

1.01.29	Tumor Treating Fields Therapy		
Original Policy Date:	October 31, 2014	Effective Date:	October 1, 2019
Section:	1.0 Durable Medical Equipment	Page:	Page 1 of 19

Policy Statement

Tumor treating fields therapy to treat glioblastoma multiforme may be considered **medically necessary** as an adjunct to standard maintenance therapy with temozolomide in patients with **newly diagnosed** glioblastoma multiforme following initial treatment with surgery, radiotherapy, and/or chemotherapy under the following conditions:

- Adult patients 18 years old or older
- Supratentorial tumor
- Karnofsky Performance Status score greater than or equal to 70%
- Documentation the patient understands device use, including the requirement for a shaved head, use for at least 18 hours a day for a minimum of 4 weeks, and is willing to comply with use criteria according to the Food and Drug Administration label (see Policy Guidelines section)

Tumor treating fields therapy is considered **investigational** in all other conditions, including but not limited to the following situations:

- As an adjunct or alternative to standard medical therapy for progressive or recurrent tumors (e.g., bevacizumab, chemotherapy) for patients with **progressive or recurrent** glioblastoma multiforme* (see Policy Guidelines section)
- For brain metastases
- For cancer in areas other than the brain
- As an adjunct to standard medical therapy (pemetrexed and platinum-based chemotherapy) for patients with malignant pleural mesothelioma

Policy Guidelines

*Use for progressive or recurrent disease is a level 2B recommendation in NCCN guidelines (as compared to level 1 for newly diagnosed). Typically, a category 1 or 2A recommendation is followed, but not 2B. Progression was defined in the EF-14 trial (Stupp et al [2015, 2017]) according to the MacDonald criteria (tumor growth greater than 25% compared with the smallest tumor area measured in the patient during the trial or appearance of 1 or more new tumors in the brain that are diagnosed radiologically as glioblastoma multiforme).

The Food and Drug Administration label includes the following notices:

- Patients should use Optune for at least 18 hours a day to get the best response to treatment
- Patients should finish at least 4 full weeks of therapy to get the best response to treatment. Stopping treatment before 4 weeks lowers the chances of a response to treatment

Coding

There are no specific codes for the initial application of this system or instruction on use. The patient reapplies the transducer arrays at home after the initial instruction.

There are HCPCS codes for the system and the transducer arrays:

- **A4555**: Electrode/transducer for use with electrical stimulation device used for cancer treatment, replacement only
- **E0766**: Electrical stimulation device used for cancer treatment, includes all accessories, any type

Description

Tumor treating fields (TTF) therapy is a noninvasive technology intended to treat glioblastoma and malignant pleural mesothelioma on an outpatient basis and at home using electrical fields. Glioblastoma multiforme (GBM) is the most common and deadly malignant brain tumor. It has a very poor prognosis and is associated with low quality of life during of treatment. Malignant pleural mesothelioma is an aggressive tumor with few treatment options that is associated with significant morbidity and mortality.

Related Policies

- Intensity-Modulated Radiotherapy: Central Nervous System Tumors
- Intracavitary Balloon Catheter Brain Brachytherapy for Malignant Gliomas or Metastasis to the Brain
- Intraoperative Radiotherapy
- Stereotactic Radiosurgery and Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy

Benefit Application

Benefit determinations should be based in all cases on the applicable contract language. To the extent there are any conflicts between these guidelines and the contract language, the contract language will control. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Some state or federal mandates (e.g., Federal Employee Program [FEP]) prohibits plans from denying Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved technologies as investigational. In these instances, plans may have to consider the coverage eligibility of FDA-approved technologies on the basis of medical necessity alone.

Regulatory Status

In April 2011, the NovoTTF-100A™ System (Novocure; assigned the generic name of TTF) was approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the premarket approval process.⁵ The FDA-approved label reads as follows: "The NovoTTF-100A System is intended as a treatment for adult patients (22 years of age or older) with confirmed GBM, following confirmed recurrence in an upper region of the brain (supratentorial) after receiving chemotherapy. The device is intended to be used as a stand-alone treatment and is intended as an alternative to standard medical therapy for recurrent GBM after surgical and radiation options have been exhausted."

In September 2014, the FDA approved Novocure's request for a product name change from NovoTTF-110A System to Optune®.⁶

In October 2015, the FDA expanded the indication for Optune® in combination with temozolomide to include newly diagnosed GBM.⁷ The device was granted priority review status in May 2015 because there was no legally marketed alternative device available for the treatment of newly diagnosed GBM, a life-threatening condition. In July 2016, a smaller, lighter version of the Optune® device, called the Optune® System (NovoTTF-200A System), received the FDA approval.

The FDA-approved label for newly diagnosed GBM reads as follows: "This device is indicated as treatment for adult patients (22 years of age or older) with histologically-confirmed glioblastoma multiforme (GBM). Optune™ with temozolomide is indicated for the treatment of adult patients

with newly diagnosed, supratentorial glioblastoma following maximal debulking surgery and completion of radiation therapy together with concomitant standard of care chemotherapy."

In May 2019, the FDA expanded the indication for the NovoTTFM-100L System to include "treatment of adult patients with unresectable, locally advanced or metastatic, malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) to be used concurrently with pemetrexed and platinum-based chemotherapy. The indication was modified from that granted for the Humanitarian Device Exemption designation to more clearly identify the patient population the device is intended to treat and in which the safety and probable benefit of the device is supported by the available clinical data." ⁸.

FDA product code: NZK.

Rationale

Background

Glioblastoma Multiforme

Glioblastomas, also known as glioblastoma multiforme (GBM), are the most common form of malignant primary brain tumor in adults.¹ GBMs are grade IV astrocytomas, a rapidly progressing and deadly type of glial cell tumor that is often resistant to standard medical therapy (e.g., bevacizumab, chemotherapy). Together, anaplastic astrocytomas and glioblastomas comprise approximately 38% of all brain and central nervous system tumors.¹ The peak incidence for GBM occurs between the ages of 45 and 70 years, with a median age at diagnosis of 64 years. Glioblastomas have the lowest survival rate of any central nervous system tumor; in one report, about a third of patients survived to 1 year, and the 5-year survival rate was around 5%.²

Treatment of Newly Diagnosed GBM

The primary treatment for patients newly diagnosed with GBM is to resect the tumor to confirm a diagnosis while debulking the tumor to relieve symptoms of increased intracranial pressure or compression. If total resection is not feasible, subtotal resection and open biopsy are options. During surgery, some patients may undergo implantation of the tumor cavity with a carmustine (bis-chloroethylnitrosourea) impregnated wafer. Due to the poor efficacy of local treatment, postsurgical treatment with adjuvant radiotherapy, chemotherapy (typically temozolomide), or a combination of these 2 therapies is recommended. After adjuvant therapy, patients may undergo maintenance therapy with temozolomide. Maintenance temozolomide is given for 5 days of every 28-day cycle for 6 cycles. Response and overall survival rates with temozolomide are higher in patients who have O⁶-methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase (*MGMT*) gene promoter methylation (see 2.04.113 on *MGMT* promoter methylation for malignant gliomas).

