Coverage Policy

In certain markets, delegated vendor guidelines may be used to support medical necessity and other coverage determinations.

HOME/PORTABLE SLEEP STUDY AND IN-FACILITY POLYSOMNOGRAPHY (PSG) ADULT:

Cigna covers a sleep study as medically necessary for the diagnosis of suspected obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in an adult (age 18 or older) when BOTH of the following criteria are met (Refer to the sections below to determine whether in-facility PSG or home/portable testing is indicated):

- evidence of daytime sleepiness (e.g., excessive sleepiness not explained by other factors, non-refreshing sleep, sleep fragmentation)
- ANY of the following additional symptoms or risk factors of OSA:
  - witnessed apneas
  - gasping or choking at night
  - disruptive snoring
  - increased neck circumference (i.e., > 17 inches in men, > 16 inches in women)
  - obesity (i.e., body mass index ≥ 30)

Home/Portable Study:

Cigna covers a home/portable sleep study* as medically necessary for the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in an adult (age 18 or older) when ALL of the following criteria are met:
• study/test equipment meets the minimum definition described in at least one of the following Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) or Health Care Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) codes:
  ➢ 95800: Sleep study, unattended, simultaneous recording: heart rate, oxygen saturation, respiratory analysis (eg, by airflow or peripheral arterial tone) and sleep time
  ➢ 95801: Sleep study, unattended, simultaneous recording: minimum of heart rate, oxygen saturation, and respiratory analysis (eg, by airflow or peripheral arterial tone)
  ➢ 95806: Sleep study, unattended, simultaneous recording of heart rate, oxygen saturation, respiratory airflow, and respiratory effort (eg, thoracoabdominal movement)
  ➢ G0398: Home sleep study test (HST) with type II portable monitor, unattended; minimum of 7 channels: EEG, EOG, EMG, ECG/heart rate, airflow, respiratory effort and oxygen saturation
  ➢ G0399: Home sleep test (HST) with type III portable monitor, unattended; minimum of 4 channels: 2 respiratory movement/airflow, 1 ECG/heart rate and 1 oxygen saturation
• medical necessity criteria for a sleep study for suspected OSA as outlined above have been met
• absence of significant comorbid condition that would be expected to degrade the accuracy of a home/portable study, such as any of the following:
  ➢ moderate to severe pulmonary disease, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), documented on pulmonary function studies (PFTs)
  ➢ moderate to severe neuromuscular/neurodegenerative disorder causing restrictive lung diseases (e.g., kyphoscoliosis, myasthenia gravis, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), post-polio, syndrome, polymyositis, Guillian Barre syndrome)
  ➢ congestive heart failure New York Heart Association (NYHA) Class III or IV (LVEF ≤ 45%)
  ➢ obesity hypoventilation syndrome, previously documented (defined as pCO2 > 45 mmHg and pO2 < 60 mmHg on arterial blood gas)
  ➢ pulmonary hypertension (defined as mean pulmonary artery pressure (mPAP) ≥ 25 mmHg)
• no sleep disorder other than OSA is suspected (e.g., central sleep apnea, periodic limb movement disorder, complex; potentially injurious or violent parasomnias, narcolepsy, REM behavior sleep disorder, nocturnal seizures)

*Note: A home/portable study is considered to be one study, whether performed during a single night or during two or more consecutive nights.

Cigna covers a follow-up home/portable sleep study when the diagnosis of OSA has been established in an adult (age 18 or older) when ALL of the following criteria are met:

• testing is to be performed for ANY of the following:
  ➢ confirmation of therapeutic benefit following final adjustment of a mandibular repositioning appliance (MRA)
  ➢ assessment of results following surgical treatment for OSA
  ➢ clinical response is insufficient or symptoms return despite a good initial response to oral appliance therapy
• no significant oxygen desaturation* during diagnostic sleep study
• absence of comorbid sleep disorder or significant comorbid medical condition, as described above, that would be expected to degrade the accuracy of a home/portable study

Cigna covers home titration using auto-titrating PAP (APAP) to determine a fixed CPAP pressure for ongoing treatment when ALL of the following criteria are met:

• individual meets the criteria for PAP (detailed in PAP section below)
• individual does not have a comorbid condition that would be expected to degrade the accuracy of auto-titration, such as any of the following:
  ➢ congestive heart failure NYHA Class III or IV (LVEF ≤ 45%)
  ➢ moderate to severe pulmonary disease, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), documented on pulmonary function studies (PFTs)
  ➢ prior diagnosis of central sleep apnea
  ➢ pulmonary hypertension (defined as mPAP ≥ 25 mmHg)
no evidence of nocturnal oxygen (O₂) desaturation* caused by a condition other than OSA (e.g. obesity hypoventilation syndrome [defined as pCO₂ > 45 mmHg and pO₂ < 60 mmHg on arterial blood gas])

Cigna covers follow-up home titration using APAP when ALL of the following criteria are met:

- no comorbid condition that would be expected to degrade the accuracy of auto-titration
- no evidence of nocturnal oxygen desaturation* caused by a condition other than OSA (as described above)
- procedure to be performed for ANY of the following:
  - to determine whether pressure adjustment is needed when clinical response is insufficient or symptoms return despite a good initial response to PAP
  - substantial weight loss (e.g., 10% of body weight) to determine if adjustment of PAP pressure is indicated
  - substantial weight gain (e.g., 10% of body weight) with return of symptoms despite continued use of CPAP, to determine if adjustment of PAP pressure is indicated

* Significant oxygen desaturation:
- O₂ saturation < 80% for > 1% of sleep time or < 90% for > 30% of sleep time during prior diagnostic facility-based study

Cigna does not cover a Type IV home-portable sleep study (HCPCS code G0400) for any indication because it is considered experimental, investigational or unproven.

Cigna does not cover a home/portable sleep study for any other indication (e.g., to assess the efficacy of PAP therapy) because it is considered not medically necessary.

In-Facility Polysomnography (PSG)-Full-Night:

Cigna covers full night in-facility polysomnography (PSG) (CPT codes 95808, 95810) as medically necessary in an adult (age 18 or older) when BOTH of the following criteria are met:

- medical necessity criteria for a sleep study for suspected obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) as outlined above have been met
- ANY of the following:
  - significant comorbid condition that would be expected to degrade the accuracy of a home/portable study such as any of the following:
    - moderate to severe pulmonary disease, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)
    - moderate to severe neuromuscular/neurodegenerative disorder causing restrictive lung diseases (e.g., kyphoscoliosis, myasthenia gravis, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), post-polio syndrome, polymyositis, Guillain Barre syndrome)
    - congestive heart failure (moderate to severe) NYHA Class III or IV (LVEF ≤ 45%)
    - obesity hypoventilation syndrome, previously documented (defined as pCO₂ > 45 mmHg and pO₂ < 60 mmHg on arterial blood gas)
    - pulmonary hypertension (defined as mPAP ≥ 25 mmHg)
  - sleep disorder other than OSA is suspected (e.g., central sleep apnea, periodic limb movement disorder, complex; potentially injurious of violent parasomnias, narcolepsy, REM behavior sleep disorder, nocturnal seizures) that is corroborated by the clinical documentation
  - recent home/portable testing proved to be technically inadequate or failed to establish the diagnosis of OSA in an individual with high pretest likelihood of OSA
  - individual and caregiver/companion incapable of operating home testing equipment

Cigna covers full night in-facility polysomnography (PSG) (CPT codes 95808, 95810) as medically necessary prior to a planned multiple sleep latency test (MSLT) in an adult (age 18 or older) with suspected narcolepsy.

In-Facility Polysomnography (PSG) with Initiation of Positive Airway Pressure (PAP) (Split-Night Study):
Cigna covers split-night in-facility polysomnography (PSG) (CPT code 95811), in which the initial diagnostic portion of the PSG is followed by positive airway pressure (PAP) titration, as medically necessary in an adult (age 18 or older) when ALL of the following criteria are met:

- medical necessity criteria for a sleep study for suspected obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) as outlined above have been met
- apnea/hypopnea index (AHI) or respiratory disturbance index (RDI) of 15 or higher during initial diagnostic portion of split-night study, or AHI or RDI ≥ 5 with symptoms indicative of significant OSA (e.g., repetitive obstructions, significant oxygen desaturation [i.e. oxygen saturation < 80% for > 1% of sleep time or < 90% for > 30% of sleep time during a diagnostic facility based PSG])
- ANY of the following:
  - significant comorbid condition that would be expected to degrade the accuracy of a home/portable study such as any of the following
    - moderate to severe pulmonary disease, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), documented on pulmonary function studies (PFTs)
    - moderate to severe neuromuscular/neurodegenerative disorder causing restrictive lung diseases (e.g., kyphoscoliosis, myasthenia gravis, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), post-polio syndrome, polymyositis, Guillain Barre syndrome)
    - congestive heart failure (moderate to severe), NYHA Class III or IV (LVEF ≤ 45%)
    - obesity hypoventilation syndrome, previously documented (defined as pCO2 > 45 mmHg and pO2 < 60 mmHg on arterial blood gas)
    - pulmonary hypertension (defined as mPAP ≥ 25 mmHg)
  - sleep disorder other than OSA is suspected (e.g., central sleep apnea, periodic limb movement disorder, complex; potentially injurious or violent parasomnias, narcolepsy, REM behavior sleep disorder, nocturnal seizures) and is corroborated by the clinical documentation
  - recent home/portable testing proved to be technically inadequate or failed to establish the diagnosis of OSA in an individual with high pretest likelihood of OSA
  - individual and caregiver/companion incapable of operating home testing equipment

In-Facility Polysomnography (PSG)-Positive Airway Pressure (PAP) Titration:

Cigna covers in-facility PSG (CPT code 95811) for PAP titration, following a prior diagnostic study as medically necessary in an adult (age 18 or older) when ALL of the following criteria are met:

- AHI or RDI or Respiratory Event Index (REI) ≥ 15 documented on prior PSG or home/portable study, or AHI or RDI or REI ≥ 5 and < 15, with symptoms of OSA (e.g., excessive daytime sleepiness, impaired cognition, mood disorders or insomnia), or with hypertension, ischemic heart disease or history of stroke
- AHI or RDI or REI was calculated based on at least two hours of continuous recorded sleep or, if calculated based on less than two hours of sleep, the total number of recorded events to calculate the AHI or RDI was, at a minimum, the number of events that would have been required in a two-hour period.
- ANY of the following:
  - a comorbid sleep disorder (e.g., significant central sleep apnea [i.e., central sleep apneas/hypopneas > 50% of total apneas/hypopneas, or ≥ 5 central apneas/hypopneas per hour], periodic limb movement disorder [≥ 15 periodic limb movements per hour resulting in arousal], complex; potentially injurious of violent parasomnias, narcolepsy, REM behavior sleep disorder, nocturnal seizures) corroborated by the clinical documentation
  - a significant comorbid condition that would be expected to degrade the accuracy of a home/portable study, such as any of the following
    - moderate to severe pulmonary disease, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), as documented on pulmonary function studies (PFTs)
    - moderate to severe neuromuscular/neurodegenerative disorder causing restrictive lung diseases (e.g., kyphoscoliosis, myasthenia gravis, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), post-polio, polymyositis, Guillain Barre syndrome)
    - congestive heart failure (moderate to severe), NYHA Class III or IV (LVEF ≤ 45%)
o obesity hypoventilation syndrome, previously documented (defined as pCO2 > 45 mmHg and pO2 < 60 mmHg on arterial blood gas)
o pulmonary hypertension (defined as mPAP ≥ 25 mmHg)
o individuals with significant oxygen desaturation described as O2 saturation < 80% for > 1% of sleep time or < 90% for > 30% of sleep time during prior diagnostic facility-based study

Cigna covers in-facility PSG (CPT code 95811) for re-titration of PAP as medically necessary in an adult (age 18 or older) when BOTH of the following criteria are met:

- clinical response to PAP is insufficient or symptoms return despite objective compliance with PAP therapy
- individuals with significant oxygen desaturation* during diagnostic sleep study, or presence of a comorbid sleep disorder or significant comorbid medical condition as described above

* Significant oxygen desaturation:
- O2 saturation < 80% for > 1% of sleep time or < 90% for > 30% of sleep time during prior diagnostic facility-based study

Cigna does not cover adult in-facility PSG for any other indication because it is considered not medically necessary.

Cigna does not cover an abbreviated cardiorespiratory sleep study to acclimate an individual to PAP (e.g., PAP-Nap study, CPT code 95807-52) because it is considered experimental, investigational or unproven.

HOME/PORTABLE SLEEP STUDY AND IN-FACILITY POLYSOMNOGRAPHY-CHILD:

In-Facility Polysomnography:

Cigna covers pediatric in-facility polysomnography (PSG) (CPT codes 95782, 95783, 95808, 95810, 95811) as medically necessary for ANY the following indications:

- suspected sleep apnea, including obstructive sleep apnea (OSA), based on clinical assessment
- following adenotonsillectomy in a child with mild preoperative OSA with residual symptoms of OSA
- following adenotonsillectomy to assess for residual OSA in child with preoperative evidence of moderate to severe OSA, obesity, craniofacial anomalies that obstruct the upper airway, or neurologic disorder (e.g., Down syndrome, Prader-Willi syndrome, myelomeningocele)
- titration of positive airway pressure (PAP) in a child with OSA
- suspected congenital central alveolar hypoventilation syndrome or sleep related hypoventilation due to neuromuscular disorders or chest wall deformities
- primary apnea of infancy
- evidence of a sleep related breathing disorder in infant who has experienced an apparent life threatening event (ALTE)
- child being considered for adenotonsillectomy to treat OSA
- follow-up for child on chronic PAP support, to determine whether pressure requirements have changed due to growth and development; if symptoms recur while on PAP; or if additional or alternate treatment is instituted
- assessment of response to treatment with an oral appliance
- noninvasive positive pressure ventilation (NIPPV) titration in child with other sleep-related breathing disorder (SRBD)
- evaluation of child treated with mechanical ventilation for adjustment of ventilator settings.
- evaluation prior to decannulation in child treated with tracheostomy for SRBD
- clinical suspicion of an accompanying sleep related breathing disorder in a child with chronic asthma, cystic fibrosis, pulmonary hypertension, bronchopulmonary dysplasia, or chest wall abnormality (e.g., kyphoscoliosis)
Cigna does not cover pediatric in-facility PSG for any other indication because it is considered not medically necessary.

**Home/Portable Testing:**

Cigna does not cover a home/portable sleep study for the diagnosis of OSA in a child younger than age 18 years because it is considered experimental, investigational or unproven.

Cigna does not cover an in-facility polysomnography (PSG) or home/portable sleep study in an adult or child for any of the following indications because each is considered experimental, investigational or unproven (this list may not be all-inclusive):

- chronic lung disease
- circadian rhythm disorders
- depression
- seizures in the absence of symptoms of sleep disorder
- transient or chronic insomnia
- insomnia associated with psychiatric disorders
- snoring without excessive daytime sleepiness

**OTHER DIAGNOSTIC TESTS:**

Cigna covers maintenance of wakefulness testing (MWT) (CPT code 95805) as medically necessary to evaluate response to treatment for obstructive sleep apnea, narcolepsy, or periodic limb movement disorder.

Cigna covers multiple sleep latency testing (MSLT) as medically necessary for the evaluation of suspected narcolepsy when other sleep disorders have been ruled out by PSG.

Cigna covers MSLT as medically necessary for the evaluation of narcolepsy when pharmacotherapy is initiated or continued and a previous MSLT is not available.

Cigna does not cover MSLT or MWT (CPT code 95805) for the diagnosis of OSA because it is considered not medically necessary.

Cigna does not cover EITHER of the following devices/procedures for the diagnosis of OSA or other sleep disorders in an adult or child because they are considered experimental, investigational or unproven (this list may not be all-inclusive):

- SleepStrip™
- Actigraphy (CPT code 95803)

Coverage of, testing for, and the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea and other sleep disorders is subject to the terms, conditions and limitations as described in the applicable benefit plan’s schedule of copayments. Please refer to the applicable benefit plan document and schedules to determine benefit availability and the terms, conditions and limitations of coverage particularly around coverage for testing required for employment, insurance coverage, or government license purposes. Even when there is no exclusion in the benefit plan for such coverage, Cigna considers screening for or the evaluation of obstructive sleep apnea or other sleep disorder to be not medically necessary when required for employment, insurance or government license purposes in the absence of symptoms suggestive of obstructive sleep apnea or other sleep disorder.

