univera HEALTHCARE

MEDICAL POLICY

MEDICAL POLICY DETAILS	
Medical Policy Title	**PLUGS FOR FISTULA REPAIR**
Policy Number	**7.01.86**
Category	**Technology Assessment**
Effective Date	**08/18/11**
Revised Date	**07/19/12, 06/20/13, 05/22/14, 04/16/15, 03/17/16, 03/16/17, 03/15/18**
Archived Date	**03/21/19**
Edited Date	**02/20/20**
Product Disclaimer	• *If a product excludes coverage for a service, it is not covered, and medical policy criteria do not apply.* • *If a commercial product (including an Essential Plan product) or a Medicaid product covers a specific service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.* • *If a Medicare product covers a specific service, and there is no national or local Medicare coverage decision for the service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.*

POLICY STATEMENT

Based upon our criteria and assessment of peer-reviewed literature, biosynthetic fistula plugs, including plugs made of porcine small intestine submucosa or of synthetic material, have not been medically proven effective and, therefore, are considered **investigational** for all indications, including, but not limited to, the repair of anal and rectal fistulas.

POLICY GUIDELINES

The Federal Employee Health Benefit Program (FEHBP/FEP) requires that procedures, devices or laboratory tests approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) may not be considered investigational and, thus, these procedures, devices or laboratory tests may be assessed only on the basis of their medical necessity.

DESCRIPTION

An anal fistula is an abnormal communication between the interior of the anal canal or rectum and the skin surface. Rarer forms may communicate with the vagina or other pelvic structures, including the bowel. Most fistulas begin as anorectal abscesses. When the abscess opens spontaneously into the anal canal (or has been opened surgically), a fistula may occur. Anal fistulas are described as low (present in the lower part and not extending up to the anorectal sling) or high (extending up to or beyond the anorectal sling). High fistula can be associated with incontinence. Anal fistulas are also classified according to their relationship with the external sphincter. Intersphincteric fistulas are the most common and cross only the internal sphincter. Transsphincteric fistulas pass through the internal and external sphincters. The type of surgical treatment depends on the location and complexity of the fistula. Treatments include fistulotomy/fistulectomy, endorectal/anal sliding flaps, seton drain, and fibrin glue. Lay-open fistulotomy in high fistulas carries risk of incontinence. Draining setons can control sepsis, but few patients heal after removal of the seton, and they are poorly tolerated long-term. Cutting setons can cause continence disturbances. Because of recurrence rates and the significant risk of incontinence with these surgical procedures, sphincter-preserving techniques such as fistula plugs have been evaluated and proposed as an alternative method in the treatment of anorectal fistulas.

Anal fistula plugs are biosynthetic devices used to promote healing and prevent recurrence of an anal fistula. In a minimally invasive procedure, the fistula tract is identified using a probe or imaging techniques and then cleaned by irrigation. The conical-shaped fistula plug is pulled into the tract until it blocks the internal opening and then is anchored in place with sutures. The external opening is not completely sealed so that drainage of the fistula can continue. The plug reinforces the soft tissue and then acts as a scaffold into which new tissue can grow to close the fistula. The plug is usually absorbed into the body in six to eight weeks. The procedure can be repeated in case of failure.

RATIONALE

The SIS Fistula Plug from Cook Biotech Incorporated received 510(k) clearance from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in March 2005 based on similarity to predicate devices, including the SURGISIS® Soft Tissue Graft and the STRATASIS® Urethral Sling, both manufactured by Cook Biotech Incorporated. The SIS Fistula Plug is manufactured from porcine small intestinal submucosa (SIS) and is intended for repair of anal, rectal, and enterocutaneous fistulas. The modified SIS Fistula Plug, also manufactured from porcine small intestinal submucosa (SIS), is supplied in a tapered configuration with a button, to provide increased retention of the plug and improved blockage of the fistula. It received 510(k) clearance in October 2006. In March 2009, W.L. Gore & Associates received 510(k) clearance for the BIO-A® Fistula Plug, intended for use in anorectal fistulas. The GORE® BIO-A® Fistula Plug device comprises a porous structure of synthetic bioabsorbable PGA/TMC copolymer fiber, degraded via a combination of hydrolytic and enzymatic pathways, and the same material, technology, and three-dimensional disk with tubes mesh design as the predicate GORE Bioabsorbable Mesh hernia plug device. The indications for use and performance of the GORE® BIO-A® Fistula Plug are substantially equivalent to the predicate Cook SIS Fistula Plug.