Prognostic factors for therapy success are age, histology, performance status or physical condition of the patient, and extent of resection. National Comprehensive Cancer Network recommendations include patient age and Karnofsky Performance Status score as important determinants of postsurgical treatment choice (see the Supplemental Information section).³ For patients with good performance status, the most aggressive treatment (standard radiotherapy [RT] plus temozolomide) is recommended. For patients with poor performance status, only single treatment cycles or even palliative or supportive care are recommended. Hypofractionated RT is indicated for patients with poor performance status because it is better tolerated, and more patients are able to complete RT.

Treatment of GBM is rarely curative, and tumors will recur essentially all patients.

Treatment of Recurrent GBM

When disease recurs, additional debulking surgery may be used if the recurrence is localized. Due to radiation tolerances, re-radiation options for patients with recurrent GBM who have previously received initial external-beam radiotherapy are limited. There is no standard adjunctive treatment for recurrent GBM. Treatment options for recurrent disease include various

forms of systemic medications such as the antivasular endothelial growth factor drug bevacizumab, alkylating agents such as nitrosoureas (e.g., lomustine, carmustine), or retreatment with temozolomide. Medical therapy is associated with side effects that include hematologic toxicity, headache, loss of appetite, nausea, vomiting, and fatigue. Response rates in recurrent disease are less than 10%, and the progression-free survival rate at 6 months is less than 20%.⁴ There is a need for new treatments that can improve survival in patients with recurrent GBM or reduce the side effects of treatment while retaining survival benefits.

Malignant Pleural Mesothelioma

Malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) is an aggressive tumor that is associated with significant morbidity and mortality. It is associated with asbestos exposure and has a latency period of about 40 years after asbestos exposure. Recommendations for treatment are mainly chemotherapy as first line with pemetrexed plus platinum. Surgical cytoreduction is also recommended in selected patients with early-stage disease. Adjuvant radiation can be offered for patients who have resection of intervention tracts found to be histologically positive or for palliation of symptomatic patients.

Literature Review

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

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

For this review, 3 indications are evaluated: (1) tumor treating fields (TTF) as an adjunct to maintenance chemotherapy in newly diagnosed patients following initial treatment with surgery, radiotherapy and chemotherapy and (2) TTF as an adjunct or (3) alternative to medical therapy (e.g., bevacizumab, chemotherapy) in progressive or recurrent glioblastoma multiforme (GBM) and as treatment of adult patients with unresectable, locally advanced or metastatic, malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) to be used concurrently with pemetrexed and platinum-based chemotherapy.

TTF Therapy as an Adjunct to Standard Maintenance Care for Newly Diagnosed GBM

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of alternating electrical field therapy, more commonly known as tumor treating fields (TTF) therapy, is to provide a treatment option that is better than existing therapies for GBM. TTF has been investigated as an adjunct to temozolomide for the treatment of newly diagnosed GBM and as an alternative or adjunct to medical therapy for progressive or recurrent GBM. The questions addressed in this evidence review are:

- Does TTF, when used as an adjunct to maintenance medical therapy in patients with newly diagnosed GBM, improve the net health outcome?

- Does TTF, when used as an adjunct to medical therapy in patients with recurrent GBM, improve the net health outcome?
- Does TTF, when used as an alternative to medical therapy in patients with recurrent GBM, improve the net health outcome?

Patients

The relevant populations of interest are patients who have newly diagnosed GBM with good performance status or patients with recurrent GBM with good performance status. Newly diagnosed patients would have undergone initial treatment with surgery, RT, and chemotherapy and be receiving maintenance chemotherapy.

The setting is outpatient care by an oncologist or neuro-oncologist.

Interventions

TTF therapy is a noninvasive technology intended to treat GBM on an outpatient basis and at home using electrical fields.^{4,9,10} TTF therapy exposes rapidly dividing cancer cells to electric fields of low intensity and intermediate frequency (200 kHz) that alternate in perpendicular orientation. TTF therapy is proposed to inhibit tumor growth by 2 mechanisms: the arrest of cell proliferation by causing microtubule misalignment in the mitotic spindle of rapidly dividing tumor cells and apoptosis due to movement of macromolecules and organelles during telophase.^{9,10} Preclinical studies have indicated that the electric fields may also make the cells more susceptible to chemotherapy.

Optune (formerly NovoTTF-100A System) is the only legally marketed TTF delivery system available in the United States. The portable, battery-powered device is carried in a backpack or shoulder pack while carrying out activities of daily living. For the treatment of glioblastoma, 4 disposable transducer arrays with insulated electrodes are applied to the patient's shaved head. The transducer array layout is typically determined using specialized software. The patient's scalp is re-shaved and the transducer arrays replaced twice a week by the patient, caregiver, or device technician. The device is worn for up to 24 hours a day for the duration of treatment, except for brief periods for personal hygiene and 2 to 3 days at the end of each month. The minimum daily treatment is 18 hours. The minimum duration of treatment is 1 month, with the continuation of treatment available until recurrence.

Comparators

The following practice is currently being used to make decisions about newly diagnosed GBM: maintenance chemotherapy with temozolomide alone.

The following practices are currently being used to make decisions about recurrent GBM: medical therapy.

TTF therapy might also be compared with palliative or supportive care, where survival rarely exceeds 3 to 5 months.⁴

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are whether TTF improves survival or quality of life during treatment and, because most GBMs recur, the time to tumor recurrence. Measures of cognitive status and quality of life measures are also of interest to determine whether TTF alters the decline in cognition and quality of life that occur with GBM. Also, adverse events of treatment such as side effects of chemotherapy and the possibility of seizures need to be assessed.