**NONSURGICAL TREATMENT**

Coverage for continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), auto-titrating positive airway pressure (APAP), and bi-level positive airway pressure (BPAP) devices is subject to the terms, conditions and limitations of the applicable benefit plan’s Durable Medical Equipment (DME) benefit and schedule of
copayments. Please refer to the applicable benefit plan document to determine benefit availability and the terms, conditions and limitations of coverage. Under many benefit plans, coverage for DME is limited to the lowest-cost alternative.

If coverage for positive airway pressure (PAP) devices is available, the following conditions of coverage apply.

Cigna covers CPAP (CPT code E0601) or auto-titrating PAP (APAP) (HCPCS code E0601) with or without a humidifier (HCPCS codes E0561, E0562) for an initial 90 day period as medically necessary for the treatment of OSA in an adult (18 years or older) when EITHER of the following criteria is met:

- apnea/hypopnea index (AHI) or respiratory disturbance index (RDI) or respiratory event index (REI) ≥ 15 as documented by polysomnography (PSG) or home/portable sleep study*
- AHI / RDI/REI ≥ 5 and < 15 as documented by PSG or home/portable sleep study*, when accompanied by symptoms of OSA (e.g., excessive daytime sleepiness, impaired cognition, mood disorders or insomnia) or when the individual has hypertension, ischemic heart disease or history of stroke

*AHI or RDI or REI is calculated based on at least two hours of continuous recorded sleep or, if calculated based on less than two hours of sleep, the total number of recorded events to calculate the AHI or RDI or REI must be at a minimum the number of events that would have been required in a two-hour period.

Cigna covers CPAP (HCPCS code E0601) or auto-titrating PAP (APAP) (HCPCS code E0601) with or without a humidifier (HCPCS codes E0561, E0562) for an initial 90 day period as medically necessary for the treatment of OSA in a child when ALL of the following criteria are met:

- OSA diagnosis established by PSG
- child weighs 30 kilograms (66 pounds) or more
- adenotonsillectomy has been unsuccessful or is contraindicated, or when definitive surgery is indicated but must await complete dental and facial development

Cigna covers bi-level positive airway pressure (BPAP) without a back-up respiratory rate (HCPCS code E0470), with or without a humidifier (HCPCS codes E0561, E0562) for an initial 90 day period as medically necessary for the treatment of OSA for an individual with coexisting central hypoventilation or for an individual who requires, but proves intolerant to, high pressures of CPAP or APAP.

Cigna covers BPAP with a back-up respiratory rate (HCPCS codes E0471, E0472) for an initial 90 day period as medically necessary for the treatment of treatment-emergent central sleep apnea when ALL of the following criteria are met:

- diagnostic PSG shows five or more predominantly obstructive respiratory events (obstructive or mixed apneas, hypopneas or respiratory effort related arousals [RERAs]) per hour of sleep
- PSG during use of positive airway pressure without a backup rate shows significant resolution of obstructive events and emergence or persistence of central apnea or central hypopnea with all of the following:
  - central apneas and central hypopneas ≥ 5/hour
  - number of central apneas and central hypopneas >50% of total number of apneas and hypopneas.
- the central sleep apnea (CSA) is not better explained by another CSA disorder (e.g., CSA with Cheyne Stokes breathing or CSA due to a medication or substance)

Cigna covers a home trial of Auto Bi-level therapy (HCPCS code E0470) as medically necessary in an individual who is documented to have tried and failed CPAP or APAP.

Cigna covers adaptive servoventilation (HCPCS codes E0471, E0472) for an initial 90 day period as medically necessary for the treatment of treatment-emergent central sleep apnea when ALL of the following criteria are met:
• individual does not have symptomatic chronic heart failure (i.e., NYHA Class I-IV) and/or reduced left ventricular ejection fraction ≤ 45%, as determined by cardiac assessment conducted prior to initiation of treatment
• diagnostic PSG shows five or more predominantly obstructive respiratory events (obstructive or mixed apneas, hypopneas or respiratory effort related arousals [RERAs]) per hour of sleep
• PSG during use of positive airway pressure without a backup rate shows significant resolution of obstructive events and emergence or persistence of central apnea or central hypopnea with all of the following:
  ➢ central apneas and central hypopneas ≥ 5/hour
  ➢ number of central apneas and central hypopneas >50% of total number of apneas and hypopneas.
• the central sleep apnea (CSA) is not better explained by another CSA disorder (e.g., CSA with Cheyne Stokes breathing or CSA due to a medication or substance).

PAP Adherence

Continued Coverage Beyond the First Three Months (90 days) of Therapy

Cigna covers a medically necessary PAP device (E0470/E0471 or E0601) beyond the first three months of therapy when, no sooner than the 31st day but no later than the 91st day after initiating therapy, there is objective evidence documenting the member is adhering to PAP therapy.

Note: Objective evidence of adherence to use of the PAP device, is defined as use of PAP ≥4 hours per night on 70% of nights during a consecutive thirty (30) day period anytime during the first three (3) months of initial usage.

If the above criterion is not met, continued coverage of a PAP device and related accessories will be considered not medically necessary.

Cigna covers CPAP, APAP, or BPAP loaner rental for up to 30 days when BOTH of the following criteria are met:

• demonstrated compliant use of the device
• description of malfunction and documentation that equipment has been sent for repair/assessment

Cigna does not cover positive airway pressure (PAP) treatment (i.e., CPAP, APAP, BPAP) for any other indication because it is considered experimental, investigational or unproven.

Cigna does not cover oral pressure therapy (e.g., Winx® Sleep Therapy System) because it is considered experimental, investigational or unproven.

Cigna covers ANY ONE of the following interfaces for use with CPAP, APAP, or BPAP as medically necessary:

• nasal mask (HCPCS code A7027)
• nasal pillows/prongs (HCPCS code A7034)
• full face mask (HCPCS code A7030)
• Oracle™ Oral Mask (Payne & Raykel Healthcare, Irvine, CA) (HCPCS code A7044)

Cigna covers a replacement of any of the above interfaces for use with CPAP, APAP, or BPAP as medically necessary at a frequency of no more often than every three months.

Cigna does not cover an interface consisting of a boil and bite mouthpiece connected to nasal inserts (e.g., CPAP PRO® [Stevenson Industries, Inc., Simi Valley, CA]) because it is considered experimental, investigational or unproven.
In general, Cigna considers duplicate equipment (e.g., travel PAP) a convenience item and not medically necessary and thus not covered. Cigna covers replacement of a medically necessary PAP device only when reasonable wear and tear renders the item nonfunctioning and not repairable and the item is no longer under warranty.

Coverage for oral appliances may be subject to the terms, conditions and limitations of the applicable benefit plan’s External Prosthetic Appliances and Devices (EPA) or Durable Medical Equipment (DME) benefit and schedule of copayments. Please refer to the applicable benefit plan document to determine benefit availability and terms, conditions and limitations of coverage.

If coverage for oral appliances is available, the following conditions of coverage apply.

Cigna covers a tongue-retaining device or a mandibular repositioning appliance (HCPCS codes E0485, E0486, S8262), also referred to as mandibular advancement appliance or mandibular advancement splint, as medically necessary for an individual with mild or moderate OSA when EITHER of the following criteria is met:

- apnea/hypopnea index (AHI) or respiratory disturbance index (RDI) or respiratory event index (REI) ≥ 15 and < 30*, as documented by polysomnography (PSG) or home/portable sleep study
- AHI or RDI or REI ≥ 5 and < 15* as documented by PSG or home/portable sleep study, when accompanied by symptoms of OSA (e.g., excessive daytime sleepiness, impaired cognition, mood disorders or insomnia) or when individual has hypertension, ischemic heart disease or history of stroke

Cigna covers a tongue-retaining device or a mandibular repositioning appliance (HCPCS codes E0485, E0486, S8262) as medically necessary for an individual with severe OSA (i.e., AHI or RDI or REI ≥ 30)* who is unwilling or unable to comply with PAP treatment.

*AHI or RDI or REI is calculated based on at least two hours of continuous recorded sleep or, if calculated based on less than two hours of sleep, the total number of recorded events to calculate the AHI or RDI or REI must be at a minimum the number of events that would have been required in a two-hour period.

Cigna covers follow-up sleep testing to improve or confirm oral appliance treatment efficacy and follow-up with their qualified healthcare professional to survey for dental-related side effects or occlusal changes and reduce their incidence.

Cigna does not cover remote-controlled titration of an oral appliance (e.g., the MATRx oral appliance titration study [CPT code 95999]) to determine appropriateness of oral appliance therapy and/or parameters for fabrication of an oral appliance for OSA because is considered experimental, investigational or unproven.

Cigna covers replacement of a medically necessary oral appliance when the item has reached the end of its five year reasonable use lifetime, or when wear and tear renders the item nonfunctioning and not repairable and the item is no longer under warranty.

Over-the-counter (OTC) oral appliances that can be obtained without a prescription are excluded under many benefit plans and therefore are generally not covered. In addition, OTC oral appliances are considered not medically necessary.

**SURGICAL TREATMENT**

Cigna covers tonsillectomy and/or adenoidectomy as medically necessary for the treatment of OSA as diagnosed by polysomnography (PSG) or home/portable sleep study.

Cigna covers uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP) as medically necessary for the treatment of OSA when ALL of the following criteria are met:

- demonstrated narrowing or collapse of the retropalatal region (soft palate, uvula, tonsils, posterior pharyngeal wall) as a source of airway obstruction
• criteria for PAP met and individual has proved intolerant to or failed a trial of PAP
• for mild or moderate OSA in an adult, consideration has also been given to use of mandibular repositioning appliance (MRA) or tongue-retaining appliance

Cigna does not cover uvulectomy as a stand-alone procedure for the treatment of OSA because it is considered experimental, investigational or unproven. (Note: this Coverage Policy is not intended to address uvulectomy performed for other indications (e.g., acute inflammation/angioedema of the uvula).

Cigna covers multi-level or stepwise surgery (MLS) (e.g., UPPP and/or genioglossus advancement and hyoid myotomy (GAHM), maxillary and mandibular advancement osteotomy [MMO]) as a combined procedure or as stepwise multiple procedures as medically necessary for the treatment of OSA when ALL of the following criteria are met:

• narrowing of multiple sites in the upper airway
• criteria for PAP met and individual has proved intolerant to or failed a trial of PAP
• in an adult, a mandibular repositioning appliance (MRA) or tongue-retaining appliance has been considered and found to be ineffective or undesirable

Cigna covers maxillo-mandibular advancement as medically necessary for the treatment of severe OSA when ALL of the following criteria are met:

• criteria for PAP met and individual has proved intolerant to or failed a trial of PAP
• in an adult, a mandibular repositioning appliance (MRA) or tongue-retaining appliance has been considered and found to be ineffective or undesirable
• individual has craniofacial disproportion or deformities

Cigna covers tracheostomy as medically necessary for the treatment of OSA when other medical and surgical options do not exist, have failed or are refused, or when deemed necessary by clinical urgency.

ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES/SERVICES

Cigna does not cover any of the following procedures or services for the treatment of OSA because they are considered experimental, investigational or unproven:

• atrial overdrive pacing
• cauter-y-assisted palatal stiffening operation (CAPSO)
• electrical devices (e.g., Night Shift™ Sleep Positioner) as therapy for positional obstructive sleep apnea
• electrosleep therapy
• implanted upper airway hypoglossal nerve stimulation devices (e.g., Inspire® II Upper Airway Stimulation)
• injection Snoreplasty
• laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP)
• Pillar™ Palatal Implant System
• Provent™ Professional Sleep Apnea Therapy Device
• radiofrequency volumetric tissue reduction (RFVTR) of the soft palate, uvula, or tongue base (e.g., Coblation®, Somnoplasty®)
• tongue-base suspension (e.g., AIRVance System)
• transpalatal advancement pharyngoplasty

Cigna does not cover the treatment of snoring alone by any method because it is considered not medically necessary.

General Background
Obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) is a treatable form of sleep disordered breathing characterized by repetitive episodes of apnea, hypopnea, or respiratory effort related arousals (RERA) during sleep. Apnea may be
obstructive, central, or mixed. With obstructive apnea, airflow is absent or nearly absent, but ventilatory effort persists. With central apnea, both airflow and ventilatory effect are absent, while with mixed apnea, there is an interval with no respiratory effort followed by an interval with obstructed respiratory effort. Hypopnea may be obstructive or central. With obstructive hypopnea, snoring occurs during the event, there is increased inspiratory flattening of the nasal pressure waveform or airflow compared to baseline, or there is associated thoracoabdominal paradox (i.e., asynchronous movement of the thorax and abdomen) during the event that was not present prior to the event. A hypopnea is considered central if none of the criteria for obstructive hypopnea are met during the event. An apneic or hypopneic event by definition lasts at least ten seconds. Most are ten to thirty seconds in duration, and may occasionally persist for one minute or more. RERAs consist of a sequence of breaths that last at least ten seconds, with increasing respiratory effort followed by an arousal from sleep that does not meet the criteria for an apnea or hypopnea.

Sleep is broadly divided into non-rapid eye movement (NREM) sleep, or N sleep, and rapid eye movement (REM) sleep, or R sleep. NREM sleep is further divided into three stages: N1, N2, and N3 sleep. Stage N1 is the typical transition from wakefulness to sleep, and is the lightest stage of sleep. Individuals awakened in this stage usually don’t perceive that they were asleep. This stage typically accounts for no more than 10% of total sleep time. The largest percentage of total sleep time, usually 45-55%, is spent in stage N2. Stage N3 is often referred to as deep sleep or slow wave sleep, and usually accounts for 10-20% of total sleep time in young to middle age adults, and decreases with age. This stage tends to occur early in the night, since it represents the homeostatic drive to sleep which is highest after wakefulness. REM sleep, or stage R, is usually the final stage of the sleep cycle in adults. During this stage an EEG will demonstrate a pattern that resembles an active, awake EEG. Rapid eye movements are the defining feature of this stage. REM sleep accounts for 18-23% of sleep time. Respiratory events occur more frequently in stages N1, N2, and R sleep than in stage N3. Events that occur in R sleep and when the individual is supine are usually longer and associated with more severe oxygen desaturation. REM related muscle atonia may impair upper airway patency, causing increased frequency of obstructive respiratory events.

OSA occurs when the patency of the nasopharyngeal airway becomes insufficient during sleep. Anatomic risk factors include nuchal obesity (cricothyroid neck circumference greater than 17 inches in men or 16 inches in women), deviated septum, nasal polyps, enlarged uvula and soft palate, small chin with deep overbite, enlarged tonsils, and hypertrophy of the lateral pharyngeal musculature. In addition to anatomical predisposition, patients with OSA appear to be unable to maintain oropharyngeal muscle dilator activity during sleep sufficient to prevent airway collapse during the negative pressure of inspiration. Apneas and hypopneas are common during REM sleep, when muscles completely relax. When the pharyngeal muscles relax, the palate may fall backward, and relaxation of the genioglossus muscle at the base of the tongue allows the tongue to fall backward, occluding the airway. The apneic event is terminated by a brief arousal to wakefulness or a lighter stage of sleep, which is accompanied by activation of the upper airway dilator and abductor muscles and restoration of airway patency and other physiologic responses.

Snoring is highly prevalent in adults and children, and it is also the most common symptom of OSA. Snoring that is not accompanied by an AHI ≥ 5 in adults and not associated with reports of excessive daytime sleepiness is referred to as primary snoring. Snoring that is associated with OSA, however, is generally loud and intermittent, and is accompanied by awakening with gasping or choking, sleep fragmentation, restless sleep, impaired concentration, and daytime sleepiness. Daytime sleepiness is thought to be related to sleep disruption and may also be related to recurrent hypoxemia. These typical symptoms are not always present or apparent, however. It is not unusual for patients subsequently diagnosed with OSA to initially present with hypertension, arrhythmias, or heart failure. There is mounting evidence that the presence and severity of OSA is associated with increased risk of cardiovascular disease. OSA is thought to play a role in the pathogenesis of systemic hypertension and heart failure and may also be associated with acute coronary syndromes, pulmonary hypertension, arrhythmias, and stroke.

Diagnosis of OSA: Adult
The American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM International Classification of Sleep Disorders (ICSD), 3rd edition (2014) includes the following diagnostic criteria for obstructive sleep apnea in adults:

(A and B) or C satisfy the criteria
A. The presence of one or more of the following:
   • The patient complains of sleepiness, nonrestorative sleep, fatigue, or insomnia symptoms.
• The patient wakes with breath holding, gasping, or choking.
• The bed partner or other observer reports habitual snoring, breathing interruptions, or both during the patient’s sleep.
• The patient has been diagnosed with hypertension, a mood disorder, cognitive dysfunction, coronary artery disease, stroke, congestive heart failure, atrial fibrillation, or type 2 diabetes mellitus.