In a European trial, H Ortiz and colleagues (2009) compared the use of porcine submucosal (Surgisis) anal fistula plug (AFP) with an endorectal anal flap (ERAF) procedure in a randomized controlled trial (RCT) with 43 patients who had high anal fistula. The primary endpoint was fistula healing. Recurrence was defined as the presence of an abscess in the same area or obvious evidence of fistulization. Five patients in the AFP group and six in the ERAF group did not receive the allocated intervention, leaving 32 patients. One patient in the AFP group was lost to follow-up. A large number of recurrences in the fistula plug group led to premature closure of the trial. After one year, fistula recurrence was seen in 12 of 15 patients treated with an anal fistula plug versus two of 16 patients who underwent the flap procedure (relative risk 6.40 [95% confidence interval 1.70-23.97]); p less than 0.001). Fistulas recurred in nine of 16 patients who had previously undergone fistula surgery; eight of the nine patients had an AFP. A trend for more sphincter involvement and more females in the ERAF group was noted. Complications were not reported in this paper.

PJ van Koperen, *et al.* (2008) conducted an RCT to compare a fistula plug (n=31) with a mucosal advancement flap (n=29) for the treatment of high transsphincteric fistulas. At a follow-up of 11 months, the recurrence rates were 71% (n=22) in the anal fistula plug group and 52% (n=15) in the mucosal advancement flap group, which was not significantly different (p=.126). There were no significant differences in postoperative pain, pre- and postoperative incontinence scores, soiling, or quality of life. One patient in the plug group and two in the flap group experienced postoperative complications (abscess, pain, bleeding retrospectively).

D Christoforidis, *et al.* (2009) performed a retrospective analysis of patients from a U.S. center with transsphincteric fistulas treated with ERAF (n=43) or anal plug (Surgisis) (n=37) between January 1996 and April 2007. Success was defined as closed external opening in absence of symptoms at minimal follow-up of six months. The success rate was 63% in the ERAF group and 32% in the AFP group after a mean follow-up of 56 (range, 6–136) months for ERAF and 14 (range, 6–22) months for AFP. After exclusion of patients with early AFP extrusion, which may be considered a technical failure, the ERAF advantage did not meet statistical significance (p=0.06). Twenty-three of 27 patients who had ERAF and seven of 12 patients who had AFP responded to a questionnaire addressing functional outcomes. In the ERAF group, 11 of 23 patients had no continence disturbance versus six of seven in the AFP group. The lack of prospectively collected incontinence scores prior to the procedure and low response rate in the AFP group prohibit valid comparisons on functional outcomes. Complication rates were low in both groups; two patients in the ERAF group required reoperation for bleeding. No serious complications occurred in the AFP group. The authors concluded that "randomized trials are needed to further elucidate the efficacy and potential functional benefit of AFP in the treatment of complex anal fistulas."

Wang, *et al.* (2009) compared outcomes of all patients with transsphincteric fistulas treated with AFP from July 2005 to December 2006 (n=29) and compared them with historical controls treated with ERAF (2001–2005) (n=26). Of 26 initial flap procedures, 10 failed and 16 healed. Of 29 initial plug procedures, 19 failed and 10 healed. In total, 30 advancement flaps and 34 plug procedures were performed (including the additional treatments for failed initial procedures). Closure

rates were 34% for plugs (mean follow-up 279 [range, 110–690] days) and 62% for flaps (median follow-up 819 [range, 93–1928] days; p=0.045). Complications were not reported. The authors concluded that a systematic randomized trial with long-term follow-up comparing advancement flaps with fistula plugs is needed, and they calculated that 112 patients would need to be randomized to detect a statistically significant difference in success rates for each procedure. Because the fistula plugs are costly, the authors recommended that a cost-benefit analysis be performed.