Due to the rapid progression of GBM, the time of interest for both progression-free survival and overall survival is months.

Study Selection

The PICO elements were used to select relevant studies.

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- To assess longer term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Within each category of study design, studies with larger sample size studies and longer duration were sought.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Stupp et al (2017) published results of the EF-14 multicenter, open-label phase 3 RCT that evaluated maintenance therapy with TTF for newly diagnosed GBM.¹⁰ The trial included 695 patients from 83 sites who had supratentorial GBM and had completed standard treatment consisting of biopsy or surgical resection followed by radiotherapy and chemotherapy (see Table 1). A Karnofsky Performance Status (KPS) score of 70 or higher was an additional inclusion criterion to ensure independence in activities of daily living, and patients with rapidly progressing GBM following radiochemotherapy were excluded from the trial. Patients were randomized in a 2:1 fashion to TTF plus maintenance temozolomide or maintenance temozolomide alone.

All patients were seen monthly for follow-up. Quality of life (QOL) was assessed every 3 months, and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) was performed every 2 months until tumor progression. Tumor progression on MRI was adjudicated by a central review committee blinded to treatment group. The primary outcome was progression-free survival (PFS), and the secondary outcome was overall survival (OS). The analysis was by intention-to-treat, including 26 patients from the control arm who crossed over to TTF following the planned interim analysis.

In 2014, an independent data and safety monitoring board concluded from the planned interim analysis that the trial met its predefined boundaries for success (improvement in PFS and OS) and recommended trial termination. The Food and Drug Administration approved the trial termination, and the trial was closed to recruitment with 695 of the planned 700 participants randomized. Control arm participants were allowed to cross over to the experimental treatment at this time. The interim analysis, which the Food and Drug Administration considered for the 2015 expanded approval of Optune, was published by Stupp et al (2015).¹¹ At the time of the interim analysis, data were available for 210 patients randomized to TTF plus temozolomide and 105 patients to temozolomide alone. Follow-up of the remainder of the 695 enrolled patients continued after enrollment was closed.

Table 1. Key Randomized Controlled Trial Characteristics for Newly Diagnosed Glioblastoma

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	Comparator
Stupp et al (2017) ¹² ; EF-14	U.S., E.U., South Korea, Israel	83	2009-2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 695 newly diagnosed with GBM and treated by radiochemotherapy (n=466) • KPS score \geq70 	TTF >18 h/d plus maintenance temozolomide (n=466)	Maintenance temozolomide alone (5 d every 28 d for 6 cycles) (n=229)

GBM: glioblastoma multiforme; h/d; hours per day; KPS: Karnofsky Performance Status; TTF: tumor treatment fields.

Results of the final analysis of the EF-14 trial were similar to the interim analysis and are shown in Table 2. Both PFS and OS improved with the addition of TTF therapy to standard maintenance chemotherapy (i.e., temozolomide). PFS increased by 2.7 mo ($p<0.001$) and OS increased by 4.9 mo ($p<0.001$) in the TTF group. The time to a decrease in mental function was 2.5 months longer with TTF therapy ($p<0.01$).

There was a similar percentage of dropouts at the final analysis-with 49 (11%) patients in the TTF group and 27 (12%) patients in the temozolomide alone group. More treatment cycles with temozolomide were administered in the TTF group (median, 6 for TTF group vs 5 for controls), a finding that is consistent with the longer PFS. Rates of adverse events were similar between the

groups, including rates of seizures. In secondary analysis of patients who had not progressed, there was no reduction in health-related quality of life with TTF compared with temozolomide alone aside from "itchy skin".¹² Interpretation of this result is limited by the low percentage of patients who completed the health-related quality of life assessments at follow-up (65.8% of the 655 patients alive at 3 months and 41.7% of the 473 patients alive at 12 months). A mixed-model analysis, which accounts for missing data, confirmed the results of the mean change from baseline analysis.

Table 2. Key Randomized Controlled Trial Results for Newly Diagnosed Glioblastoma

Study	Final N (%)	Median PFS (95% CI), mo	Median OS (95% CI), mo	Systemic Adverse Events, n (%)	Seizures, n (%)	Time to 6-Point Decline in MMSE Score (95% CI), mo
Stupp et al (2017) ¹²						
TTF + temozolomide	417 (89)	6.7 (6.1 to 8.1)	20.9 (19.3 to 22.7)	218 (48)	26 (6)	16.7 (14.7 to 19.0)
Temozolomide alone	202 (88)	4.0 (3.8 to 4.4)	16.0 (14.0 to 18.4)	94 (44)	13 (6)	14.2 (12.7 to 17.0)
HR (95% CI)		0.63 (0.52 to 0.76)	0.63 (0.53 to 0.76)			0.79 (0.66 to 0.95)
P value		<0.001	<0.001	0.58		0.01

CI: confidence interval; HR: hazard ratio; MMSE: Mini-Mental State Examination; OS: overall survival; PFS: progression-free survival; TTF: tumor treatment fields.

Tables 3 and 4 display notable gaps identified in this trial, the major limitation is the lack of patient blinding to treatment assignment. However, PFS was assessed by investigators who were blinded to treatment and placebo effects on OS were expected to be minimal. Investigators considered it practically unfeasible (due to the heat and current of the TTF therapy) and ethically unacceptable to submit the control patients to repeated shaving of the head and continuous wear of a sham device over many months.

Table 3. Relevance Gaps

Study; Trial	Population ^a	Intervention ^b	Comparator ^c	Outcomes ^d	Follow-Up ^e
Stupp et al (2017) ¹² ; EF-14			3. Possible differences in post-progression treatment affecting overall survival		

The evidence gaps stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

^a Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Clinical context is unclear; 3. Study population is unclear; 4. Study population not representative of intended use.

^b Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest.

^c Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively.

^d Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. No CONSORT reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinical significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinical significant difference not supported.

^e Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms.

Table 4. Study Design and Conduct Gaps

Study; Trial	Allocation ^a	Blinding ^b	Selective Reporting ^c	Data Completeness ^d	Power ^e	Statistical ^f
Stupp et al (2017) ¹² ; EF-14		1. No sham control and not blinded to treatment assignment				

The evidence gaps stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

^a Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias.