B. Polysomnography (PSG) or home sleep apnea test (HSAT) demonstrates:
• Five or more predominantly obstructive respiratory events (obstructive and mixed apneas, hypopneas, or respiratory effort related arousals [RERAs]) per hour of sleep during a PSG or per hour of monitoring (HSAT).

OR

C. PSG or HSAT demonstrates:
• Fifteen or more predominantly obstructive respiratory events (apneas, hypopneas, or RERAs) per hour of sleep during a PSG or per hour of monitoring (HSAT).

The authors noted that HSAT commonly underestimates the number of obstructive respiratory events per hour compared to PSG because actual sleep time, determined primarily by EEG, is often not recorded. The term respiratory event index (REI) may be used to denote event frequency based on monitoring time rather than total sleep time. Respiratory event related arousals and hypopnea events based on arousals from sleep cannot be scored using HSAT because arousals by EEG criteria cannot be identified.

Respiratory effort related (RERAs) may result in daytime sleepiness, fatigue and inattention despite the absence of apneas or hypopneas. RERAs (> 5 events per hour) associated with daytime sleepiness were previously referred to as upper airway resistance syndrome (UARS) and considered a subtype of OSA. These patients have abnormal sleep and cardiorespiratory changes typical of OSA. According to the ICSD 3rd edition, the term UARS is subsumed under the diagnosis of OSA because the pathophysiology does not significantly differ from that of OSA.

Treatment emergent sleep apnea, also referred to as complex sleep apnea, was not recognized as a sleep related breathing disorder in the AASM ICSD 2nd edition. The ICSD 3rd edition does, however, include treatment-emergent central sleep apnea as a defined type of central sleep apnea, with diagnostic criteria as follows:

Diagnostic Criteria
Criteria A-C must be met
A. Diagnostic PSG shows five or more predominantly obstructive respiratory events (obstructive or mixed apneas, hypopneas or RERAs) per hour of sleep

B. PSG during use of positive airway pressure without a backup rate shows significant resolution of obstructive events and emergence or persistence of central apnea or central hypopnea with all of the following:
• Central apnea-central hypopnea index [CAHI] ≥ 5/hour.
• Number of central apneas and central hypopneas is >50% of total number of apneas and hypopneas.
C. The central sleep apnea is not better explained by another CSA disorder (e.g., CSA with Cheyne Stokes breathing or CSA due to a medication or substance

The authors note that a diagnosis of treatment-emergent central sleep apnea does not exclude a diagnosis of OSA. That is, a diagnosis of OSA can be made based on the diagnostic sleep study.

Treatment-emergent central sleep apnea (CSA), also referred to as complex sleep apnea, is the emergence or increase in central apneas and hypopneas when treatment with CPAP or bilevel PAP without a backup rate feature is initiated. It is usually an incidental finding during the initial in-facility titration. The increase in central apneas and hypopneas prevents the apnea hypopnea index (AHI) from normalizing although obstructive apneas and hypopneas have been eliminated. The AHI is often higher during NREM than REM sleep. The prevalence of treatment-emergent CSA is not known, but one large prospective study reported an incidence of 12% during the first night with CPAP. The incidence is reported to be higher in split-night vs. full night PSG. Some patients develop treatment-emergent CSA during CPAP use even when it was not present initially. It is not clear whether
treatment-emergent CSA and OSA are separate disorders. The fact that they respond differently to PAP therapy suggests that they result from separate pathophysiologic mechanisms. However, the presence of many potential mechanisms in which OSA treatment may induce central apneas suggests that they may not be separate disorders; the central apneas may merely be an effect of treating the OSA (AASM ICD 3rd ed., 2014; Kuzniar and Morgenthaler, 2012, Parthasarathy, 2015).

The natural history of treatment-emergent CSA is not well-defined. Observational studies have reported spontaneous resolution in 50-75% of patients, but these estimates cannot be relied upon due to the retrospective nature of most studies and significant number of patients lost to follow-up, which could overestimate the true rate of spontaneous improvement. Patients who continue the PAP treatment used when treatment-emergent CSA was detected may remain asymptomatic or they manifest symptoms and signs of disrupted sleep (e.g., excessive daytime sleepiness, poor subjective sleep quality, repetitive awakenings, and insomnia) due to the central apneas and related arousals. Symptoms related to recurrent oxyhemoglobin desaturation, including morning headaches and nocturnal angina, may also be reported. Optimal management of treatment-emergent CSA has not yet been defined. Continuation of CPAP, with follow-up sleep testing in two to three months to determine whether the condition has resolved spontaneously is one treatment option. Because the risks of even short-term central apneas and hypopneas are uncertain and haven’t been well studied, however, changing the mode of pressure to either or bilevel positive airway pressure with a backup respiratory rate or adaptive servo-ventilation (ASV) has also been recommended. BPAP without a backup respiratory rate, however, does not decrease the AHI in patients with treatment-emergent OSA, and may actually worsen the AHI (Parthasarathy, 2015).

**Polysomnography (PSG) and Home/Portable Sleep Studies**

Polysomnography is the collective process of monitoring and recording physiologic data during sleep. Full-night in-laboratory PSG is considered by most experts as the reference method for evaluating OSA. Based on 1994 American Sleep Disorders Association (now American Academy of Sleep Medicine [AASM]) recommendations, four levels are used to classify the complexity of technology used in the diagnosis of sleep-related breathing disorders. Polysomnography, a Type I study, requires that a technician be present and must include the following recordings at a minimum: electroencephalogram (EEG), electrooculogram (EOG), chin electromyography (EMG), airflow, arterial oxygen saturation, respiratory effort, and electrocardiogram or heart rate. Although not a required component of PSG, anterior tibialis EMG is also useful to assist in detecting movement arousals and may assess periodic limb movements which coexist with sleep-related breathing disorders in many patients.

In a split-night PSG, the initial diagnostic portion of the PSG is followed by positive airway pressure (PAP) titration, based on the apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) during the initial portion of the test. A follow-up PSG may be performed when a diagnosis of OSA is confirmed during a prior full-night PSG, or when confirmed during a split-night study when the PAP titration portion of the study is insufficient.

PSG is not indicated for the diagnosis of chronic lung disease, circadian rhythm disorders, depression, or in cases of typical parasomnias when the diagnosis is clear, for patients with seizures when no symptoms of a sleep disorder are present, or for the diagnosis and treatment of restless leg syndrome. PSG is also not indicated for the routine evaluation of transient insomnia, chronic insomnia, or insomnia associated with psychiatric disorders (Kushida, et al., 2005; Littner, et al., 2002).

As stated above, in 1994 the AASM defined four levels to classify the complexity of technology used in the diagnosis of sleep-related breathing disorders. A Type II study, or comprehensive portable polysomnography, is similar to a Type I study (i.e., PSG), but ECG can be replaced by a heart rate monitor and a technician is not in constant attendance. In a Type III study, referred to as a cardiopulmonary study or modified portable sleep apnea testing, at least four parameters are measured. Minimum requirements include recording of ventilation (at least two channels of respiratory movement, or respiratory movement and airflow); ECG or heart rate; and oxygen saturation. Personnel are needed for preparation, but the ability to intervene is not required for all studies. A Type IV study, or continuous single or dual bioparameter recording, generally uses oximetry and may employ a second airflow assessment parameter. Type IV devices provide limited information; they do not measure sleep time and cannot distinguish between obstructive and central apneas.

The 1994 classification system was based on the number and type of “leads” used, and was closely aligned with existing Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) codes. Since then, there has been a proliferation of devices that
measure various parameters, and many devices do not fall within this classification scheme. In 2011, an AASM task force proposed a more specific and inclusive method of classifying and evaluating sleep testing devices other than PSG. Also in 2011, AASM published Standards for Accreditation of Out of Center Sleep Testing that state that HSAT equipment must meet the minimum definitions described in at least one of the specified sleep testing Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) or Health Care Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) codes currently in use.

Although facility-based PSG is considered by most experts to be the reference method for evaluation of OSA, this does not mean that it is an error-free “gold standard” for the diagnosis of OSA. Such a gold standard would consist of a set of criteria or measurements that distinguish patients with OSA from those without, with small misclassification errors, PSG indices alone, however, are not adequate to classify individuals as those with and without OSA. An AHI suggestive of OSA is not sufficient for the diagnosis of the condition, since the severity of symptoms must be accounted for, and other conditions that affect sleep must be excluded. A gold-standard would also have inherent prognostic ability, since patients with OSA have a different prognosis than those without OSA. AHI is not well correlated with response to CPAP therapy, or compliance with therapy. Thus the increased accuracy of the AHI obtained by facility-based PSG may not be predictive of outcomes (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality [AHRQ], 2011).

Comparison of portable testing to PSG has been one approach taken to validate portable monitoring. Because there is not a direct correlation of PSG results with clinical symptoms and outcomes, however, determination of an accepted treatment threshold based solely on AHI or any other PSG measurement has not been possible. Lack of such a threshold prevents comparative studies of portable monitor testing to calculate sensitivity, specificity, and likelihood ratios. Simultaneous in-laboratory PSG and portable monitoring recordings may be compared to unattended portable monitoring in the home, but direct comparison of results from PSG and portable monitoring are not closely correlated. This may be due to differences in equipment and testing environments, intra-scorer reliability, and night-to-night variability of AHI.

Because of the limitations of studies directly comparing results of PSG to portable monitoring, comparative effectiveness studies have instead evaluated clinical outcomes of patients managed with portable monitoring at home vs. those managed with PSG. These non-inferiority or equivalency trials compare improvements in quality of life and other outcomes instead of directly comparing sleep test results. Based on the available evidence, diagnosis of OSA based on in-facility PSG does not lead to superior outcomes compared to home/portable sleep testing in terms of functional improvement, quality of life, blood pressure, and CPAP adherence (Kuna, et al., 2011; Skomro, et al., 2010).

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS): A National Coverage Determination (NCD) for sleep testing for OSA issued in 2009 concluded that the evidence was sufficient to determine that the results of the sleep tests below can be used to diagnose OSA, that the use of such sleep testing technologies demonstrated improved health outcomes in Medicare beneficiaries who have OSA and receive the appropriate treatment, and that these tests are reasonable and necessary. The NCD provides the following coverage indications and limitations:

Nationally Covered Indications

- **Type I PSG** is covered when used to aid the diagnosis of OSA in beneficiaries who have clinical signs and symptoms indicative of OSA if performed attended in a sleep lab facility.
- **Type II or Type III sleep testing devices** are covered when used to aid the diagnosis of OSA in beneficiaries who have clinical signs and symptoms indicative of OSA if performed unattended in or out of a sleep lab facility or attended in a sleep lab facility.
- **Type IV sleep testing devices** measuring three or more channels, one of which is airflow, are covered when used to aid the diagnosis of OSA in beneficiaries who have signs and symptoms indicative of OSA if performed unattended in or out of a sleep lab facility or attended in a sleep lab facility.
- **Sleep testing devices** measuring three or more channels that include actigraphy, oximetry, and peripheral arterial tone, are covered when used to aid the diagnosis of OSA in beneficiaries who have signs and symptoms indicative of OSA if performed unattended in or out of a sleep lab facility or attended in a sleep lab facility.

Nationally Non-Covered Indications
- Effective for claims with dates of services on and after March 3, 2009, other diagnostic sleep tests for the diagnosis of OSA, other than those noted above for prescribing CPAP, are not sufficient for the coverage of CPAP and are not covered.

**SleepStrip™**: The SleepStrip is an OSA screening device that incorporates signal detection, acquisition and display in a disposable package. The self-adhesive device is placed on the upper lip at bedtime and adjusted until respiration is detected, as indicated by a flashing light. Two nasal thermistors and one oral thermistor produce flow signals that are processed within the SleepStrip’s microprocessor (CPU). The five possible results are as follows: zero (no apneas); one (mild sleep apnea, comparable to sleep lab AHI between 15 and 24); two (moderate sleep apnea, comparable to sleep lab AHI between 25 and 39); three (severe sleep apnea, comparable to sleep lab AHI of greater than 40); and E (error in measurement).

Pang et al. (2006) conducted a prospective, nonrandomized cohort study to investigate the role of the SleepStrip in the diagnosis of OSA. Patients with suspected OSA who were scheduled for PSG wore the device at home the night after the PSG. The AHI determined by PSG was compared with the results of the SleepStrip. The sensitivity and specificity of the SleepStrip in diagnosing severe OSA when the AHI was > 40 were 33.3% and 95%, respectively. The sensitivity and specificity of the SleepStrip when the AHI was > 25 were 43.8% and 81.3%, respectively. When the AHI was > 15, the sensitivity and specificity of the test were 54.6% and 70%, respectively. The authors concluded that the SleepStrip has a low correlation with the AHI as measured by PSG, and that further studies are needed before this device can be recommended as a screening tool for the diagnosis of OSA.

**American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM)**: A task force was commissioned by the Board of the American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM) (Collop, et al., 2011) to determine a more specific and inclusive method of classifying and evaluating sleep testing devices other than PSG used as aids in the diagnosis of OSA in the out-of-center setting. The term out-of-center (OOC) sleep testing is used to describe portable monitoring/home sleep apnea testing. The first widely used classification system published by AASM in 1994 placed devices into four categories based on the number and type of “leads” used, and this scheme closely aligned with available Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) codes. Since that time, a plethora of devices have been developed, and many do not fall within this classification scheme. The authors proposed a new classification method that details the types of signals measured. The proposed system categorizes OOC devices based on measurements of Sleep, Cardiovascular, Oximetry, Position, Effort, and Respiratory (SCOPER) parameters. Criteria for evaluating devices was also proposed; in patients with a high pre-test probability of having OSA, the OOC testing device has a positive likelihood ratio of 5 or greater, coinciding with an in-lab PSG-generated AHI of ≥ 5, and an adequate sensitivity (at least 0.825). Using the above criteria, the authors reviewed peer-reviewed literature on FDA-approved devices that utilize more than one signal. Devices that do not include oximetry were excluded, since oximetry is a mandatory signal for scoring AHI using PSG. The literature was analyzed to answer six questions the address the adequacy of different respiratory and effort sensors and combinations to diagnose OSA. The task force provided the following conclusions in response to the six key questions:

- The literature is inadequate to state with confidence that a thermistor alone without any effort sensor is adequate to diagnose OSA. If a thermal sensing device is used as the only measure of respiration, two effort belts are required as part of the montage, and piezoelectric belts are acceptable in this context.
- Nasal pressure can be an adequate measurement of respiration with no effort measure with the caveat that this may be device specific.
- Nasal pressure may be used in combination with either two piezo-electric or respiratory inductance plethysmographic (RIP) belts (but not one piezoelectric belt).
- There is insufficient evidence to state that both nasal pressure and thermistor are required to adequately diagnose OSA.
- Regarding alternative devices to diagnose OSA:
  - The data indicate that peripheral arterial tonometry (PAT) devices are adequate for the proposed use.
  - The device based on cardiac signals shows promise, but more study is required as it has not been tested in the home setting.
  - The device based on end-tidal CO₂ (ETC₂) appears to be adequate for a hospital population.
For devices using acoustic signals, the data are insufficient to determine whether the use of acoustic signals with other signals, as a substitute for airflow, is adequate to diagnose OSA.

The taskforce stated that future studies for the evaluation of OOC testing devices would greatly benefit by the use of consistent outcome measures to allow direct comparisons and meta-analyses of studies. Standardized research is needed that report a positive likelihood ratio at the appropriate AHI (i.e., \( \geq 5 \)), and scored according to the recommended definitions, while using appropriate research reporting and methodology to minimize bias.

The AASM Clinical Guideline for the Evaluation, Management and Long-Term Care of Obstructive Sleep Apnea in Adults (Epstein, et al., 2009) states that the presence of absence and severity of OSA must be determined before initiating treatment in order to identify those at risk for developing complications of sleep apnea, guide treatment, and provide a baseline to evaluate the effectiveness of subsequent treatment. Diagnostic criteria are based on clinical signs and symptoms established during a comprehensive sleep evaluation, which includes a sleep oriented history and physical examination, and findings established by sleep testing. A comprehensive sleep history should include an evaluation for snoring, witnessed apneas, gasping/choking episodes, excessive sleepiness not explained by other factors, including assessment of sleepiness severity by the Epworth Sleepiness Scale, total sleep amount, nocturia, morning headaches, sleep fragmentation/sleep maintenance, insomnia, and decreased concentration and memory. The guideline also states that particular attention should be paid to the presence of obesity, signs of upper airway narrowing, or the presence of other disorders that can contribute to the development of OSA. Features to be evaluated that may suggest the presence of OSA include increased neck circumference (> 17 in men, and > 16 in women), body mass index (BMI) \( \geq 30 \), and various physiologic abnormalities that may compromise respiration (e.g., retrognathia, macroglossia, tonsillar hypertrophy, elongated/enlarged uvula).