A 2009 systematic review to assess the efficacy of the anal fistula plug by P Garg and colleagues reported a wide range of success rates. In the 12 included studies, all case series, reported success rates for the AFP procedure were from 24% to 92%. Success rates in treating complex fistula-in-ano in the eight prospective studies reviewed were 35%–87%. The authors concluded that, while the anal fistula plug procedure appeared safe, further RCTs are needed.

In 2012, three reviews were published comparing AFP to conventional surgical treatment for anal fistulas. Pu and colleagues undertook a meta-analysis of five studies (two RCTs and three retrospective studies) published through April 2012. Treatment options in the conventional arm of this review included endorectal/mucosal advancement flaps, fibrin glue, and seton drains. On combined analysis, AFP patients had a higher recurrence rate (62%) compared to those undergoing conventional treatment options (47%) after three months of follow-up (5 studies, 428 patients; p=0.004,).

Leng and Jin undertook a meta-analysis of six studies published through April 2011 (three RCTs, two retrospective studies, and one cohort study) involving 408 patients, comparing AFP with mucosal advancement flap (MAF). On combined analysis, the differences in the overall success rates (six studies) and incidence of fistula recurrence (four studies, including three RCTs) were not statistically significant between the AFP and MAF. The risk of continence postoperatively (three studies, including two RCTs), however, was reported to be lower with AFP. In addition to the small numbers of controlled studies and limited follow-up, the findings of this meta-analysis were further limited by significant heterogeneity across studies.

O'Riordan and colleagues undertook a systematic review of AFP for patients with Crohn's and non-Crohn's-related anal fistulas. The follow-up period across studies ranged from three months to 24.5 months. The pooled proportion of patients achieving fistula closure in patients with non-Crohn's anal fistula was 0.54. The proportion achieving closure in patients with Crohn's disease was similar. There were no reported cases of any significant change in continence after AFP insertion in any of the study patients (n=196). The findings of this systematic review were limited by the variability of operative technique and perioperative care across studies, which may influence the probability of success or failure associated with the AFP.

Overall, the evidence of efficacy of anal fistula plug treatment is limited. Two randomized controlled trials and retrospective comparisons did not demonstrate that anal plugs improved healing rates or reduced recurrence of anal fistulas. Numerous case series report a wide range of results (e.g., CN Ellis, *et al.* (2010), BJ Champagne, *et al.* (2006), MF McGee, *et al.* (2010), S Gonsalves, *et al.* (2009)) and contribute to the inability to allow conclusions to be drawn related to the long-term efficacy of fistula plugs. Randomized controlled trials with sufficient numbers of patients and with appropriate length of follow-up reporting healing and recurrence rates, and sphincter function before and after procedures, are required.

CODES

- *Eligibility for reimbursement is based upon the benefits set forth in the member's subscriber contract.*
- *CODES MAY NOT BE COVERED UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES. PLEASE READ THE POLICY AND GUIDELINES STATEMENTS CAREFULLY.*
- *Codes may not be all inclusive as the AMA and CMS code updates may occur more frequently than policy updates.*
- *Code Key: Experimental/Investigational = (E/I), Not medically necessary/ appropriate = (NMN).*

CPT Codes

Code	Description
46707 **(E/I)**	Repair of anorectal fistula with plug (e.g., porcine small intestine mucosa [SIS])

Copyright © 2020 American Medical Association, Chicago, IL

HCPCS Codes

Code	Description
No specific codes	

ICD10 Codes

Code	Description
J86.0	Pyothorax with fistula
K50.013	Crohn's disease of small intestine with fistula
K50.113	Crohn's disease of large intestine with fistula
K50.813	Crohn's disease of both small and large intestine with fistula
K50.913	Crohn's disease, unspecified, with fistula
K51.013	Ulcerative (chronic) pancolitis with fistula
K51.213	Ulcerative (chronic) proctitis with fistula
K51.313	Ulcerative (chronic) rectosigmoiditis with fistula
K51.413	Inflammatory polyps of colon with fistula
K51.513	Left sided colitis with fistula
K51.813	Other ulcerative colitis with fistula
K51.913	Ulcerative colitis, unspecified with fistula
K60.3-K60.5	Anal rectal fistulas (code range)
K63.2	Fistula of intestine
N32.1	Vesicointestinal fistula
N32.2	Vesical fistula, not elsewhere classified
N82.2-N82.4	Female intestinal-genital tract fistula (code range)

REFERENCES

*Adamina M, et al. To plug or not to plug: a cost effectiveness analysis for complex anal fistula. Surgery 2010 Jan;147(1):72-8.