^bBlinding key: 1. Not blinded to treatment assignment; 2. Not blinded outcome assessment; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician.

^cSelective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication.

^dData Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials).

^ePower key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference.

^fStatistical key: 1. Analysis is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Analysis is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated.

Section Summary: TTF Therapy as an Adjunct to Standard Maintenance Care for Newly Diagnosed GBM

The final analysis of the EF-14 trial, which included 695 patients from 83 sites, found a statistically and clinically significant increase of 2.7 months in PFS and an increase of 4.9 months in OS with the addition of TTF therapy to standard maintenance therapy (i.e., temozolomide) in patients with newly diagnosed GBM. There was no sham control, and patients were not blinded to treatment assignment, but PFS was assessed by blinded evaluators, and placebo effects on the objective measure of OS were likely to be minimal. There was no evidence of a negative impact of TTF therapy on health-related quality of life, except for itchy skin from the transducers.

TTF Therapy as an Adjunct or Alternative to Medical Therapy for Progressive or Recurrent GBM Randomized Controlled Trials

The 2011 Food and Drug Administration approval of the NovoTTF-100A System (now called Optune) was based on a phase 3 multinational RCT (EF-11), results of which were published by Stupp et al (2012).⁴ This trial compared TTF therapy alone with physician's choice medical therapy in 237 adults who had relapsed or progressive glioblastoma (see Table 5). Patients had failed conventional treatment with radiotherapy, chemotherapy, and/or surgery, and more than 80% of participants had failed 2 or more prior chemotherapy regimens. In this trial, the term chemotherapy also applied to targeted agents such as bevacizumab. Patient characteristics and performance of additional post-recurrence debulking surgery were similar in the 2 groups.

Table 5. Summary of Key Randomized Controlled Trial Characteristics for Progressive or Recurrent Glioblastoma

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	Comparator
Stupp et al (2012) ⁴ ; EF-11	U.S., E.U., Israel	28	1987-2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 237 adults with relapsed or progressive supratentorial glioblastoma KPS score $\geq 70\%$ 	120 patients treated with TTF alone, 93 (78%) completed 1 cycle	117 patients treated with physician's choice of medical therapy ^a

EU: European Union; KPS: Karnofsky Performance Status; TTF: tumor treating fields.

^a Medical therapy included bevacizumab, irinotecan, nitrosoureas, platinum-based chemotherapy (i.e., carboplatin); temozolomide; or a combination of procarbazine, chloroethyl ether, and vincristine.

Participants were followed monthly, including laboratory tests. MRI images were evaluated at 2, 4, and 6 months from initiation of treatment, with subsequent MRIs performed according to local practice until disease progression. QOL questionnaires were completed every 3 months. Medical follow-up continued for 2 months after disease progression. Monthly telephone interviews with participants' caregivers were used to assess mortality rates. The primary end point was OS. Secondary end points included PFS, the percentage of patients with PFS at 6 months, time to progression, 1-year survival rate, QOL, and radiologic response. All end points were evaluated using intention-to-treat analysis.

The trial did not reach its primary end point of improved survival compared with active medical therapy (see Table 6). With a median follow-up of 39 months, 93% of patients had died. There was not a statistically significant difference in survival rates at 1, 2, and 3 years between groups. Patients in the TTF group did not, however, suffer the typical systemic side effects of chemotherapy. The most common adverse event in the TTF group was grade 1 and 2 contact dermatitis on the scalp, which resolved with topical corticosteroids and did not require treatment breaks. Control participants experienced grade 2, 3, or 4 events by organ system related to the pharmacologic activity of chemotherapy agents used. Hematologic events of grade 2 or greater were observed in 17% of chemotherapy patients compared with 3% of TTF patients. Gastrointestinal disorders of grade 2 or greater were identified in 17% of chemotherapy patients compared with 4% of TTF patients. Severe (grades 3-4) hematologic and gastrointestinal toxicity was observed in 7% of chemotherapy controls compared with 1% of the TTF group.

Longitudinal QOL data, available in 63 (27%) participants, showed no meaningful differences between groups for the domains of global health and social functioning. However, cognitive and emotional functioning domains favored TTF therapy. Symptom scale analysis was by treatment-associated toxicity; appetite loss, diarrhea, constipation, nausea, and vomiting were directly related to the chemotherapy administration.

The trial had a number of limitations (see Tables 7 and 8), that included lack of blinding and high loss to follow-up. Discontinuation of TTF therapy occurred in 22% of patients due to noncompliance or inability to handle the device, usually within the first few days. In the control group, 21 (18%) patients did not return to the treatment site, and details on disease progression and toxicity were not available. Longitudinal QOL could be analyzed only for 27% of patients who remained on study therapy for 3 months. The trial was designed as a superiority trial and did not provide adequate evidence of noninferiority.

Table 6. Summary of Key Randomized Controlled Trial Results for Recurrent or Progressive Glioblastoma

Study; Trial	LTFU, n (%)	Median OS, mo	Progression-Free Survival		Overall Survival (95% CI), %		
			Median, mo	Rate at 6 Months (95% CI), %	1 Year	2 Years	3 Years
Stupp et al (2012) ⁴ ; EF-11							
TTF	23 (22)	6.6	2.2	21.4 (13.5 to 29.3)	20	8 (4 to 13)	4 (1 to 8)
PCC	12 (18)	6.0	2.1	15.1 (7.8 to 22.3)	20	5 (3 to 10)	1 (0 to 3)
HR (95% CI)		0.86 (0.66 to 1.12)	0.81 (0.60 to 1.09)				
P value		0.27	0.16	0.13			

CI: confidence interval; HR: hazard ratio; LTFU: loss to follow-up; PCC: physician's choice chemotherapy; TTF: tumor treating fields.

Table 7. Relevance Gaps

Study	Population ^a	Intervention ^b	Comparator ^c	Outcomes ^d	Follow-Up ^e
Stupp et al (2012) ⁴ ; EF-11			2. Physician's choice chemotherapy		

The evidence gaps stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

^a Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Clinical context is unclear; 3. Study population is unclear; 4. Study population not representative of intended use.

^b Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest.

^c Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively.

^d Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. No CONSORT reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinical significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinical significant difference not supported.

^e Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms.