The 2009 AASM guideline (Epstein et al.) reaffirmed recommendations provided in a 2007 guideline on the use of unattended portable monitoring (Collop et al.). Recommendations are based on a review of the literature and consensus: The guideline states that portable monitoring may be used in the unattended setting as an alternative to PSG for the diagnosis of OSA in patients with a high pretest probability of moderate to severe OSA and no comorbid sleep disorder or major comorbid medical disorders when all the following parameters are met:

- Portable monitoring (PM) for the diagnosis of OSA should be performed only in conjunction with a comprehensive sleep evaluation. Clinical sleep evaluations using PM must be supervised by a practitioner with board certification in sleep medicine or an individual who fulfills the eligibility criteria for the sleep medicine certification examination.
- A PM should, at a minimum, record airflow, respiratory effort, and blood oxygenation.
- The type of biosensors used to monitor these parameters for in-laboratory PSG are recommended for use in portable monitors, and include an oronasal thermal sensor to detect apneas, a nasal pressure transducer to measure hypopneas, oximetry, and ideally, inductance plethysmography for respiratory effort.
- An experienced sleep technician, sleep technologist, or appropriately trained healthcare practitioner must perform the application of PM sensors or directly educate the patient in the correct application of sensors.
- Testing should be performed under the auspices of an AASM accredited comprehensive sleep medicine program with policies and procedures for sensor application, scoring, and interpretation of PM
- A quality/performance improvement program for PM, including inter-scorer reliability must be in place to assure accuracy and reliability.
- Scoring criteria should be consistent with the current published AASM standards for scoring of apneas and hypopneas.
- Due to the known rate of false negative PM tests, in-laboratory PSG should be performed in cases where PM is technically inadequate or fails to establish the diagnosis of OSA in patients with a high pretest probability.

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ): An AHRQ comparative effectiveness review was conducted in 2011 (Balk et al.) to systematically review the evidence on OSA diagnosis and treatment in adults. The key questions focused on OSA screening and diagnosis, treatments, associations between apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) and clinical outcomes, and predictors of treatment compliance. Of the 234 studies that
met eligibility criteria, 46 evaluated diagnostic tests. The authors concluded that portable monitors and questionnaires may be effective screening tools, but assessments with clinical outcomes are necessary to prove their value over PSG. This conclusion was based on the following two Key Questions that addressed OSA diagnosis:

Key Question 1
How do different available tests compare in their ability to diagnose sleep apnea in adults with symptoms suggestive of disordered sleep? How do these tests compare in different subgroups of patients, based on race, sex, body mass index, existing non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus, existing cardiovascular disease, existing hypertension, clinical symptoms, previous stroke, or airway characteristics?

To address this Key Question, three types of comparisons were evaluated: portable monitoring devices (Types II, III, and IV) versus PSG, questionnaires versus PSG or portable monitors, and clinical prediction models versus PSG or portable monitors. Studies included in the 2007 Technology Assessment (discussed below) were not reevaluated. The authors provided the following conclusions:

Portable monitors vs. PSG: The strength of evidence is moderate among 15 quality A, 45 quality B, and 39 quality C studies that Type III and IV monitors may have the ability to accurately predict AHI suggestive of OSA with high positive likelihood ratios and low negative likelihood ratios for various AHI cutoffs in PSG. Type III monitors perform better than Type IV monitors at AHI cutoffs of 5, 10, and 15 events per hour. Analysis of difference vs. average analyses plots suggest that substantial differences in the measured AHI may be encountered between PSG and both Type III and Type IV monitors. Large differences compared to in-laboratory PSG cannot be excluded for all portable monitors. The evidence is insufficient to adequately compare specific monitors to each other.

No recent studies compared Type II monitors with PSG. The prior Technology Assessment concluded that based on three quality B studies, type II monitors used at home may identify AHI suggestive of OSA with high positive likelihood ratios and low negative likelihood ratios, although substantial differences in the AHI may be encountered between type II monitors and facility-based PSG.

Questionnaire vs. PSG
The strength of evidence is low that the Berlin Questionnaire is moderately accurate (sensitivity and specificity generally < 90%) to screen for OSA. The strength of evidence is insufficient to evaluate other questionnaires (TOP, STOP-Bang, ASA Checklist, Epworth Sleepiness Scale, Hawaii Sleep questionnaires).

Clinical Prediction Rules vs. PSG
The strength of evidence is low that some clinical prediction rules may be useful in the prediction of a diagnosis of OSA. Ten different clinical prediction rules have been described (e.g., oropharyngeal morphometric model, pulmonary function data model). While all the models were internally validated, external validation for these predictive rules had not been conducted in the vast majority of the studies.

Key Question 2:
How does phased testing (screening tests or battery followed by full test) compare to full testing alone? The strength of evidence is insufficient to determine the utility of phased testing, followed by full testing when indicated, to diagnose sleep apnea. Only one study met the inclusion criteria, and this study did not fully analyze the phased testing. The sensitivity and specificity of this phased strategy could not be calculated due to a verification bias; not all participants received PSG testing.

In a discussion of OSA diagnosis, the authors stated that, in theory, OSA is relatively simple to diagnose. PSG, the standard diagnostic test, is inconvenient, resource-intensive, and may not be representative of a typical night’s sleep. In addition, there are variations across laboratories in definitions of OSA and in the way results are read and interpreted. AHI, which is used as the single metric to define OSA, can also vary from night to night and does not take into account symptoms, comorbidities, or response to treatment. Numerous portable monitors (evaluated in 99 studies) have been developed for use in non-laboratory settings. These use fewer “channels”, or specific physiologic measures than typical 16-channel PSG. Although most of the tested portable monitors fairly accurately predict OSA, it is unclear whether any of these monitors can replace laboratory-based PSG. The evidence suggests that the measured AHI from portable monitors is variable compared with PSG-derived
AHI, but the source of this variability is unclear. No studies have evaluated the predictive ability for clinical outcomes or response to treatment by portable monitors.

Future studies of the accuracy or bias of diagnostic tests should focus more on head-to-head comparisons of portable monitors, questionnaires, and predictive rules to determine the optimal tool for use in a primary care setting to maximize initial evaluation of OSA and triage high risk patients for prompt PSG. Direct comparisons among existing alternatives to PSG are more important that the current focus on developing new diagnostic tests.

**Summary: Facility-Based PSG and Portable Monitoring/Home Sleep Apnea Studies**

Although facility-based PSG has been considered the standard method for evaluation of OSA, it cannot be considered the "gold standard", since a true gold standard would include a defined set of criteria or measurements to distinguish patients with OSA from those without OSA. An AHI suggestive of OSA is not sufficient for the diagnosis of the condition, since the severity of symptoms must be accounted for, and other conditions that affect sleep must be excluded. A gold-standard would also have prognostic ability, since patients with OSA have a different prognosis than those without OSA. Although the published evidence comparing PSG with home/portable testing has demonstrated that PSG more accurately measures AHI, AHI is not well correlated with response to CPAP therapy or compliance with therapy. The increased accuracy of the AHI obtained by facility-based PSG therefore may not be predictive of outcomes. In addition, the precise accuracy of PSG may be impacted by several factors, including inter-reader variability, use of different test instruments, an individual’s night to night variability, and ability to sleep in a non-home setting (CMS, 2009).

As diagnostic tests, PSG and HST or home sleep apnea study (HSAT) would not be expected to directly change health outcomes, but would affect outcomes through changes in disease management by actions taken in response to the test results. The usefulness of a test result is constrained somewhat by the available treatment options. The number of practical treatment options for OSA is limited; most patients are treated with CPAP, and a small number are treated with oral appliances or surgery (CMS, 2009).

There is adequate evidence to demonstrate that portable monitoring/home sleep apnea studies accurately predict AHI suggestive of OSA with high positive likelihood ratios and low negative likelihood ratios in patients with a high pretest probability of OSA. Comparative effectiveness studies that have evaluated clinical outcomes of patients managed with home testing vs. those managed with PSG demonstrated similar outcomes in terms of functional improvement (e.g., sleepiness scores, activity level, vigilance, productivity), and CPAP adherence. Home sleep apnea studies are not indicated, however, for individuals with significant comorbid medical conditions that may degrade the accuracy of portable testing, including moderate to severe pulmonary disease, neuromuscular disease, obesity-hypoventilation syndrome, or heart failure. Home testing has not been evaluated for, and/or does not include the diagnostic data necessary for those suspected of having other sleep disorders.

Most studies of home sleep apnea testing have evaluated Type III devices that measure two respiratory variables (e.g., respiratory movement and airflow), a cardiac variable (e.g., heart rate or an electrocardiogram), and arterial oxyhemoglobin saturation via pulse oximetry. Some devices also include signals that can detect snoring, determine body position, or detect movement. Type IV devices or continuous single or dual bioparameter recording, generally use oximetry and may employ a second airflow assessment parameter. Type IV devices provides limited information; they do not measure sleep time and cannot distinguish between obstructive and central apneas. There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to determine the diagnostic accuracy of Type IV studies.

A full night or split night facility-based PSG may be indicated when recent portable monitoring was technically inadequate or failed to establish the diagnosis in an individual with a high pretest probability of OSA; when a sleep disorder other than OSA is suspected, or when a significant comorbid medical condition exists, including moderate to severe pulmonary disease, neuromuscular disease, obesity-hypoventilation syndrome, or heart failure. In-facility PSG may also be indicated for PAP titration; when the PAP titration portion of a prior split-night study was insufficient; or prior to a planned multiple sleep latency test (MSLT) when narcolepsy is suspected.

Subsequent in-facility PSG or home/portable testing may be indicated when the diagnosis of OSA has been established, in order to assess outcomes following OSA treatment or to evaluate a return of symptoms or inadequate clinical response to treatment.
Multiple Sleep Latency Test (MSLT): The MSLT is used to measure physiological sleep tendency under standardized conditions in the absence of external alerting factors. It is based on the premise that sleep latency reflects the degree of sleepiness. The patient is given four or five opportunities to sleep for up to 20 minutes at two-hour intervals during the day. The mean time to fall asleep is monitored, and it is determined whether the patient has marked sleepiness, usually defined as a mean sleep latency of less than five minutes.

The MSLT is indicated as part of the evaluation of patients with suspected narcolepsy, since the narcoleptic patient, in addition to demonstrating sleepiness, usually experiences two or more episodes of REM sleep during these naps. This is unlikely with other conditions associated with excess sleepiness. The pathophysiology of narcolepsy involves intrusion of aspects of REM sleep (e.g., muscle atonia and dreams) into periods of wakefulness. The test may also be used to evaluate patients with suspected idiopathic hypersomnia to help differentiate between this condition and narcolepsy, and to evaluate response to medications in patients with idiopathic hypersomnia or narcolepsy (Littner, et al., 2005).

The MSLT is not routinely indicated in the initial evaluation and diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea syndrome, or in assessment of change following treatment with nasal CPAP, nor is it routinely indicated for evaluation of sleepiness in medical and neurological disorders other than narcolepsy, or for insomnia, or circadian rhythm disorders (Littner, et al., 2005).

Maintenance of Wakefulness Test (MWT): The MWT measures the ability to stay awake for a defined period of time in patients with disorders associated with excessive sleepiness.

The MWT may be indicated in the assessment of individuals in whom the inability to remain awake constitutes a safety issue, or in patients with narcolepsy or idiopathic hypersomnia to assess response to treatment (e.g., medications or PAP). Since there is little evidence linking MWT sleep latency results with risk of accidents in real world circumstances, the MWT should be considered an option to be integrated with findings from the clinical history and compliance with treatment (Littner, et al., 2005).

Actigraphy: An actigraph is a small portable device that records movement over an extended period of time and is usually worn on the wrist. Actigraphy measures movement of a limb, and although it may provide an estimate of total sleep time, it does not actually measure sleep or the subjective experience of sleep.

According to updated AASM Practice Parameters for the Use of Actigraphy in the Assessment of Sleep and Sleep Disorders (Morgenthaler, et al., 2007) actigraphy is increasingly used in sleep research and the clinical care of patients with sleep and circadian rhythm abnormalities. The practice parameters state that actigraphy provides an acceptably accurate estimate of sleep patterns in normal, healthy adult populations and in patients suspected of certain sleep disorders. The practice parameters address the use of actigraphy in patients with advanced sleep phase syndrome, delayed sleep phase syndrome, shift work disorder, jet-lag, and non-24 hour sleep/wake syndrome. Regarding OSA, the AASM practice parameters state that, when PSG is not available, actigraphy is indicated as a method to estimate total sleep time in patients with OSA, and that combined with a validated way of monitoring respiratory events, use of actigraphy may improve accuracy in assessing the severity of OSA compared to using time in bed. In recommendations for further research, the practice parameters state that additional research is needed that compares results from different actigraphy devices and the variety of algorithms used to evaluate data in order to further establish standards of actigraphy technology, and that there is a need for additional study addressing the reliability and validity of actigraphy compared to reference standards such as PSG.

There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to demonstrate the accuracy of actigraphy in the diagnosis or management of OSA.

Treatment of OSA
Patients diagnosed with OSA receive education regarding the pathophysiology of OSA and the impact of lifestyle modifications, including weight loss, reduced alcohol consumption, especially at bedtime, and lateral sleeping position (vs. supine). While such noninvasive measures are encouraged, particularly in the obese or those with very poor sleep hygiene, OSA does not usually resolve with these measures alone. Potential treatment options for OSA include treatment with positive airway pressure (PAP), the use of oral appliances,
and surgical interventions. Treatment decisions are based on condition severity, the presence of comorbidities and complicating factors, and the patient’s tolerance and response to treatment.

**Non-Surgical Treatment**

**Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)**

The 2011 AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Review, Diagnosis and Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea in Adults (discussed in the diagnosis section above) included the following key questions and conclusions regarding treatment with PAP and mandibular advancement devices (MAD):

**Key Question: What is the comparative effect of different treatments for obstructive sleep apnea in adults?**

- Despite no or weak evidence on clinical outcomes, given the large magnitude of effect on the important intermediate outcomes AHI, ESS and other sleep study measures, the strength of evidence is moderate that CPAP is an effective treatment for OSA. However, the strength of evidence is insufficient to determine which patients might benefit most from treatment.
- Despite no or weak evidence on clinical outcomes, overall there is moderate strength of evidence that auto CPAP and fixed CPAP result in similar compliance and treatment effects for patients with OSA.
- The strength of evidence is low of no substantial difference in compliance or other outcomes between C-Flex and CPAP.
- The strength of evidence is insufficient regarding comparisons of different CPAP devices or modifications.
- Despite no or weak evidence on clinical outcomes, given the large magnitude of effect on the important intermediate outcomes AHI, ESS and other sleep study measures, overall the strength of evidence is moderate that MAD is an effective treatment for OSA in patients without comorbidities (including periodontal disease) or excessive sleepiness. However, the strength of evidence is insufficient to address which patients might benefit most from treatment.
- The strength of evidence is insufficient regarding comparisons of different oral devices.
- Despite no or weak evidence on clinical outcomes, overall the strength of evidence is moderate that the use of CPAP is superior to MAD. However, the strength of evidence is insufficient to address which patients might benefit most from either treatment.

**Positive Airway Pressure (PAP) Treatment**

PAP is the most effective and widespread treatment of OSA. A flow generator delivers pressurized air into the nose and/or mouth, providing a pneumatic splint to the airway, preventing development of subatmospheric collapsing pressure. The flow generator is connected to the patient via connecting tubing and an interface attached to the patient’s face. PAP may be provided using continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), autotitrating PAP (APAP), or bi-level positive airway pressure (BPAP).

**Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (CPAP):** CPAP is the most commonly used method of positive airway pressure. It is the simplest and most extensively studied mode of PAP, with the greatest amount of clinical experience. During CPAP titration, the minimum amount of positive pressure required eliminating or nearly eliminating respiratory events in REM and NREM sleep, including REM sleep with the patient in the supine position, is determined. Traditional CPAP maintains this effective fixed pressure at all times.

AASM practice parameters for the use of continuous and bilevel positive airway pressure devices states that CPAP is indicated for the treatment of moderate to severe OSA, based on the fact that randomized controlled trials testing whether CPAP significantly reduces sleep related respiratory events compared to a controlled procedure had positive outcomes. The guideline also states that CPAP is recommended as an option for the treatment of mild OSA (Kushida, et al., 2006).