Almeida IS, et al. Treatment of fistula in-ano with fistula plug: experience of a tertiary care centre in South Asia and comparison of results with the West. BMC Res Notes 2018 Jul 28;11(1):513.

BlueCross BlueShield Association. Plug for Fistula Repair. Medical Policy Reference Manual. Policy #7.01.123. 2019 Nov 14.

*Champagne BJ, et al. Rectovaginal fistula. Surg Clin North Am 2010 Feb;90(1):69-82.

*Champagne BJ, et al. Efficacy of anal fistula plug in closure of cryptoglandular fistulas: long-term follow-up. Dis Colon Rectum 2006 Dec.49(12):1817-21.

*Christoforidis D, et al. Treatment of transsphincteric anal fistulas by endorectal advancement flap or collagen fistula plug: a comparative study. Dis Colon Rectum 2009 Jan;52(1):18-22.

*El-Gazzaz G, et al. A retrospective review of chronic anal fistulae treated by anal fistulae plug. Colorectal Dis 2010 May;12(5):442-7.

*Ellis CN, et al. Long-term outcomes with the use of bioprosthetic plugs for the management of complex anal fistulas. Dis Colon Rectum 2010 May;53(5):798-802.

Fisher OM, et al. An outcome and cost analysis of anal fistula plug insertion versus endorectal advancement flap for complex anal fistulae. Colorectal Dis 2015 July;17(7):619-626.

*Garg P, et al. The efficacy of anal fistula plug in fistula-in-ano: a systematic review. Colorectal Dis 2010 Oct;12(10):965-70.

*Gonsalves S, et al. Assessment of efficacy of the rectovaginal button fistula plug for the treatment of ileo pouch-vaginal and rectovaginal fistulas. Dis Colon Rectum 2009 Nov;52(11):1877-81.

Gottgens KW, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of surgical interventions for high cryptoglandular perianal fistula. In J Colorectal Dis 2015 May;30(5):583-93.

Han JG, et al. Ligation of intersphincteric fistula tract vs ligation of the intersphincteric fistula tract plus a bioprosthetic anal fistula plug procedure in patients with transsphincteric anal fistula: early results of a multicenter prospective randomized trial. Ann Surg 2016 Dec;264(6):917-922.

Herold A, et al. Results of the Gore Bio-A fistula plug implantation in the treatment of anal fistula: a multicenter study. Tech Coloproctol 2016 Aug;20(8):585-590.

*Jacob TJ, et al. Surgical intervention for anorectal fistula. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2010 May 12;(5):CD006319.

*Johnson EK, et al. Efficacy of anal fistula plug vs fibrin glue in closure of anorectal fistulas. Dis Colon Rectum 2006 Mar;49(3):371-6.

Kockerling F, et al. Treatment of fistula-in-ano with fistula plug- a review under special consideration of the technique. Front Surg 2015 Oct 16;2:55.

*Lenisa L, et al. Anal fistula plug is a valid alternative option for the treatment of complex anal fistula in the long term. Int J Colorectal Dis 2010 Dec;25(12):1487-93.

Limura E, et al. Modern management of anal fistula. World J Gastroenterol 2015 Jan 7;21(1):12-20.

*Lin H, et al. Anal fistula plug vs rectal advancement flap for the treatment of complex cryptoglandular anal fistulas: a system review and meta-analysis of studies with long-term follow-up. Colorectal Dis 2019 May;21(5):502-515.

*Lupinacci RM, et al. Treatment of fistula-in-ano with the Surgisis® AFP™ anal fistula plug. Gastroenterol Clin Biol 2010 Oct;34(10):549-53.

*McGee MF, et al. Tract length predicts successful closure with anal fistula plug in cryptoglandular fistulas. Dis Colon Rectum 2010 Aug;53(8):1116-20.