Table 8. Study Design and Conduct Gaps

Study; Trial	Allocation ^a	Blinding ^b	Selective Reporting ^d	Data Completeness ^e	Power ^d	Statistical ^f
Stupp et al (2012) ⁴ ; EF-11		1. Not blinded to treatment assignment		1. 78% of TTF group completed only 1 cycle of therapy, 18% of control group lost to follow-up 1. Longitudinal QOL data were available for 27% of patients		1. Not designed as a noninferiority trial

The evidence gaps stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

QOL: quality of life.

^a Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias.

^b Blinding key: 1. Not blinded to treatment assignment; 2. Not blinded outcome assessment; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician.

^c Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication.

^d Data Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials).

^e Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference.

^f Statistical key: 1. Analysis is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Analysis is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated.

Nonrandomized Comparative Studies

Kesari et al (2017) conducted a post hoc analysis of the EF-14 trial (see Stupp et al [2017] above) to evaluate the efficacy of TTF in patients who had the first recurrence.¹³ Some patients in the temozolomide alone group crossed over to receive TTF plus chemotherapy after the first recurrence, resulting in 144 patients who received TTF fields plus chemotherapy and 60 patients who received chemotherapy alone for recurrent GBM (see Table 9). Patient characteristics and second-line treatments were well-balanced between the groups, with bevacizumab the most common second-line therapy. The median OS in patients treated with systemic therapy alone was 9.2 months (see Table 10). In comparison, the group of patients who received TTF therapy in addition to systemic therapy had a median OS of 11.8 months (p=0.043).

A registry study published Mrugala et al (2014) assessed OS data from patients who received NovoTTF therapy in a real-world, clinical practice setting (see Table 9).¹⁴ Concurrent treatment was not captured in the registry, and it is possible that some patients received combination therapy. Median OS in the PRiDe clinical practice dataset (9.6 mo) was reported as superior to that attained in the EF-11 pivotal trial (6.6 mo, p<0.001) (see Table 10). More patients in the PRiDe registry were treated for first recurrence (33% vs 9%), and more had received bevacizumab as prior therapy (55% vs 19%). The PRiDe investigators reported no novel or unexpected treatment-related adverse events compared with the EF-11 trial.

Table 9. Characteristics of Key Nonrandomized Trial Results

Study	Study Type	Country	Dates	Participants	TTF	Controls	FU
Kesari et al (2017) ¹³ .	EF-14 post hoc analysis	U.S., E.U., South Korea, Israel	2009-2016	204 patients with first recurrence in the EF-14 trial	144 patients treated with TTF plus second-line chemotherapy	60 patients treated with second-line chemotherapy	12.6 mo
Mrugala et al (2014) ¹⁴ .	Registry	U.S. (91 centers)	2011-2013	457 patients with recurrent GBM	Patient Registry Dataset (PRiDe)	EF-11	

FU: follow-up; GBM: glioblastoma; TTF: tumor treating fields.

Table 10. Summary of Key Nonrandomized Trial Results

Study	Median OS, mo	Median OS With Bevacizumab, mo
Kesari et al (2017) ¹³ ; EF-14		
TTF plus chemotherapy	11.8	11.8
Chemotherapy alone	9.2	9.0
Hazard ratio (95% CI)	0.70 (0.48 to 1.00)	0.61 (0.37 to 0.99)
P value	0.049	0.043
		1-Year OS, %
		2-Year OS, %
Mrugala et al (2014) ¹⁴ .		
PRiDe Registry	9.6	44
EF-11	6.6	20
Hazard ratio (95% CI)	0.66 (0.05 to 0.86)	
P value	<0.001	

CI: confidence interval; OS: overall survival, TTF: tumor treating fields.

Post hoc analyses of the EF-11 pivotal trial have been reported. Wong et al (2014) published a subgroup analysis to determine characteristics of responders and nonresponders in the active treatment and active treatment control.¹⁵ They found that responders had a lower grade of histology and lower daily dexamethasone use than nonresponders. A second post hoc analysis by Kanner et al (2014) of the EF-11 pivotal trial data was performed to evaluate OS among patients who finished at least 1 complete course of TTF or chemotherapy.¹⁶ The investigators reported that median OS was 7.7 months in the TTF group compared with 5.9 months in the chemotherapy group (p=0.009). These post hoc analyses are considered to be hypothesis-generating.

Section Summary: TTF Therapy as an Adjunct or Alternative to Chemotherapy for Progressive or Recurrent GBM

The single RCT for TTF as an alternative to chemotherapy reported that outcomes following TTF therapy were similar to outcomes following standard chemotherapy. However, this RCT is not sufficient to permit conclusions on the efficacy of the device. The noninferiority of TTF compared with chemotherapy might be considered a sufficient health benefit, if TTF reduced treatment toxicity. However, because the trial was not designed as a noninferiority trial no inferences of noninferiority compared with chemotherapy can be made. Physician's choice therapy during the trial was heterogeneous, although analysis indicated that survival was not affected by choice of chemotherapy. More patients in the TTF group than in the control group did not complete the treatment course. The number of patients who contributed QOL data was approximately one-quarter of total enrollment, and the self-reported QOL indicators might have been subject to bias due to the lack of blinding.

A nonrandomized post hoc evaluation of the EF-14 trial suggests that TTF may improve survival when combined with chemotherapy for recurrent GBM. This analysis should be considered hypothesis-generating, and further study in high-quality RCTs is needed.

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of alternating electrical field therapy, more commonly known as tumor treating fields (TTF) therapy, is to provide a treatment option that is better than existing therapies for malignant pleural mesothelioma. TTF has been investigated as an adjunct to pemetrexed and

platinum-based chemotherapy for the treatment of unresectable, locally advanced or metastatic, malignant pleural mesothelioma.

Patients

The relevant population of interest is patients with unresectable, locally advanced or metastatic, malignant pleural mesothelioma.

The setting is outpatient care by an oncologist.

Interventions

TTF therapy is a noninvasive technology intended to treat malignant pleural mesothelioma on an outpatient basis and at home using electrical fields. TTF therapy exposes rapidly dividing cancer cells to electric fields of low intensity and intermediate frequency (200 kHz) that alternate in perpendicular orientation. TTF therapy is proposed to inhibit tumor growth by 2 mechanisms: the arrest of cell proliferation by causing microtubule misalignment in the mitotic spindle of rapidly dividing tumor cells and apoptosis due to movement of macromolecules and organelles during telophase. Preclinical studies have indicated that the electric fields may also make the cells more susceptible to chemotherapy. The minimal treatment course duration has been determined to be approximately 4 weeks to reach tumor stabilization.