**Autotitrating Positive Airway Pressure (APAP):** The pressure required to maintain airway patency changes during a night of sleep depending on body position, sleep stage, nasal obstruction, and ingestion of alcohol or hypnotic agents. Pressure requirements also change over time based on changes in body weight and upper airway properties. APAP devices deliver variable pressure according to the needs of the patient. When an obstructive event is detected, an APAP device will increase pressure until the event is eliminated. If no further events are detected during a set time period, the device will decrease pressure to a pre-set minimum. APAP
devices may use combinations of physiologic signals to detect airflow obstruction, including snoring, flow, or impedance. Because the minimum pressure required to keep the airway open is used, the mean pressure applied throughout the night is reduced. This reduction in mean pressure may improve tolerance in some patients, resulting in improved adherence with the use of PAP (Ayas, et al., 2004; Nussbaumer, et al., 2006).

AASM practice parameters for the use of auto-titrating CPAP devices for titrating pressures and treating adult patients with OSA include the following recommendations (Morgenthaler, et al., 2008). Recommendations are classified as follows: Standard: a generally accepted patient care strategy that reflects a high degree of clinical certainty; Guideline: a patient care strategy that reflects a moderate degree of clinical certainty, and Option: a patient care strategy that reflects uncertain clinical use.

- APAP is not recommended to diagnose OSA (Standard)
- Patients with the following conditions are not currently candidates for APAP titration or treatment: (Standard)
  - Congestive heart failure
  - Lung disease, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
  - Patients expected to have nocturnal arterial oxyhemoglobin desaturation due to conditions other than OSA (e.g., obesity, hypoventilation syndrome)
  - Patients who do not snore, either due to palate surgery or naturally
- APAP devices are not currently recommended for split-night titration (Standard)
- Certain APAP devices may be used during attended titration with PSG to identify a single pressure for use with standard CPAP for treatment of moderate to severe OSA. (Guideline)
- Certain APAP devices may be used in an unattended way to determine a fixed CPAP pressure for patients with moderate to severe OSA without significant comorbidities (CHF, COPD, central sleep apnea syndrome, or hypoventilation syndromes) (Option)
- Patients being treated with fixed CPAP on the basis of APAP titration or being treated with APAP must have close clinical follow-up to determine treatment effectiveness and safety. This is especially important during the first few weeks of PAP use. (Standard)
- A re-evaluation and, if necessary, a standard attended CPAP titration should be performed if symptoms do not resolve or the CPAP or if the APAP treatment otherwise appears to lack efficacy. (Standard)

**Auto Bi-Level**: Auto Bi-Level delivers a combination of Bi-Level technology and auto-CPAP. Instead of having one fixed inspiratory pressure and one fixed expiratory pressure, these two pressure settings auto adjust based on therapy need. A pressure support number is established to instruct the machine the differences in pressure between the inspiratory pressure and expiratory pressure. This pressure setting is typically between 3cm/H2O and 6cm/H2O. Much like auto CPAP machines, the Auto Bi-Level device can operate in two modes which are the standard Bi-Level mode or auto adjust mode. Individuals who require Auto Bi-Level therapy have the same determining factors as the standard Bi-Level candidates. Home Auto Bi-Level therapy is an alternative in an individual who has tried and failed CPAP and/or APAP therapy.

**BPAP and Adaptive Servoventilation**: BPAP delivers a higher fixed level of pressure during inspiration and a lower fixed pressure during expiration, unlike CPAP which delivers a level of positive airway pressure that remains constant during the respiratory cycle. BPAP is not considered a first-line treatment for OSA, but for those who require high levels of PAP, the lower pressure administered during expiration with BPAP can make treatment easier to tolerate. With most BPAP devices, it is possible to set a backup respiratory rate, which consists of the number of breaths initiated by the device per minute. When no backup rate is set, the device is said to be in spontaneous mode. BPAP with a backup respiratory rate is a treatment option for treatment-emergent central sleep apnea.

Adaptive servoventilation (ASV) provides a varying amount of inspiratory pressure superimposed on a low level of CPAP, with a backup respiratory rate. The degree of inspiratory pressure delivered is reciprocal to changes in peak flow, determined over a three to four minute window. ASV devices were introduced on the 1990s to treat central sleep apnea (CSA) syndromes, and have been used for patients with treatment-emergent CSA.

In 2016 the AASM published updated adaptive servo-ventilation (ASV) recommendations for the 2012 AASM Guideline: “The Treatment of Central Sleep Apnea Syndromes in Adults: Practice Parameters with an Evidence-Based Literature Review and Meta-Analyses”. The AASM states that adaptive servo-ventilation, autoSV/BiPAP
and autoSV advanced devices should not be used in patients with symptomatic chronic congestive heart failure (CHF) with reduced ejection fraction (LVEF less than or equal to 45%) (Aurora, et al., 2016). ResMed identified a significant increase in the risk of cardiovascular death in patients with symptomatic, chronic heart failure (NYHA II–IV) with reduced ejection fraction (LVEF ≤ 45%) and moderate to severe predominant central sleep apnea (AHI ≥ 15, CAHI/AHI ≥ 50% and CAI ≥ 10) (ResMed website, 2016).

The SERVE-HF study is a multinational, multicenter randomized parallel trial designed to assess the effects of addition of ASV to optimal medical management compared with medical management alone in patients with symptomatic chronic heart failure, left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤ 45%, and predominant central sleep apnea (n=1325). The study began in 2008, with an estimated completion date of May 2015. On May 13, 2015, ResMed issued a press release and Urgent Field Safety Notice based on preliminary results of the trial. Although there were no significant differences between the two groups in the primary endpoint of all-cause mortality or unplanned hospitalization for worsening heart failure, there was a significant 2.5% absolute increased annual risk of cardiovascular mortality for those randomized to ASV therapy compared to those in the control group. Ten percent of those in the ASV group experiences a cardiovascular death each year compared to 7.5% of those in the control group; a 33.5% relative increased risk of cardiovascular mortality (p=0.010) (Cowie, et al., 2013, ResMed website, 2016).

According to the ResMed website, manuals for their ASV products are being updated to state that use of ASV is contraindicated in patients with symptomatic chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (LVEF ≤ 45%). Although only ResMed ASV devices were used in the SERVE-HF study, Philips Respironics is actively evaluating the information provided by ResMed and until that investigation is complete, are strongly recommending that clinicians adhere to the recommendations published by ResMed (FDA website).

Adaptive servoventilation (ASV) is therefore considered to be contraindicated for an individual with predominantly central sleep apnea who has symptomatic chronic heart failure and reduced left ventricular ejection fraction ≤ 45%. BPAP with a back-up rate, however, may be considered as a therapeutic option for such patients.

Note: This Coverage Policy is not intended to address the use of BPAP or adaptive servoventilation in the treatment of respiratory conditions other than OSA or treatment-emergent CSA (e.g. obesity hypoventilation syndrome, respiratory failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, neuromuscular chest wall disease).

Morgenthaler et al. (2014) conducted a small randomized controlled trial to compare clinical and PSG outcomes over prolonged treatment of patients with complex sleep apnea syndrome with CPAP (n=33) vs. ASV (n=33). The device used was the Resmed VPAP Adapt SV flow generator, and devices were set in the ASV mode or CPAP mode, depending on the allocation arm. At baseline, the diagnostic AHI was 37.7 ± 27.8 (central apnea index [CAI] 3.2 ± 5.8) and best CPAP AHI was 37.0 ± 24.9 (CAI 29.7 ± 25.0). After second night treatment titration, the AHI was 4.7 ± 8.1 (CAI 1.1 ± 3.7) on ASV and 14.1 ± 20.7(CAI 8.8 ±16.3) on CPAP (p<0.0003). At 90 days the ASV vs. CPAP AHI was 4.4 ± 9.6 vs. 9.9 ±11.1 (p=0.0024) and CAI was 0.7 ± 3.4 vs. 4.8 ± 6.4 (p<0.0001), respectively. In the intention to treat analysis, success (i.e., AHI <10) at 90 days was achieved in 89.7% of patients in the ASV group compared to 64.5% of those in the CPAP group (p=0.0214). There were no significant differences in changes in compliance, Epworth Sleepiness Scale, or Sleep Apnea Quality of life index.

Dellweg et al. (2013) conducted a small randomized controlled trial to compare treatment with noninvasive positive pressure ventilation using bilevel positive airway pressure (BPAP) with a backup rate (n=19) vs. servoventilation (n=18) for the treatment of CPAP-induced central sleep apnea. Inclusion criteria consisted of AHI ≥ 15 during initial PSG with a predominance of obstructive events, or AHI ≥ 15 on CPAP therapy after six weeks of CPAP treatment during a follow-up PSG, with a predominance of central events. During initial titration, BPAP with a backup rate and servoventilation significantly improved the AHI (9.1 ± 4.3 vs. 9 ± 6.4 events/hour), apnea indices (2 ± 3.1 versus 3.5 ± 4.5 events/hour) central apnea index (2 ± 3.1 vs. 2.5 ± 3.9 events/hour) and oxygen desaturation indices (10.1 ± 4.5 vs. 8.9 ± 8.4 events/hour) when compared to CPAP treatment (all p < 0.05). After 6 weeks the following differences were observed: between BPAP with a backup rate and servoventilation, respectively: AHI (16.5 ± 8 versus 7.4 ± 4.2 events/hour, p = 0.027), apnea indices (10.4 ± 5.9 versus 1.7 ± 1.9 events/hour, p = 0.001), central apnea index (10.2 ± 5.1 vs. 1.5 ± 1.7 events/hour, p < 0.0001) and oxygen desaturation indices (21.1 ± 9.2 versus 4.8 ± 3.4 events/hour, p < 0.0001). Sleep was not affected...
by either intervention. The authors stated that changes in carbon dioxide homeostasis inducted by BPAP with a backup rate but not by servoventilation might have accounted for the different results at six weeks.

Allam et al. (2007) conducted a retrospective review to evaluate the application and effectiveness of ASV in the treatment of complex and central sleep apnea (CSA) syndromes. The analysis was performed by a chart review of 100 consecutive patients who underwent PSG using ASV at the Mayo Clinic Sleep Center. ASV titration was performed for treatment emergent CSA (63%), CSA (22%) or CSA/Cheyne Stokes breathing patterns (15%). The median diagnostic AHI was 48 events per hour (range 24-62). With CPAP, obstructive apneas decreased, but the appearance of central apneas maintained the AHI at 31 events/hour (range 17-47; p=0.02). With BPAP in spontaneous mode, AHI trended toward worsening vs. baseline, with a median 75 event/hour (range 46-111; p=0.055). BPAP with a backup rate improved the AHI to 15 events per hour (range 11-31; p=0.002). Use of ASV dramatically improved the AHI to a mean of 5 events per hour (range 1-11) vs. baseline and vs. CPAP (p<0.0001). ASV also resulted in increased REM sleep (18%) vs. baseline (12%) and vs. CPAP (10%).

AASM practice parameters on the use of CPAP and BPAP (Kushida, et al. 2006) state that BPAP is an optional therapy in some cases where high pressure is needed and the patient experiences difficulty exhaling against a fixed pressure. BPAP may also be indicated when coexisting central hypoventilation is present. These practice parameters were published prior to publication of the AASM International Classification of Sleep Disorders (ICSD) 3rd edition, and do not specifically address treatment-emergent central sleep apnea. AASM practice parameters for the treatment of central sleep apnea (Aurora et al., 2011) were also published prior to publication of ICSD 3rd edition and therefore do not include recommendations for treatment-emergent CSA.

There is lack of high quality evidence to determine the appropriate mode of PAP for patients with treatment-emergent CSA. CSA resolves spontaneously in a significant percentage of patients who continue to be treated with CPAP. It is not possible to identify any PSG or patient characteristics, however, that would predict resolution of treatment-emergent CSA. The condition may persist on CPAP, despite improvement in daytime sleepiness; Patients with treatment-emergent CSA treated with CPAP who remain symptomatic are likely to be less compliant than those whose treatment-emergent CSA resolves. Therefore, initial treatment with BPAP with a back-up respiratory rate or adaptive servoventilation rather than CPAP is reasonable as the initial mode of PAP therapy for patients with treatment-emergent CSA (Morgenthaler, 2014; Kuzniar, 2011).

C-Flex: C-Flex (Respironics Inc., Murrysville, PA) received FDA 510(k) approval on Oct 10, 1999. C-Flex is a feature available on CPAP, APAP, and BPAP devices manufactured by Respironics. The C-Flex feature lowers the initial expiratory pressure in proportion to the patient’s expiratory flow rate. The pressure is then increased to therapeutic levels near the end of exhalation when airway collapse is most likely. It has been proposed that C-Flex could result in increased comfort and may improve treatment adherence. C-Flex is a standard feature on PAP devices.

Oral Pressure Therapy
Oral pressure therapy has also been proposed for the treatment of OSA. The Winx® Sleep Therapy System (ApriCure, Inc., Redwood City CA) received FDA approval through the 510(k) process on May 22, 2013. An earlier version of the device was approved in 2012. The Winx Sleep Therapy System consists of a small electronic bedside console, a soft polymer mouthpiece, a flexible polymer tube that connects the mouthpiece to the console, and a physician’s software application. The mouthpiece is an intraoral device that is worn during sleep. The system is designed to increase airway patency and decrease airway obstruction by delivering a gentle negative pressure into the oral cavity and holding the tongue and soft palate out of the airway. Published evidence evaluating the use of this device is limited to feasibility studies and a small case series (Colrain, et al., 2013). There is insufficient evidence to determine the safety and efficacy of this system for the treatment of OSA.

PAP Interfaces: PAP is most commonly applied using a nasal mask, or alternately, nasal pillows or prongs. An Oracle™ Oral Mask (Fisher & Paykel Healthcare, Irvine, CA) may be used as an alternative to nasal interfaces. The Oracle interface delivers pressure through the mouth rather than the nose. The type of interface used is likely to influence acceptance and adherence to PAP therapy; compliance is affected by the incidence of side effects, including claustrophobia, air leaks, pressure sores, nasal stuffiness, dry mouth and mask discomfort (Chai, et al, 2006)
In a Cochrane review, Chai et al. (2006, updated 2014) compared the efficacy of various CPAP delivery interfaces available for the treatment of OSA (n=132). Two studies compared nasal masks with the Oracle Oral Mask and showed no significant difference in compliance at one month. There were no significant differences in any of the physiological parameters (e.g., apnea-hypopnea index, arousal index, minimum oxygen saturation), Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS) or symptoms of OSA. One study comparing a nasal mask to nasal pillows showed a significant difference in compliance in favor of nasal pillows (p=0.02), fewer overall adverse effects (p<0.001), and greater interface satisfaction (p=0.001). A study comparing nasal mask with face mask showed significantly greater compliance and lower ESS scores with use of a nasal mask. The nasal mask was the preferred interface in almost all patients. The authors concluded that due to the limited number of studies comparing various interface types, the optimum form of delivery interface remains unclear. Nasal pillows or the Oracle oral mask may be useful alternatives when a patient is unable to tolerate conventional nasal masks. A full-face mask, while not a first-line interface, may be used if nasal obstruction or dryness limits the use of a nasal interface.

CPAP PRO® (Stevenson Industries, Inc., Simi Valley, CA) has been proposed as an interface alternative without straps or headgear. CPAP PRO consists of a boil and bite dental appliance that is snapped in place on the upper teeth, with a small bracket extending beyond the lips to attach to a pair of nasal tubes. The paired nasal tubes combine to form a “Y”; the lower arm is attached to a CPAP machine, and the upper arms terminate in soft silicone nasal inserts. There are no published studies of CPAP PRO in the medical literature. It is not possible to determine how this device compares to standard and broadly used CPAP interfaces.

**Home PAP Titration**

As discussed in the PSG section above, PAP pressures may be titrated during the second portion of a split-night PSG when a diagnosis of OSA has been established during the initial diagnostic portion of the exam, or during a full-night PSG that follows a diagnostic PSG in which the diagnosis of OSA is established. In-facility PSG, rather than home/portable testing, is indicated only for patients who are not suitable candidates for home testing due to medical comorbidities, or when sleep disorders other than OSA are suspected. When a diagnosis of OSA is established following a home/portable study, home titration to determine a fixed CPAP pressure can be effectively completed using auto-titrating positive airway pressure. Evidence from several well-designed trials demonstrates that home PAP titration using APAP compared to in-facility titration results in similar outcomes in terms of improvement in AHI, Epworth Sleepiness scores, and CPAP acceptance and adherence (Gao, et al., 2012, Mulgrew, et al., 2007; Cross, et al., 2006).

