Services - Guideline Note 173. 2020; <https://www.oregon.gov/oha/HPA/DSI-HERC/PrioritizedList/3-13-2020%20Prioritized%20List%20of%20Health%20Services.pdf>. Accessed 4/22/2020.
30. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Laparoscopic insertion of a magnetic titanium ring for gastro-oesophageal reflux disease. 2017; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg585>. Accessed 4/22/2020.
31. Telem DA, Wright AS, Shah PC, Hutter MM. SAGES technology and value assessment committee (TAVAC) safety and effectiveness analysis: LINX® reflux management system. *Surgical endoscopy*. 2017;31(10):3811-3826.<https://www.sages.org/publications/tavac/tavac-safety-and-effectiveness-analysis-linx-reflux-management-system/>
32. Katz PO, Gerson LB, Vela MF. Corrigendum: guidelines for the diagnosis and management of gastroesophageal reflux disease. *The American journal of gastroenterology*. 2013;108(10):1672

33. American Society of General Surgeons. LINX Statement of Support from ASGS. 2014; <https://theasgs.org/position-statements/linx-statement-of-support-from-asgs/>. Accessed 4/22/2020.
34. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). LINX Reflux Management System - Instructions for Use. 2012; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf10/p100049c.pdf. Accessed 4/22/2020.