Optune (formerly NovoTTF-100A System) is the only legally marketed TTF delivery system available in the United States.

Comparators

The following practice is currently being used to make decisions about unresectable, locally advanced or metastatic, malignant pleural mesothelioma. Therapy with pemetrexed and platinum-based chemotherapy

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are whether TTF improves survival or quality of life during treatment.

The time of interest for both progression-free survival and overall survival is months to years.

Study Selection

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- To assess longer term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Within each category of study design, studies with larger sample size studies and longer duration were sought.

Prospective Single-Arm Study

TTF therapy for patients with metastatic, malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) has been evaluated in one prospective, single-arm study (STELLAR). The study has not been published in a peer-reviewed journal but is described in the FDA Summary of Safety and Probable Benefit associated with its Humanitarian Device Exemption designation.⁸ Study characteristics and results are summarized in Tables 11 and 12.

The STELLAR study enrolled 80 patients with inoperable, previously untreated MPM. Patients were treated with cisplatin or carboplatin in combination with TTF therapy delivered by the NovoTTF-100L System at 13 sites outside the U.S. The primary outcome was overall survival as measured from time of diagnosis until date of death. Secondary outcomes were progression free survival based on investigator assessment of CT scan imaging, radiological response rate, one and two year survival rates, and safety.

Median overall survival was 18.2 months and median progression free survival was 7.6 months. Seventy of the 80 patients enrolled had at least one follow up CT scan. Of those, 40% had a partial response, 57% had stable disease, and 3% progressed. The limitations of the STELLAR study are summarized in Tables 13 and 14. Because there was no control group, it is not possible to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of TTF therapy compared to standard medical care alone. Additional limitations include the small sample size and no reporting of symptoms or quality of life outcomes.

Table 11. Summary of The STELLAR Single Arm Study

Study	Study Type	Country	Dates	Participants	Treatment	Follow-Up
STELLAR FDA (2019) ⁸ . NCT02397928	Prospective, single-arm, multicenter (13 sites)	Outside the US (countries not specified)	2015- 2018	Age 18 years or older, with mesothelioma, Stage IV, not candidate for curative treatment (surgery or radiotherapy), at least 4 weeks since last surgery, life expectancy at least 3 months; able to operate the device independently or with help of a caregiver	TFields (delivered by the NovoTTF- 100L System) in combination with emetrexed and cisplatin or carboplatin N=80	Protocol specified minimum follow up of at least 12 months

Table 12. Summary of The STELLAR Single Arm Study Results

Study	Median Overall Survival (95% CI)	Median Progression- free Survival (95% CI)	One-year Survival (95% CI)	2-year survival (95% CI)	Response
STELLAR FDA (2019) ⁸ . NCT02397928	18.2 months (12.3 to 25.8)	7.6 months (6.7 to 8.6)	62.2% (50.3% to 72.0%)	41.9% (28.0% to 55.2%)	Of 70 who had a follow up CT scan: 29/70 (40%) partial response 14/70 (57%) stable disease 2/70 (3%) progressed

CI: confidence interval

Table 13. Relevance Limitations

Study	Population ^a	Intervention ^b	Comparator ^c	Outcomes ^d	Follow-Up ^e
STELLAR FDA (2019) ⁸ . NCT02397928			2. No comparator	1. quality of life not assessed	

The evidence limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

^a Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Clinical context is unclear; 3. Study population is unclear; 4. Study population not representative of intended use.

^b Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest.

^c Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively.

^d Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. No CONSORT reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinical significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinical significant difference not supported.

^e Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms.

Table 14. Study Design and Conduct Limitations

Study	Allocation ^a	Blinding ^b	Selective Reporting ^c	Data Completeness ^d	Power ^e	Statistical ^f
STELLAR FDA (2019) ⁸ NCT02397928	1. not randomized	1. not blinded	3. not published	1. 8 patients lost to followup (10%)		

The evidence limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

^a Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias.

^b Blinding key: 1. Not blinded to treatment assignment; 2. Not blinded outcome assessment; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician.

^c Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication.

^d Data Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials).

^e Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference.

^f Statistical key: 1. Analysis is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Analysis is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated.

Section Summary: TTF Therapy as an Adjunct to Pemetrexed and Platinum-based Chemotherapy

TTF therapy for patients with metastatic, malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) has been evaluated in one prospective, single-arm study conducted in 80 patients (STELLAR). The STELLAR study enrolled 80 patients with inoperable, previously untreated MPM who were treated with cisplatin or carboplatin in combination with TTF therapy at 13 sites outside the U.S. Median overall survival was 18.2 months and median progression free survival was 7.6 months. Seventy of the 80 patients enrolled had at least one follow up CT scan. Of those, 40% had a partial response, 57% had stable disease, and 3% progressed. Because there was no control group, it is not possible to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of TTF therapy compared to standard medical care alone. Additional limitations include the small sample size and no reporting of symptoms or quality of life outcomes.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have newly diagnosed GBM on maintenance therapy after initial treatment who receive TTF therapy as an adjunct to standard maintenance therapy, the evidence includes an RCT. Relevant outcomes include overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The EF-14 trial found a significant increase of 2.7 months in progression-free survival and an increase of 4.9 months in overall survival with the addition of TTF therapy to standard maintenance therapy (i.e., temozolomide) in patients with newly diagnosed GBM. Although patients were not blinded to treatment assignment, progression-free survival was assessed by blinded evaluators, and the placebo effects on the objective measure of overall survival are expected to be minimal. This technology represents a clinically significant option in the treatment of patients with GBM, for whom options are limited. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have progressive or recurrent GBM who receive TTF therapy as an adjunct or alternative to standard medical therapy, the evidence includes an RCT and nonrandomized comparative studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The single RCT evaluating TTF therapy for recurrent GBM did not show superiority of TTF therapy for the primary outcome (overall survival) compared with physicians' choice chemotherapy. Because no serious adverse effects have been identified with TTF therapy, this raises the possibility that treatment with TTF might reduce the toxicity associated with treatment for recurrent GBM. A reduction in chemotherapy-associated toxicity without loss of efficacy would be considered a net health benefit. However, this RCT is not sufficient to permit conclusions on the efficacy of the device. Because the trial was not designed as a