The AASM practice parameters on the use of APAP for titrating pressures, discussed above (Morgenthaler, et al., 2008), state:

- Certain APAP devices may be used in an unattended way to determine a fixed CPAP pressure for patients with moderate to severe OSA without significant comorbidities (CHF, COPD, central sleep apnea syndrome, or hypoventilation syndromes). (Option).

The writing committee noted that the evidence was specific to each device, including the particular version of software and device version, and the pressure determination should be made by experienced sleep specialists after examining the raw pressure titration data for each patient. For these reasons, the authors did not find that the available evidence supported a guideline recommendation. The use of APAP for titrating pressures was considered an option, meaning that this is a patient care strategy that reflects uncertain clinical use and implies inconclusive or conflicting evidence, or conflicting expert opinion.

Although PSG-directed titration remains the standard method for determination of effective CPAP pressure, unattended titration using an APAP device may be a reasonable option for patients diagnosed with moderate or severe OSA without significant comorbidities.

**Adherence to PAP Therapy**

The ability of PAP to reverse the repetitive upper airway obstruction of sleep apnea is dramatic. PAP has been demonstrated to normalize sleep architecture, reduce daytime sleepiness, enhance daily functioning, elevate mood, reduce auto accidents, and decrease blood pressure and cardiovascular events. Despite the efficacy of CPAP, studies evaluating adherence report high rates of non-adherence. Adherence to PAP therapy is usually defined as ≥ four hours of CPAP usage for ≥ 70% of the nights monitored, based on a 1993 prospective study by Kribbs et al., evaluating patterns of CPAP use. Patient reports of the frequency and duration of CPAP use
frequently overestimate actual use. The average duration of CPAP use is approximately five hours per night, as reported in numerous studies. The available evidence indicates that CPAP used for more than six hours per night results in normal levels of objectively measured and subjectively reported daytime sleepiness, and improved daily functioning (Kribbs, et al., 1993; Gay, et al., 2006; Weaver and Grundstein, 2008). CPAP adherence is measured objectively using downloaded information from an electronic chip or through a modem which transmits information.

As stated above, adherence to PAP therapy is usually defined as ≥ four hours of CPAP usage for ≥ 70% of the nights monitored. Patients with borderline adherence to PAP therapy (e.g., 55%-69% of nights for at least three hours but less than four hours per night, may require intervention to evaluate barriers to treatment. According to the AASM Clinical Guideline, Evaluation, Management, and Long-Term Care of Obstructive Sleep Apnea in Adults (Epstein, et al., 2009) CPAP usage should be objectively monitored with time meters to help assure utilization. The guidelines also recommend close follow-up for PAPA usage and problems by appropriately trained health care providers to establish effective utilization patterns and remediate problems, if needed. This is especially important during the first few weeks of PAP use.

PAP-Nap Study: An abbreviated cardiorespiratory sleep study, referred to as a PAP-nap study, has been proposed as a method to acclimate patients to PAP and promote adherence to therapy. The PAP-nap study includes mask and pressure desensitization and therapy to overcome aversive emotional reactions, mental imagery, and physiologic exposure to PAP therapy during a nap period. There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to determine whether PAP-nap studies result in improved adherence to therapy of improved patient outcomes (Krakow, et al., 2008).

Oral Appliances
Various oral appliances have been developed for the treatment of OSA. Most of these devices are designed based on the principal that advancing the mandible and holding it forward during sleep improves upper airway patency and/or decreases upper airway collapsibility. The appliance is attached to the upper and lower dental arches and allows for incremental advancement of the mandible. Studies using cephalometry have shown that these mandibular repositioning appliances (MRAs) lower the tongue position, reduce the mandibular plane-to-hypoid distance, advance the mandible and widen the upper oropharynx (retropalatal and retroglossal) in some patients. An MRA, also referred to as mandibular advancement appliances (MAA) mandibular advancement device (MAD) or mandibular advancement splint (MAS) may be custom-made based on dental impressions or may consist of a prefabricated appliance adapted to the patient’s dimensions. Side effects reported with the use of MRAs include discomfort in the temporomandibular joint (TMJ), tooth and facial musculature discomfort, bite change, excessive salivation, and mouth dryness. Contraindications to MRA therapy include moderate to severe TMJ disorders, an inadequate protrusive ability, and lack of an adequate number of healthy teeth in the upper and lower dental arch. Significant bruxism may also be a contraindication, since damage to the appliance or increased pain may result. Patients with full dentures are generally unable to use an MRA but may be treated with a tongue-retaining appliance (TRA).

TRAs, also referred to as tongue-retaining devices (TRD), hold the tongue forward and affect genioglossus muscle activity in patients with OSA. The effect on other upper airway muscles has not been evaluated, however. TRAs may be custom-made or fitted by the patient. There are few studies on the use of TRAs, and these devices are generally only used in patients with contraindications to the use of an MRA.

A randomized controlled crossover trial was conducted by Phillips et al. (2013) to evaluate the health outcomes of optimal CPAP therapy compared to use of a mandibular advancement device (MAD). A total of 126 patients with moderate to severe OSA were randomly assigned to a treatment order and 108 completed the trial with both devices. The reduction in AHI was greater with CPAP than with MAD (CPAP AHI, 4.5 ± 6.6/hour; MAD AHI 11.1 ± 12.1/hour, p < 0.01), but compliance was higher with MAD (6.50 ± 1.3 hours/night vs. 5.20 ± 2 hours/night, p<0.00001). The 24-hour mean arterial pressure was not inferior on treatment with MAD compared to CPAP. Neither treatment improved blood pressure. Sleepiness, driving simulator performance, and disease-specific quality of life improved on both treatments by similar amounts, but MAD was superior to CPAP for improving four general quality of life domains. The authors stated that the similar results in terms of important health outcomes may be explained by greater efficacy of CPAP being offset by inferior compliance compared to MAD.
**Titration of an Oral Appliance:** Titration of adjustable mandibular advancement devices, during sleep studies, involves slowly adjusting (titrating) the mandibular advancement device to move the lower jaw, or mandible, forward slightly to enlarge the upper airway and thus prevent it from collapsing during sleep. Various methods have been proposed to predict treatment outcome with mandibular repositioning appliances for obstructive sleep apnea. Titration can be guided by a combination of both subjective symptomatic improvement and objective monitoring by overnight oximetry to find the optimally effective advancement level. A newly available remotely controlled mandibular titration device provides an objective mechanism by which to determine the maximal therapeutic level of mandibular protrusion during sleep. Optimizing mandibular advancement in individual patients is important for successful treatment, although no standardized titration procedure currently exists (Sutherland, et al., 2014).

Per the manufacturer website, (Zephyr Sleep Technologies; Calgary, Alberta Canada) MATRx is a remote-controlled, oral appliance titration study performed in the sleep lab. The MATRx study is proposed to identify the target protrusive position that will provide effective oral appliance therapy. MATRx is widely compatible with all types of PSG systems and has been installed in sleep labs across the US and Canada.

There is insufficient evidence in the published peer-reviewed literature to demonstrate the efficacy, long-term outcomes, impact on health outcomes and clinical utility of single-night oral appliance titration (e.g., the MATRx oral appliance titration study) to determine appropriateness of oral appliance therapy or parameters for fabrication of an oral appliance for the treatment of OSA.

A prospective, blinded outcome study (n=67) was performed by Remmers et al. (2013). Study objectives were to address the need for a validated tool that prospectively identifies favorable candidates for oral appliance therapy in treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. Therapeutic outcome with a mandibular protruding oral appliance was predicted following a mandibular protrusive titration study in the PSG laboratory. The mandibular protrusion titration study was performed using the MATRx device during a standard PSG study. All participants were blindly treated with a MRA, at either the predicted effective target protrusive position (ETPP) or a sham position, and therapeutic outcome was compared against prediction. At the final protrusive position, standard predictive parameters (sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values) showed statistically significant predictive accuracy (p< 0.05) in the range of 83% to 94%. The predicted ETPP provided an efficacious protrusive position in 87% of participants predicted to be therapeutically successful with MRA therapy (p<0.05). No long term outcomes were reported in this study.

In a 2016 UptoDate document on oral appliances in the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea in adults, the author reported that single-night titration is a promising approach whose practical application has begun to enter clinical practice. Single-night titration studies may be useful as a method for predicting which individuals will have a successful treatment outcome with an oral appliance (Cistulli, 2016).


Recommendations are classified as Standard, Guideline, or Option, in descending order based on the benefits vs. harms and the quality of evidence. Recommendations are included in the relevant sections below.

**Standard**
- Sleep physicians prescribe oral appliances, rather than no therapy, for adult patients who request treatment of primary snoring (without obstructive sleep apnea).
- Sleep physicians consider prescription of oral appliances, rather than no treatment, for adult patients with obstructive sleep apnea who are intolerant of CPAP therapy or prefer alternate therapy.

**Guideline**
- When oral appliance therapy is prescribed by a sleep physician for an adult patient with obstructive sleep apnea, a qualified dentist use a custom, titratable appliance over non-custom oral devices.
- Qualified dentists provide oversight—rather than no follow-up—of oral appliance therapy in adult patients with obstructive sleep apnea, to survey for dental related side effects or occlusal changes and reduce their incidence.
• Sleep physicians conduct follow-up sleep testing to improve or confirm treatment efficacy, rather than conduct follow-up without sleep testing, for patients fitted with oral appliances.
• Physicians and qualified dentists instruct adult patients treated with oral appliances for obstructive sleep apnea to return for periodic office visits—as opposed to no follow-up—with a qualified dentist and a sleep physician.

**Surgical Treatment**
Patients with OSA who fail or cannot comply with conservative treatment may be candidates for surgical interventions. The surgical techniques used to treat OSA specifically modify either the retropalatal or retrolingual region of the pharyngeal airway, or, in the case of tracheotomy, bypass the pharyngeal portion of the upper airway. The goals of surgical intervention in the treatment of OSA include resolution of clinical signs and symptoms of OSA and normalization of sleep quality, AHI, and oxyhemoglobin saturation levels.

Numerous upper airway procedures have been developed that may be used alone or in combination with other procedures to treat OSA. Palatal surgery procedures include uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP) and laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP). Additional palatal stiffening procedures introduced recently include cautery-assisted palatal stiffening operation (CAPSO) and radiofrequency energy (Coblation®, Somnoplasty®).

Palatal surgical procedures alone are not successful in achieving adequate reductions in AHI in most patients. The following procedures may be performed either alone or following palatal surgery when an unacceptable AHI persists: tracheotomy; inferior sagittal mandibular osteotomy (ISO) and genioglossal advancement with hyoid myotomy and suspension (GAHN); and maxillomandibular osteotomy and advancement (MMO). Several additional tongue-base procedures have been proposed for the treatment of OSA, including tongue base suspension with the AIRVance System (Influence Corp; San Francisco, CA), and base-of-tongue Somnoplasty.

**American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM):** Practice Parameters for the Surgical Modification of the Upper Airway for Obstructive Sleep Apnea in Adults (Aurora et al., 2010), based on a systematic review of the literature (Caples et al, 2010) updated earlier practice parameters published in 1996.

Recommendations are classified as Standard, Guideline, or Option, in descending order based on the benefits vs. harms and the quality of evidence. Recommendations for individual procedures are included in the relevant sections below.

**Standard:**
- The presence and severity of obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) must be determined before initiating surgical therapy
- The patient should be advised about potential surgical success rates and complications, the availability of alternative treatment options such as nasal positive airway pressure and oral appliances, and the levels of effectiveness and success rates of these alternative treatments.
- The desired outcomes of treatment include resolution of the clinical signs and symptoms of OSA and the normalization of sleep quality, the apnea-hypopnea index, and oxyhemoglobin saturation levels.

**Option**
- Maxillo-mandibular advancement (MMA) is indicated for surgical treatment of severe OSA in patients who cannot tolerate or who are unwilling to adhere to positive airway pressure therapy, or in whom oral appliances, which are more often appropriate in mild and moderate OSA patients, have been considered and found ineffective or undesirable.
- Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP) as a sole procedure, with or without tonsillectomy, does not reliably normalize the apnea hypopnea index (AHI) when treating moderate to severe OSA syndrome. Therefore, patients with severe OSA should initially be offered positive airway pressure (PAP) therapy, while those with moderate OSA should initially be offered either PAP therapy or oral appliances.
- Use of multi-level or stepwise surgery (MLS), as a combined procedure or as stepwise multiple operations, is acceptable in patients with narrowing of multiple sites in the upper airway, particularly if they have failed UPPP as a sole treatment.
- Laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP) is not routinely recommended as a treatment for obstructive sleep apnea syndrome.
• Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) can be considered as a treatment in patients with mild to moderate OSA who cannot tolerate or who are unwilling to adhere to PAP therapy, or in whom oral appliances have been considered and found ineffective or undesirable.

• Palatal implants may be effective in some patients with mild OSA who cannot tolerate or who are unwilling to adhere to PAP therapy, or in whom oral appliances have been considered and found ineffective or undesirable.

An AHRQ comparative effectiveness review was conducted in 2011 to systematically review the evidence on OSA diagnosis and treatment in adults (discussed above in the diagnosis section). The review provided the following conclusions regarding surgical treatment of OSA:

Key Question: What is the comparative effect of different treatments for OSA in adults?

• The strength of evidence is insufficient to determine the relative merits of surgical treatments versus CPAP.

• The strength of evidence is insufficient regarding the relative merit of mandibular advancement devices versus surgery in the treatment of OSA.

American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS): No evidence-based practice guidelines were found by the AAO-HNS that address the treatment of OSA. The AAO-HNS has published several position statements related to OSA treatment options; however, these documents are based on an informal process of expert or committee consensus (AAO-HNS website).

Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP): UPPP increases the area of the retro-palatal airway by resection of the free edge of the uvula and soft palate in patients with collapse of the oropharyngeal and hypopharyngeal airways, or with some other anatomical impediment such as small retrolingual airways. UPPP may be combined with tonsillectomy and may also be performed sequentially with other surgical procedures. The success of UPPP is variable, with positive results most often seen in patients whose obstruction is limited to the retropalatal airway (Sher, et al., 1996; Sundaram, et al., 2005).

The recommendation for UPPP in the 2010 AASM practice parameters for surgical modification of the upper airway (Aurora, et al.), discussed above, states that UPPP does not reliably normalize the AHI in moderate to severe OSA; patients with severe OSA should therefore initially be offered PAP therapy, while those with moderate OSA should initially be offered either PAP therapy or an oral appliance. This recommendation differs from the previously published guideline that recommended UPPP for patients with narrowing or collapse of the retropalatal area.

Franklin et al. (2009) conducted a systematic review to evaluate the efficacy and adverse effects of surgery for snoring and OSA. The review included four randomized controlled trials of surgery vs. either sham surgery or conservative treatment in adults. The trials included outcome measures of daytime sleepiness, quality of life, AHI, and snoring. There was no significant effect on daytime sleepiness and quality of life after laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP). The AHI and snoring were reduced in one trial after LAUP but not in another. A total of 45 observational studies were also reviewed to evaluate adverse effects following surgical treatment. Persistent side-effects occurred after uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP) and uvulopalatoplasty (UPP), with difficulty swallowing, globus sensation, and voice changes commonly observed.

A Cochrane systematic review assessed the results of any surgery in the treatment of OSA in adults (Sundaram, et al., 2005). UPPP was one of several procedures evaluated. The authors concluded that available studies do not provide evidence to support the use of surgery in OSA because overall significant benefit has not been demonstrated. Long-term follow-up of patients who undergo surgical treatment is required to determine whether surgery is curative or whether the signs and symptoms of OSA tend to recur, requiring further treatment.

Sher (1996) conducted a systematic literature review with meta-analysis to provide an overview of the surgical treatment of OSA to provide the basis for the AASM practice parameters on this subject. Studies included in the meta-analysis provided preoperative and postoperative PSG data on at least nine patients treated with UPPP for OSA. Analysis of the UPPP studies revealed that this procedure is, at best, effective in treating less than
50% of patients with OSA. AASM practice parameters based on this review state that UPPP, with or without a tonsillectomy, may be appropriate for patients with narrowing or collapse in the retropalatal region. The recommendations also state that effectiveness of UPPP is variable, and the procedure should only be performed when nonsurgical treatment options, such as PAP, have been considered.

**Tracheostomy:** AASM practice parameters (Aurora et al., 2011), discussed above state that tracheostomy has been shown to be an effective single intervention to treat OSA. This operation should be considered only when other options do not exist, have failed, are refused, or when this operation is deemed necessary by clinical urgency. This recommendation is considered an Option; although tracheostomy is nearly always successful in bypassing the upper airway obstruction and normalizing AHI, it is not recommended as primary therapy based on placing a high value on patient safety, autonomy, and quality of life.