Narang SK, et al. Delayed absorbable synthetic plug (GORE® BIO-A®) for the treatment of fistula-in-ano: a systematic review. Colorectal Dis 2016 Jan;18(1):37-44.

Nasseri Y, et al. The anal fistula plug in Crohn's disease patients with fistula-in-ano: a systematic review. Colorectal Dis 2016 April;18(4):351-356.

*Pinto RA, et al. Are there predictors of outcome following rectovaginal fistula repair? Dis Colon Rectum 2010 Sep;53(9):1240-7.

*O'Connor L, et al. Efficacy of anal fistula plug in closure of Crohn's anorectal fistulas. Dis Colon Rectum 2006 Oct;49(10):1569-73.

*Ortiz H, et al. Randomized clinical trial of anal fistula plug versus endorectal advancement flap for the treatment of high cryptoglandular fistula in ano. Br J Surg 2009 Jun;96(6):608-12.

Ozturk E. Treatment of recurrent anal fistula using an autologous cartilage plug: a pilot study. Tech Colorectal 2015 May;19(5):301-7.

*Rizzo JA, et al. Anorectal abscess and fistula-in-ano: evidence-based management. Surg Clin North AM 2010 Feb;90(1):45-68.

*Safar B, et al. Anal fistula plug: initial experience and outcomes. Dis Colon Rectum 2009 Feb;52(2):248-52.

Sakata KK, et al. Extracellular matrix fistula plug for repair of bronchopleural fistula. Respir Med Case Rep 2018 Sep 13;25:207-210.

*Schwandner O, et al. Initial experience on efficacy in closure of cryptoglandular and Crohn's transsphincteric fistulas by the use of the anal fistula plug. In J Colorectal Dis 2008 Mar;23(3):319-24.

*Schwandner O, et al. Preliminary results on efficacy in closure of transsphincteric and rectovaginal fistulas associated with Crohn's disease using new biomaterials. Surg Innov 2009 Jun;16(2):162-8.

Senejoux A, et al. Fistula plug in fistulizing ano-perineal Crohn's disease: a randomized controlled trial. J Crohns Colitis 2016 Feb;10(2):141-148.

Stamos MJ, et al. Prospective multicenter study of a synthetic bioabsorbable anal fistula plug to treat cryptoglandular transsphincter anal fistulas. Did Colon Rectum 2015 Mar;58(3):344-51.

Sugrue J, et al. Sphincter-sparing anal fistula repair: are we getting better? Dis Colon Rectum 2017 Oct;60(10):1071-1077.

*Thekkinkattil DK, et al. Efficacy of the anal fistula plug in complex anorectal fistulae. Colorectal Dis 2009 Jul;11(6):584-7.

*Van Koperen PJ, et al. Anal fistula plug for closure of difficult anorectal fistula: a prospective study. Dis Colon Rectum 2007 Dec;50(12):2168-72.

*Van Koperen PJ, et al. The anal fistula plug treatment compared with mucosal advancement flap for cryptoglandular high transsphincteric perianal fistula: a double-blinded multicenter randomized trial. BMC Surg 2008 Jun 23;8:11.

Vogel JD, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the management of anorectal abscess, fistula-in-ano, and rectovaginal fistula. Dis Colon Rectum 2016 Dec;59(12):1117-1133.

*Wang JY, et al. Treatment of transsphincteric anal fistulas: are fistula plugs an acceptable alternative? Dis Colon Rectum 2009 Apr;52(4):692-7.

*Whiteford MH, et al. Practice parameters for the treatment of perianal abscess and fistula-inano (revised). Dis Colon Rectum 2005 Jul;48(7):1337-42.

Xu Y, et al. Comparison of an anal fistula plug and mucosa advancement flap for complex anal fistulas: a meta-analysis. ANZ J Surg 2016 Dec;86(12):978-982.

*Key Article

KEY WORDS

Fistula plug

CMS COVERAGE FOR MEDICARE PRODUCT MEMBERS

Based upon our review, repair of an anal fistula with a fistula plug is not addressed in National or regional CMS coverage determinations or policies.