noninferiority trial, no inferences of noninferiority compared with chemotherapy can be made. Also, quality of life assessment was measured in an insufficient number of patients to reach firm conclusions on differences in quality of life between TTF therapy and medical treatment. The highest quality study of TTF combined with medical treatment for recurrent GBM is a post hoc analysis of the EF-14 trial. A high-quality, prospective RCT is needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have unresectable, locally advanced or metastatic, malignant pleural mesothelioma who receive TTF therapy as an adjunct to standard maintenance therapy, the evidence includes one single-arm observational study conducted in 80 patients. Relevant outcomes include overall survival, disease-specific survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The study has not been published but is described in the FDA Summary associated with its Humanitarian Device Exemption designation. In patients who received TTF therapy in combination with pemetrexed and cisplatin or carboplatin, median overall survival was 18.2 months (95% CI 12.3 to 25.8 months). Because there was no comparison group, it is not possible to make conclusions about the effectiveness of the intervention compared to medical therapy alone. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Supplemental Information

Clinical Input From Physician Specialty Societies and Academic Medical Centers

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

In response to requests from Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, input was received from 3 physician specialty societies (one of which provided 6 responses and 2 of which provided 1 response each) and 1 academic medical center (total of 9 individual responses) in 2016. There was majority support, but not consensus, for the use of tumor treatment fields therapy as an adjunct to maintenance treatment following initial therapy for glioblastoma multiforme. There was mixed support for the use of tumor treatment fields as an alternative to chemotherapy in advanced or recurrent glioblastoma multiforme.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines on central nervous system cancers (v.1.2018) include recommendations for the treatment of glioblastoma (see Table 11).³ For the initial treatment of patients with glioblastoma with good performance status and either methylated or unmethylated or indeterminate O⁶-methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase promotor status, treatment with standard brain radiotherapy plus concurrent temozolomide and adjuvant temozolomide plus alternating electric field therapy is a category 1 recommendation. Alternating electric currents therapy is only an option for patients with supratentorial disease. Consideration of alternating electric field therapy for recurrent glioblastoma is a category 2B recommendation.

Table 15. Guidelines for Adjuvant Treatment of Glioblastoma, by Age and Performance Status

Age, y	KPS Score,%	Treatment Options	Category
≤70	≥60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard RT plus concurrent and adjuvant temozolomide plus TTF • Standard RT plus concurrent and adjuvant temozolomide 	1
≤70	<60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hypofractionated RT with/without concurrent or adjuvant temozolomide • Temozolomide • Palliative/best supportive care 	2A
>70	≥60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hypofractionated RT plus concurrent and adjuvant temozolomide • Standard RT plus concurrent and adjuvant temozolomide plus TTF • Temozolomide alone 	1

Age, y	KPS Score,%	Treatment Options	Category
>70	<60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hypofractionated brain RT alone • Hypofractionated brain RT alone • Temozolomide alone • Palliative/best supportive care 	2A

KPS: Karnofsky Performance Status; RT: radiotherapy; TTF: tumor treating fields.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage

There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 12. Of particular note are the phase 3 trials evaluating TTF therapy in non-small-cell lung cancer and pancreatic cancer. TTF therapy is an active area of research for mechanisms underlying its effects on cancer cells.

Table 16. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
NCT03940196 ^a	ENGOT-ov50 / GOG-3029 / INNOVATE-3: Pivotal, Randomized, Open-label Study of Tumor Treating Fields (TFields, 200kHz) Concomitant With Weekly Paclitaxel for the Treatment of Platinum-resistant Ovarian Cancer (PROC)	540	Dec 2024
NCT01971281 ^a	A Phase II Study of TFields (150 kHz) Concomitant With Gemcitabine and TFields Concomitant With Gemcitabine Plus Nab-paclitaxel for Front-line Therapy of Advanced Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma	40	Dec 2017 (ongoing)
NCT01894061 ^a	A Prospective Phase II Trial of NovoTTF-100A With Bevacizumab (Avastin) in Patients With Recurrent Glioblastoma	40	Dec2019
NCT02663271 ^a	A Phase 2, Multi-center, Single Arm, Histologically Controlled Study Testing the Combination of TFields and Pulsed Bevacizumab Treatment in Patients With Bevacizumab-refractory Recurrent Glioblastoma	18	Mar 2020
NCT02831959 ^a	Pivotal, Open-label, Randomized Study of Radiosurgery With or Without Tumor Treating Fields (TFields) (150kHz) for 1-10 Brain Metastases From Non-small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC) (METIS)	270	Jul 2019
NCT02973789 ^a	LUNAR: Pivotal, Randomized, Open-label Study of Tumor Treating Fields (TFields) Concurrent With Standard of Care Therapies for Treatment of Stage 4 Non-small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC) Following Platinum Failure	534	Dec 2021
NCT02743078 ^a	Phase II Trial Of Optune® Plus Bevacizumab In Bevacizumab-Refractory Recurrent Glioblastoma	85	Aug 2022
NCT03377491 ^a	EF-27 Pivotal, Randomized, Open-label Study of Tumor Treating Fields (TFields, 150kHz) Concomitant With Gemcitabine and Nab-paclitaxel for Front-line Treatment of Locally-advanced Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma (PANOVA-3)	556	Dec 2022

NCT: national clinical trial.