**Laser-Assisted Uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP)/Uvulectomy:** LAUP differs from UPPP in that much less palatal tissue is removed, the tonsils and pharyngeal pillars are not altered, and a carbon dioxide laser is used rather than a scalpel. Vertical transpalatal laser incisions measuring approximately one cm are made bilaterally through the soft palate lateral to the base of the tongue, followed by partial vaporization of the uvula. Up to seven separate treatment sessions may be required. Well-designed trials evaluating the safety and efficacy of LAUP are lacking.

AASM 2010 Practice Parameters for the Surgical Modification of the Upper Airway for OSA, as noted above, state that LAUP is not routinely recommended. The evidence was judged to be low quality LAUP does not generally normalize the AHI, and the literature does not demonstrate significant improvement in secondary outcomes. Two studies performed since the last review in 2001 actually reported worsening of the overall AHI.

**Uvulectomy:** Uvulectomy has been proposed as a surgical treatment for snoring and mild obstructive sleep apnea. There are no well-designed studies in the peer-reviewed medical literature that evaluate uvulectomy for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. Based on the available evidence, it is not possible to determine the safety and efficacy of this procedure compared to established medical and surgical treatment. Uvulectomy performed as a separate procedure is not addressed in relevant published specialty society guidelines.

(Note: This Coverage Policy is not intended to address uvulectomy when performed for other indications (e.g., acute inflammation/angioedema of the uvula).

**Cautery-Assisted Palatal Stiffening Operation (CAPSO):** CAPSO is an office-based procedure in which a midline strip of soft palate mucosa is removed, and the wound is left to heal by secondary intention. The procedure has been proposed as a treatment for OSA based on the premise that the resulting midline palatal scar stiffens the palate and eliminates palatal snoring.

Wassmuth et al. (2000) conducted a case series (n=25) to evaluate the ability of CAPSO to treat OSA. PSG was performed preoperatively and at three months following the procedure on all patients. Patients with a reduction in the AHI of 50% or more and an AHI of 10 or less were classified as responders. Based on these criteria, 40% of patients were considered to have responded to CAPSO. Mean AHI improved from 25.1 ± 12.9 to 16.6 ± 15.0. The ESS improved from 12.7 ± 5.6 to 8.8 ± 4.6. The authors concluded that CAPSO is as effective as other palatal surgeries in the management of OSA.

Although this case series reported promising results, there is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to demonstrate the safety, efficacy, and long-term outcomes of CAPSO in the treatment of OSA. Data from well-designed trials with adequate numbers of patients that compare this procedure with other treatments of OSA are lacking.

**Pillar™ Palatal Implant System:** The Pillar Palatal Implant System (Restore Medical, St. Paul, MN) received FDA 510(k) approval on December 18, 2002, for the treatment of snoring. On June 7, 2004, FDA approval of the Pillar System was expanded to include treatment of OSA. According to the FDA summary, the Pillar System consists of an implant and delivery tool, and is designed to stiffen the tissue of the soft palate to reduce the incidence of snoring in some patients and to reduce the incidence of airway obstruction in patients with mild to moderate OSA. The implant is a cylindrical-shaped segment of braided polyester filaments. The delivery tool consists of a handle and needle assembly that allows for positioning and placement of the implant in the submucosa of the soft palate.
A meta-analysis of the efficacy of the Pillar implant in the treatment of snoring and OSA was conducted by Choi et al. (2013). Efficacy for snoring (seven studies) and for mild to moderate OSA (seven studies) was analyzed separately. For patients with mild to moderate OSA, the Pillar implant significantly reduced the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (p<.001) and AHI (p=.002) compared to pre-procedure values. The authors noted that these results indicate that the Pillar implant has a moderate effect on snoring and mild to moderate OSA, but more studies with a high level of evidence are needed to arrive at a definite conclusion.

Friedman et al. (2007) conducted a retrospective review to assess subjective and objective improvement in 145 patients with mild to moderate OSA treated with a single-stage multilevel minimally invasive technique. All patients were treated with nasal surgery, palatal stiffening by Pillar implants, and radiofrequency volume reduction of the tongue base. Of 145 patients, 122 had a minimum follow-up of six months and complete data available for review. The primary outcome measure was change from baseline in AHI. The mean AHI decreased from 28.2 ± 7.6 preoperatively to 14.5 ± 10.2 postoperatively (p<.0001). Mean Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS) decreased from 9.7 ± 3.9 to 7.0 ± 3.3 (p<.0001). It is difficult to draw conclusions from this study due to its retrospective design, lack of long-term outcomes, and the inability to determine the individual impact of each procedure on short-term outcomes.

Nordgard et al. (2006) conducted a prospective nonrandomized study of 25 patients with untreated OSA with an AHI of 10–30, as determined by preoperative PSG, and BMI ≤ 30. Three permanent implants were placed in the soft palate of each patient in an office setting under local anesthesia. A repeat PSG showed a mean decrease in AHI from 16.2 to 12.1 for the study group. Twenty of 25 patients demonstrated a reduced AHI, and 12 of 25 patients demonstrated an AHI of 10 or less 90 days post-implant. The mean ESS score decreased from 9.7 to 5.5. The authors concluded that palatal implants can significantly improve AHI and other sleep-related parameters in patients with mild to moderate OSA and BMI ≤ 30, with short-term results comparable to those reported for UPPP. The authors acknowledged the lack of long-term outcomes in this study and the limited number of patients. As with other palatal procedures, reduction in effectiveness over time may be expected. The authors further concluded that while short-term durability and effectiveness have been established, longer-term research needs to be conducted.

A multicenter non-comparative study was conducted by Walker et al. (2006) to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the Pillar Palatal Implant System (n=53). Primary inclusion criteria were primary palatal contribution to OSA as determined by the investigator, an AHI of 10–30 events per hour, BMI ≤ 32 kg/m², age 18 or greater, and soft palate length adequate to accommodate a 28-mm implant. Each patient had three implants placed in the soft palate in an office procedure under local anesthesia. The primary outcome measure was AHI. PSG was performed prior to and 90 days following Pillar implantation. The AHI decreased from 25.0 ± 13.9 to 22.0 ± 14.8 events/hour (p=0.05). ESS scores, a secondary outcome measure, decreased from 11.0 ± 5.1 to 6.9 ± 4.5 (p<0.001). The AHI was reduced to below 10 in 12 patients (23%), and the AHI increased in 18 patients (34%). There were no serious complications. The most common adverse event was partial extrusion. Of 202 implants, 20 became partially exposed through the mucosa of the soft palate. All were removed and, in most cases, the implant was replaced.

AASM Practice Parameters for the Surgical Modification of the Upper Airway for OSA (Aurora, et al., 2011) discussed above, state that palatal implants may be effective in some patients with mild obstructive sleep apnea who cannot tolerate or are unwilling to adhere to PAP therapy, or in whom oral appliances have been considered and found ineffective or undesirable. Evidence is of very low quality, and while this procedure may be an alternate mode of therapy for mild OSA, it is difficult to predict if it will ultimately be found to be a reliably effective intervention.

There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to demonstrate the safety, efficacy, and long-term outcomes of the Pillar System in the treatment of OSA.

Radiofrequency Volumetric Tissue Reduction (RFVTR): RFVTR (e.g., Coblation®, Somnoplasty®) is a procedure used to remove redundant tissue in the upper airway. Although the procedure has been used to remove tissue from the turbinates and tonsils, recent studies of RFA in the treatment of OSA have limited the procedure to the soft palate, uvula and tongue base.
The ENTec™ ReFlex™ Wand (ArthroCare Corp., Sunnyvale, CA) received FDA approval through the 510(k) process on February 4, 2000, for ablation and coagulation of soft tissue in otolaryngological (ENT) surgery, including tissue in the uvula/soft palate for the treatment of snoring and submucosal palatal shrinkage. The ReFlex Wand is used to perform Coblation® treatment using radiofrequency energy. In 2002, the ENTec Plasma Wand received 510(k) approval for ablation, resection, and coagulation of soft tissue and hemostasis of blood vessels in ENT surgery, including tissue of the uvula/soft palate for the treatment of snoring.

The Somnoplasty system (Somnus Medical Technologies, Sunnyvale, CA) received FDA 510(k) approval on July 17, 1997, for coagulation of soft tissue, including the uvula/soft palate. The 510(k) summary states that the Somnoplasty system may reduce the severity of snoring in some individuals. An expanded approval on November 2, 1998, states that the system is intended for the reduction of the incidence of airway obstruction in patients with upper airway resistance syndrome and OSA. The Somnoplasty system is comprised of an RF generator and tissue coagulating electrodes. The procedure is usually performed on an outpatient basis with local anesthesia.

AASM practice parameters discussed above (Aurora, et al., 2010) state that RFA can be considered in patients with mild to moderate OSA who cannot tolerate or are unwilling to adhere to PAP therapy, or in whom oral appliances have been considered and found ineffective or undesirable. This is noted to be a new recommendation based on very low quality evidence. The average post-procedure AHI was found in 7 case series and one randomized controlled trial to be 14.9, consistent with residual mild OSA. The authors noted that RFA studies have shown improvement in subjective sleepiness and, in one study, quality of life. Because cardiovascular complications of OSA are associated with even lower values of AHI, patients treated with RFA should receive follow-up assessments for residual AHI, even if symptoms have improved. The authors also note that long-term sequelae of RFA are not published.

The systematic review by Franklin et al. (2009) to evaluate the efficacy and adverse effects of surgery for snoring and OSA, discussed above, concluded that there was no significant effect on daytime sleepiness and quality of life after radiofrequency ablation.

There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to demonstrate the safety, efficacy, and long-term outcomes of RFVTR (e.g., Somnoplasty, Coblation) in the treatment of OSA.

Multi-Level or Stepwise surgery (MLS): This category includes a wide array of combined procedures that address narrowing of multiple upper airway sites. MLS often consists of phase I, utilizing UPPP and/or genioglossus advancement and hyoid myotomy (GAHM). Phase II procedures, consisting of maxillary and mandibular advancement osteotomy (MMO), may be considered for patients who fail phase I surgeries (Aurora, et al., 2011).

AASM Practice Parameters for the Surgical Modification of the Upper Airway for OSA (Aurora, et al, 2011) discussed above state that use of multi-level or stepwise surgery (MLS), as a combined procedure or as stepwise multiple operations, is acceptable in patients with narrowing of multiple sites in the upper airway, particularly if they have failed UPPP as a sole treatment. Although a large volume of literature addressing MLS exists, the evidence is of low quality, consisting of observational case series or comparative studies without randomization. While a multilevel approach may eventually result in significant improvement in AHI, available data are heterogeneous, clinical outcomes such as cardiovascular events are not well studies, and multiple procedures could be associated with increased morbidity and mortality.

Maxillomandibular Advancement (MMA): Maxillomandibular advancement is a surgical procedure that involves the simultaneous advancement of the maxilla and mandible through sagittal split osteotomies. The procedure provides enlargement of the retrolingual airway, and some advancement of the retropalatal airway (Aurora, et al., 2011).

Holty and Guilleminault (2010) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 22 studies (627 patients) to evaluate the clinical efficacy and safety of maxillomandibular advancement for the treatment of OSA. The mean AHI decreased from 63.9/hour to 9.5/hour (p<0.001) following surgery. The pooled surgical success and cure (AHI<5) rates were 86.0% and 43.2%, respectively. Younger age, lower preoperative weight and AHI, and greater degree of maxillary advancement were predictive of increased surgical success. The major and minor complication rates were 1.0% and 31%, respectively. Long-term surgical success was maintained at a mean
follow-up of 44 months. Statistically significant improvements in quality of life measures, OSA symptomatology
(i.e., excessive daytime sleepiness) and blood pressure control were reported after MMA. The authors
concluded that MMA appears to be a safe and highly effective treatment for OSA, but further research is needed
to assess clinical outcomes of MMA more thoroughly in long-term cohort studies, and to identify which OSA
patients would benefit most from MMA.

AASM Practice Parameters for the Surgical Modification of the Upper Airway for OSA (Aurora et al., 2011),
discussed above, state that MMA is indicated for surgical treatment of severe OSA in patients who cannot
tolerate or who are unwilling to adhere to positive airway pressure therapy, or in whom oral appliances, which
are more often appropriate in mild and moderate OSA patients, have been considered and found ineffective or
undesirable. The evidence was considered to be very low quality, consisting of nine case series, but did tend to
demonstrate consistent effectiveness in severe OSA. In the published series, AHI was reduced to at least
10/hour in most patients, but PAP remains more effective in normalizing AHI, and improvement in other
measures such as sleepiness and quality of life are well supported for PAP but are lacking for MMA. PAP or oral
appliance therapy therefore should be suggested ahead of MMA in appropriate candidates.

Traditional "stepped" care frequently utilizes MMA as a final approach for surgical treatment of OSA, but MMA
may be considered as an initial or sole approach in treating OSA. The authors recommended multidisciplinary
evaluation to identify which patients would benefit from MMA as initial or sole therapy. There is a need for
further clarification regarding the relative risks and benefits of MMA compared with other treatment modalities.

The AirVance System:
The Repose Bone Screw System (Influence, Inc., San Francisco, CA) received FDA 510(k) approval on August 27, 1999. The device name was changed to AirVance in 2011, and is marketed by MedTronic. The system is used to perform anterior tongue base suspension by fixation of the soft tissue of the tongue base to the mandible bone using a bone screw with pre-threaded sutures. It is indicated for the treatment of OSA and/or snoring. The AirVance System has been proposed as a sole treatment of OSA and has also been used in conjunction with UPPP and radiofrequency ablation.

Kuhnel et al. (2005) conducted a prospective nonrandomized study (n=28) to demonstrate the efficacy of tongue base suspension with the Repose System in the treatment of OSA. PSG was performed before as well as three and 12 months after surgery. Lateral cephalometric radiography and videoendoscopy of the pharynx were performed preoperatively and postoperatively to identify morphological changes in the posterior airway space. A suspension suture anchored intraorally at the mandible was passed submucosally in the body of the tongue, with suture tightness adjusted individually. The posterior airway space was widened by at least 2 mm in 60% of cases. Daytime sleepiness improved subjectively in 67% of patients, and the RDI improved postoperatively in 55% of patients. The correlation between posterior airway space widening and the improvements in daytime sleepiness and respiratory disturbance index was not significant. The authors concluded that surgical intervention in obstructive sleep apnea syndrome with the Repose System does not result in permanent anatomical change in the posterior airway space.

Miller et al. (2002) conducted a retrospective analysis of the Repose System for the treatment of OSA to
describe preliminary experience using the system in conjunction with UPPP in the multilevel surgical approach.
The authors evaluated 19 consecutive patients undergoing UPPP and the Repose System tongue base suspension for the management of OSA during a one-year period (1998 through 1999). Fifteen patients had complete preoperative and postoperative PSG data. A 46% reduction in RDI was demonstrated at a mean of 3.8 months after surgery. The apnea index demonstrated a 39% reduction. The authors concluded that the Repose System in conjunction with UPPP has been shown to produce significant reductions in the RDI and apnea index, as well as a significant increase in oxygen saturation. Despite the improvement in these objective parameters, the overall surgical cure rate was only 20% (three of 15 patients) in this retrospective series. Further research is warranted to define the role of the Repose System in the management of obstructive sleep apnea patients.

There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to support the safety, efficacy, and long-term outcomes of the use of the Repose System in the treatment of OSA.

Transpalatal Advancement Pharyngoplasty
Transpalatal Advancement Pharyngoplasty has been proposed as an alternative to traditional methods of
reconstructing the upper pharyngeal airway. The procedure enlarges and stabilizes the upper pharyngeal airway
by altering bone and soft tissue attachments of the posterior maxilla. The concept of transpalatal advancement
pharyngoplasty is based on OSA pathophysiology in which the primary craniofacial predictor of OSA severity is maxillary constriction. The procedure increases the retropalatal airway size by combining a posterior maxillectomy with soft palate mobilization. Evidence evaluating this technique is limited, consisting primarily of retrospective reviews. There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to determine the safety and efficacy of this procedure or to determine how it compares to available treatment options for OSA.