^a Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

References

1. National Cancer Institute (NCI). Adult Central Nervous System Tumors Treatment (PDQ)Health Professional Version. 2018; https://www.cancer.gov/types/brain/hp/adult-brain-treatment-pdq#cit/section_1.1. Accessed April 28, 2018.
2. Chien LN, Gittleman H, Ostrom QT, et al. Comparative brain and central nervous system tumor incidence and survival between the United States and Taiwan Based on Population-Based Registry. *Front Public Health*. Jul 21 2016;4:151. PMID 27493936
3. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Central Nervous System Cancers. Version 1.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/cns.pdf. Accessed April 28, 2018.
4. Stupp R, Wong ET, Kanner AA, et al. NovoTTF-100A versus physician's choice chemotherapy in recurrent glioblastoma: a randomised phase III trial of a novel treatment modality. *Eur J Cancer*. Sep 2012;48(14):2192- 2202. PMID 22608262
5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Tumor treatment fields. NovoTTF-10A System. Summary of safety and effectiveness data (SSED). Premarket Approval Application (PMA) No. P100034. 2011; http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf10/P100034b.pdf. Accessed April 28, 2018.
6. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Supplemental application for device name change. 2014; http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpma/pma_template.cfm?id=p100034s010. Accessed April 28, 2018.
7. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data (SSED): Optune™ (formerly NovoTTF-100ATM System) 2015; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf10/P100034S013B.pdf. Accessed April 28, 2018.
8. US Food and Drug Administration. NovoTTF 100L System: Summary of Safety and Probable Benefit. May 23, 2019. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf18/H180002B.pdf. Accessed June 15, 2019.
9. Davies AM, Weinberg U, Palti Y. Tumor treating fields: a new frontier in cancer therapy. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. Jul 2013;1291:86-95. PMID 23659608
10. Pless M, Weinberg U. Tumor treating fields: concept, evidence and future. *Expert Opin Investig Drugs*. Aug 2011;20(8):1099-1106. PMID 21548832
11. Stupp R, Taillibert S, Kanner AA, et al. Maintenance therapy with tumor-treating fields plus temozolomide vs temozolomide alone for glioblastoma: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. Dec 15 2015;314(23):2535-2543. PMID 26670971
12. Stupp R, Taillibert S, Kanner A, et al. Effect of tumor-treating fields plus maintenance temozolomide vs maintenance temozolomide alone on survival in patients with glioblastoma: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. Dec 19 2017;318(23):2306-2316. PMID 29260225
13. Kesari S, Ram Z, Investigators EFT. Tumor-treating fields plus chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone for glioblastoma at first recurrence: a post hoc analysis of the EF-14 trial. *CNS Oncol*. Jul 2017;6(3):185-193. PMID 28399638
14. Mrugala MM, Engelhard HH, Dinh Tran D, et al. Clinical practice experience with NovoTTF-100A system for glioblastoma: The Patient Registry Dataset (PRiDe). *Semin Oncol*. Oct 2014;41(Suppl 6):S4-S13. PMID 25213869
15. Wong ET, Lok E, Swanson KD, et al. Response assessment of NovoTTF-100A versus best physician's choice chemotherapy in recurrent glioblastoma. *Cancer Med*. Jun 2014;3(3):592-602. PMID 24574359
16. Kanner AA, Wong ET, Villano JL, et al. Post Hoc analyses of intention-to-treat population in phase III comparison of NovoTTF-100A system versus best physician's choice chemotherapy. *Semin Oncol*. Oct 2014;41(Suppl 6):S25-34. PMID 25213871
17. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association. Medical Policy Reference Manual, No. 1.01.29 (July 2019).

Documentation for Clinical Review

Please provide the following documentation (if/when requested):

- History and physical and/or consultation notes including:
 - Clinical findings (i.e., pertinent symptoms and duration)
 - Karnofsky Performance Score
 - Past and present diagnostic testing and results
 - Previous treatment plan and response
 - Tumor type and description
 - Documentation of the patient's understanding on the use of the device
- Radiology report(s) and interpretation (i.e., MRI, CT scan, PET)

Post Service

- Results/reports of test performed

Coding

This Policy relates only to the services or supplies described herein. Benefits may vary according to product design; therefore, contract language should be reviewed before applying the terms of the Policy. Inclusion or exclusion of codes does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement.

MN/IE

The following services may be considered medically necessary in certain instances and investigational in others. Services may be considered medically necessary when policy criteria are met. Services may be considered investigational when the policy criteria are not met or when the code describes application of a product in the position statement that is investigational.

Type	Code	Description
CPT®	None	
HCPCS	A4555	Electrode/transducer for use with electrical stimulation device used for cancer treatment, replacement only
	E0766	Electrical stimulation device used for cancer treatment, includes all accessories, any type
ICD-10 Procedure	None	

Policy History

This section provides a chronological history of the activities, updates and changes that have occurred with this Medical Policy.

Effective Date	Action	Reason
10/31/2014	BCBSA Medical Policy adoption	Medical Policy Committee
05/01/2016	Policy revision without position change	Medical Policy Committee
10/01/2016	Policy revision without position change	Medical Policy Committee
09/01/2017	Policy revision without position change	Medical Policy Committee
11/01/2018	Policy title change from Tumor Treatment Fields Therapy for Glioblastoma Policy revision with position change	Medical Policy Committee
10/01/2019	Policy revision without position change	Medical Policy Committee

Definitions of Decision Determinations

Medically Necessary: A treatment, procedure, or drug is medically necessary only when it has been established as safe and effective for the particular symptoms or diagnosis, is not investigational or experimental, is not being provided primarily for the convenience of the patient or the provider, and is provided at the most appropriate level to treat the condition.

Investigational/Experimental: A treatment, procedure, or drug is investigational when it has not been recognized as safe and effective for use in treating the particular condition in accordance with generally accepted professional medical standards. This includes services where approval by the federal or state governmental is required prior to use, but has not yet been granted.

Split Evaluation: Blue Shield of California/Blue Shield of California Life & Health Insurance Company (Blue Shield) policy review can result in a split evaluation, where a treatment, procedure, or drug will be considered to be investigational for certain indications or conditions, but will be deemed safe and effective for other indications or conditions, and therefore potentially medically necessary in those instances.

Prior Authorization Requirements (as applicable to your plan)

Within five days before the actual date of service, the provider must confirm with Blue Shield that the member's health plan coverage is still in effect. Blue Shield reserves the right to revoke an authorization prior to services being rendered based on cancellation of the member's eligibility. Final determination of benefits will be made after review of the claim for limitations or exclusions.

Questions regarding the applicability of this policy should be directed to the Prior Authorization Department. Please call (800) 541-6652 or visit the provider portal at www.blueshieldca.com/provider.

Disclaimer: This medical policy is a guide in evaluating the medical necessity of a particular service or treatment. Blue Shield of California may consider published peer-reviewed scientific literature, national guidelines, and local standards of practice in developing its medical policy. Federal and state law, as well as contract language, including definitions and specific contract provisions/exclusions, take precedence over medical policy and must be considered first in determining covered services. Member contracts may differ in their benefits. Blue Shield reserves the right to review and update policies as appropriate.