Other Devices and Procedures

Implanted Upper Airway Stimulation Devices

Inspire® Upper Airway Stimulation (UAS) (Inspire Medical Systems Inc., Maple Grove, MN) received FDA approval through the PMA process on April 30, 2014 (P130008). The implanted components of the Inspire therapy system consist of the Inspire II implantable pulse generator, the stimulation lead, and the respiratory sensing lead model. When therapy is on, the Inspire system detects the patient’s respiratory effort and maintains airway patency with mild stimulation of the hypoglossal nerve. Therapy settings are stored in the pulse generator and configured by the physician using an external programmer. The patient uses the Inspire sleep remote to turn therapy on before sleep and to turn therapy off on awakening.

According to the FDA labeling, the Inspire system is indicated for treatment of a subset of patients with moderate to severe OSA (apnea-hypopnea index of ≥ 20 and ≤ 65). Inspire UAS may be used in adults 22 years of age and older who have been confirmed to fail or cannot tolerate PAP treatments (such as CPAP or BPAP) and who do not have a complete concentric collapse at the soft palate level. PAP failure is defined as an inability to eliminate OSA (AHI of greater than 20 despite PAP usage), and PAP intolerance is defined as: (1) Inability to use PAP (greater than five nights per week of usage; usage defined as greater than four hours of use per night), or (2) unwillingness to use PAP (for example, a patient returns the PAP system after attempting to use it).

Hypoglossal nerve stimulator devices that have not received FDA approval include the aura 6000 (Imthera Medical Inc., San Diego CA) and HGNS® System (Apnex Medical, Inc, Minneapolis, MN).

Strollo et al. (2014) conducted a multicenter single-group cohort study to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of a surgically implanted upper airway stimulation device (Inspire UAS) for the treatment of patients with moderate to severe OSA who had difficulty either accepting or adhering to CPAP therapy (n=126). The mean age was 54.5 years and mean BMI was 28.4. The primary outcome measures were AHI and oxygen desaturation index (ODI) (the number of times per hour of sleep that the blood oxygen level drops by ≥ 4 percentage points from baseline). Secondary outcomes were ESS, Functional Outcomes of Sleep Questionnaire (FOSQ), and percentage of sleep time with the oxygen saturation less than 90%. The median AHI score at 12 months decreased 68% from 29.3 events/hour to 7.4 events/hour (p<0.001). Scores on the FOSQ and ESS indicated significant improvement at 12 months; the increase in the FOSQ score exceeded the 2.0 point increase typically considered to be a clinically meaningful improvement, and the ESS score at 12 months was consistent with normalization of the measure (i.e., score <10.0). At 12 months, the criteria for the co-primary outcomes of AHI reduction and reduction in ODI were met by 66% and 75% of participants, respectively. Consecutive patients with a response were included in a randomized, controlled therapy withdrawal trial. In this randomized phase the mean AHI did not differ significantly from the 12-month score in the initial phase among the 23 patients in the therapy-maintenance group (8.9 and 7.2 events/hour, respectively). The AHI was significantly higher in the 12 participants in the therapy withdrawal group (25.8 vs. 7.6 events/hour, p<0.001). (The device was turned off in the therapy withdrawal group). The rate of serious adverse events was less than 2%. The lack of a control group limits the validity of the results of this study. Follow-up studies of the same patient population at 18 and 36 months, indicate that the treatment effects are maintained over time. Limitations are the same as the original study (Strollo, et al., 2015; Woodson, et al., 2016).

Certal et al. (2015) conducted a systematic review of the evidence regarding the efficacy and safety of hypoglossal nerve stimulation as an alternative therapy in the treatment of OSA. A total of six prospective studies with 200 patients were included in this review. Studies were included that evaluated the efficacy of hypoglossal nerve stimulation to treat OSA in adults with outcomes for apnea-hypopnea index (AHI), oxygen desaturation index (ODI), and effect on daytime sleepiness (Epworth Sleepiness Scale [ESS]). Tests for heterogeneity and subgroup analysis were performed. At 12 months, the pooled fixed effects analysis demonstrated statistically significant reductions in AHI, ODI, and ESS mean difference of -17.51 (95% CI: -20.69 to -14.34); -13.73 (95% CI: -16.87 to -10.58), and -4.42 (95% CI: -5.39 to -3.44), respectively. Similar significant
reductions were observed at 3 and 6 months. Overall, the AHI was reduced between 50% and 57%, and the ODI was reduced between 48% and 52%. Despite using different hypoglossal nerve stimulators in each subgroup analysis, no significant heterogeneity was found in any of the comparisons, suggesting equivalent efficacy regardless of the system in use. The authors reported that further studies comparing hypoglossal nerve stimulation with conventional therapies are needed to definitively evaluate outcomes.

The 2009 AASM Clinical Guideline for the Evaluation, Management and Long-Term Care of Obstructive Sleep Apnea in Adults does not mention the use of a hypoglossal nerve stimulator device as treatment option for the treatment of OSA (Epstein, et al., 2009).

In a 2016 Hayes Directory Report on Hypoglossal Nerve Stimulation for Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea the authors concluded that the overall quality of the evidence evaluating hypoglossal nerve stimulation is very low. The authors reported that “for use of hypoglossal nerve stimulation (HGNS) for the treatment of moderate-to-severe obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in adult patients for whom continuous positive airway pressure has failed to provide relief there is a paucity of good-quality comparative studies with sufficient sample sizes assessing HGNS for OSA. The limited number of available studies presented consistent improvements in apnea-hypopnea index, oxygen desaturation index, and airflow mechanics for OSA patients. Inconsistent evidence generally indicated that quality-of-life measures did improve, but that sleep efficiency and/or sleep architecture parameters did not improve”. The procedure may carry risks for complications and post-implantation surgical procedures. Additionally, better-quality studies are required to define the patient population that is most likely to respond to HGNS (Hayes, 2016).

In a 2016 UptoDate document on surgical treatment of OSA in adults, the author reports that hypoglossal nerve stimulation is a new strategy that is emerging as a potential treatment option in selected patients. The author reports that the device has not yet been compared directly with other therapies for OSA, and its role is still evolving. Optimal patient selection, generalizability, health outcomes, and longer-term outcomes for this treatment are not yet clear (Weaver, 2016).

Provent™ Device: The Provent Professional Sleep Apnea Therapy device (Ventus Medical, Inc., Belmont, CA) received U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Approval through the 510(k) process on February 6, 2008 for use in the treatment of OSA. The Provent device consists of a single-use nasal insert composed of soft foam surrounding a valve body constructed of a urethane polymer. The valve body contains a silicone valve mechanism that acts to increase the expiratory pressure by creating expiratory resistance, resulting in airway positive back pressure during expiration. A device is inserted into each nostril and held in place by adhesive tape.

In a pilot evaluation of the Provent nasal expiratory resistance device, Colrain et al. (2008) recruited 24 patients with an AHI > 5 and six patients with primary snoring. Exclusion criteria included basal metabolic index (BMI) > 35. Patients were evaluated with PSG on two consecutive nights; PSG alone was performed on one night, and PSG was combined with the Provent device on the alternate night. The AHI and oxygen desaturation both decreased significantly with use of the device (p<0.001 and p < 0.1, respectively). The percentage of time spent above 90% oxygen saturation also increased significantly with device use (p < 0.05). There were no significant changes in measures of sleep architecture. Because of the study design, small number of participants and data from a single night of treatment, conclusions cannot be drawn from this pilot study.

Berry et al. (2010) conducted a randomized controlled trial to evaluate treatment with expiratory positive airway pressure (EPAP). Patients with OSA with an AHI of ≥ 10 were assigned to treatment with the Provent device (n=127) or a similar-appearing sham device (n=123) for three months. During the first week of treatment, after at least three nights of device use, PSG was performed on two non-consecutive nights; PSG alone was performed on one night, and PSG was combined with the Provent device on the alternate night. The AHI and oxygen desaturation both decreased significantly with use of the device (p<0.001 and p < 0.1, respectively). The percentage of time spent above 90% oxygen saturation also increased significantly with device use (p < 0.05). There were no significant changes in measures of sleep architecture. Because of the study design, small number of participants and data from a single night of treatment, conclusions cannot be drawn from this pilot study.
Although EPAP with the use of the Provent device is a promising treatment option, additional well-designed studies are needed to determine how this device compares to currently available options in the treatment of OSA in terms of safety, efficacy, and long-term outcomes.

Electrosleep Therapy: Electrosleep therapy consists of the application of short duration, low-amplitude pulses of direct current to the patient's brain via externally placed occipital electrodes. It has been used in the treatment of chronic insomnia, anxiety, and depression, but has also been used in disorders with possible psychosomatic components, such as asthma, spastic colitis, or tension headache, and for organic disorders, including essential hypertension. Scientific assessment of this technique has not been completed, and its efficacy in the treatment of OSA has not been established.

Injection Snoreplasty: Injection Snoreplasty is a nonsurgical treatment for snoring that involves the injection of a hardening agent into the upper palate. Sodium tetradecyl sulfate is the most common hardening agent used. Following the injection, scar tissue is reported to pull the uvula forward to eliminate palatal flutter associated with snoring. There is no evidence in the published medical literature to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of injection Snoreplasty in the treatment of OSA.

Atrial Overdrive Pacing: Atrial overdrive pacing by means of an implantable cardiac pacemaker has been proposed as a treatment for central sleep apnea patients and in certain OSA patients with some degree of heart failure. Atrial overdrive pacing consists of pacing at a rate higher than the mean nocturnal sinus rate. Investigators theorized that atrial overdrive pacing would improve vagal tone and increase upper airway muscle activity in patients with OSA.

Weng et al. conducted a meta-analysis of eight randomized controlled trials to determine the effects of atrial overdrive pacing on sleep apnea syndrome (n=129). Atrial overdrive pacing, as compared to non-pacing, reduced the apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) and increased the minimum arterial oxygen saturation (SaO2) significantly in the central sleep apnea-predominant trials. No statistically significant increase in minimum SaO2 was observed in the obstructive sleep apnea syndrome-predominant trials, however, and it was unclear whether AHI was reduced in these patients. The authors concluded that the role of atrial overdrive pacing in obstructive sleep apnea syndrome remains unclear.

Guidelines for device-based therapy published by the American College of Cardiology (ACC) and the American Heart Association (AHA) state that, a variety of heart rhythm disturbances may occur in OSA. Sinus bradycardia or pauses may occur during hypopneic episodes, and atrial tachyarrhythmias may also be observed, especially following an apnea episode. The guideline states that although a small retrospective trial demonstrated a decrease in central or OSA without reducing the total sleep time, subsequent randomized trials have not validated a role for atrial overdrive pacing in OSA (Epstein et al., 2008).

There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of atrial overdrive pacing in the treatment of OSA.

Night Shift™ Sleep Positioner: The Night Shift Sleep Positioner (Advanced Brain Monitoring, Carlsbad, CA) is proposed for patients with positional obstructive sleep apnea and snorers. The device is worn on the back of the neck and will vibrate when the user starts to back sleep warning the user to change positions. There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of this device in the treatment of OSA.

Diagnosis of OSA-Child:
The etiology, clinical manifestations and treatment of OSA in the pediatric population differ from those in adults. OSA in children is described in a clinical statement by the ATS (1996) as a disorder of breathing during sleep characterized by prolonged partial upper airway obstruction and/or intermittent complete obstruction (obstructive apnea) that disrupts normal ventilation during sleep and disrupts normal sleep patterns. In children, obstructive apneas of any length are considered abnormal, and children with OSA may demonstrate obstructive hypoventilation or continuous hypopnea associated with hypercapnia, as opposed to discrete obstructive apnea events as seen in adults. During these episodes, increased respiratory effort as evidenced by retractions and/or paradoxical chest movements may be seen. Hypercapnia or oxyhemoglobin desaturation usually accompany these periods of obstructive hypoventilation. The episodes may terminate spontaneously or by arousal from sleep but may last continuously throughout the night.
American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP): An updated AAP Clinical Practice Guideline, Diagnosis and Management of Childhood Obstructive sleep Apnea Syndrome, was published in 2012 (Marcus et al.). The guideline focuses on uncomplicated childhood OSA, i.e., the OSA associated with adenotonsillar hypertrophy and/or obesity in an otherwise healthy child being treated in the primary care setting. The guideline defines OSA in children, consistent with the ATS definition above) as “a disorder of breathing during sleep characterized by prolonged partial upper airway obstruction and/or intermittent complete obstruction (obstructive apnea) that disrupts normal ventilation during sleep and normal sleep patterns”, accompanied by the following symptoms or signs:

- **History**
  - Frequent snoring (≥3 nights/week)
  - Labored breathing during sleep
  - Gasp/snorting noises/observed episodes of apnea
  - Sleep enuresis (especially secondary enuresis) after at least 6 months of continence
  - Sleeping in a seated position or with the neck hyperextended
  - Cyanosis
  - Headaches on awakening
  - Daytime sleepiness
  - Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder
  - Learning problems

- **Physical examination**
  - Underweight or overweight
  - Tonsillar hypertrophy
  - Adenoidal facies
  - Micrognathia/retrognathia
  - High-arched palate
  - Failure to thrive
  - Hypertension

Evidence grading used in the Key Action Statements ranges from A (randomized controlled trials or diagnostic studies on relevant population) to D (expert opinion, case reports, reasoning from first principles), with an additional category of X (exceptional situations where validating studies cannot be performed and there is a clear preponderance of benefit or harm). Recommendations are designated as strong recommendation, recommendation, option, or no recommendation.

The guideline includes the following key action statements regarding testing for OSA:

**Polysomnography**
If a child or adolescent snores on a regular basis and has any of the [above] complaints or findings, clinicians should either
- obtain a polysomnogram (Evidence Quality A, Key Action strength: Recommendation) OR
- refer the patient to a sleep specialist or otolaryngologist for a more extensive evaluation (Evidence quality D, Key Action strength: Option). (Evidence Quality: Grade A for polysomnography; Grade D for specialist referral, Recommendation Strength: Recommendation.)

**Alternative Testing**
- If polysomnography is not available, then clinicians may order alternative diagnostic tests, such as nocturnal video recording, nocturnal oximetry, daytime nap polysomnography, or ambulatory polysomnography. (Evidence Quality: Grade C, Recommendation Strength: Option.)

American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM): Practice Parameters for the Respiratory Indications for Polysomnography in Children, based on a systematic review of the literature. (Aurora et al., 2011), classifies recommendations as follows:
• Standard: A generally accepted patient-care strategy that reflects a high degree of clinical certainty and generally implies the use of Level 1 evidence or overwhelming Level 2 evidence.
• Guideline: A patient-care strategy that reflects a moderate degree of clinical certainty and implies the use of Level 2 evidence or a consensus of Level 3 evidence.
• Option: A patient care strategy that reflects uncertain clinical use and implies inconclusive or conflicting evidence or conflicting expert opinion.

Recommendations for PSG use include the following:

**Standard**
1. Polysomnography in children should be performed and interpreted in accordance with the recommendations of the AASM Manual for the Scoring of Sleep and Associated Events.
2. Polysomnography is indicated when the clinical assessment suggests the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea syndrome (OSAS) in children.
3. Children with mild OSAS preoperatively should have clinical evaluation following adenotonsillectomy to assess for residual symptoms. If there are residual symptoms of OSAS, polysomnography should be performed.
4. Polysomnography is indicated following adenotonsillectomy to assess for residual OSAS in children with preoperative evidence for moderate to severe OSAS, obesity, craniofacial anomalies that obstruct the upper airway, and neurologic disorders (e.g., Down syndrome, Prader-Willi syndrome, and myelomeningocele).
5. Polysomnography is indicated for positive airway pressure (PAP) titration in children with obstructive sleep apnea syndrome.

**Guideline**
1. Polysomnography is indicated when the clinical assessment suggests the diagnosis of congenital central alveolar hypoventilation syndrome or sleep related hypoventilation due to neuromuscular disorders or chest wall deformities. It is indicated in selected cases of primary sleep apnea of infancy.
2. Polysomnography is indicated when there is clinical evidence of a sleep related breathing disorder in infants who have experienced an apparent life-threatening event (ALTE).
3. Polysomnography is indicated in children being considered for adenotonsillectomy to treat obstructive sleep apnea syndrome.
4. Follow-up PSG in children on chronic PAP support is indicated to determine whether pressure requirements have changed as a result of the child’s growth and development, if symptoms recur while on PAP, or if additional or alternate treatment is instituted.

**Option**
1. Polysomnography is indicated after treatment of children for OSAS with rapid maxillary expansion to assess for the level of residual disease and to determine whether additional treatment is necessary.
2. Children with OSAS treated with an oral appliance should have clinical follow-up and polysomnography to assess response to treatment.
3. Polysomnography is indicated for noninvasive positive pressure ventilation (NIPPV) titration in children with other sleep related breathing disorders.
4. Children treated with mechanical ventilation may benefit from periodic evaluation with polysomnography to adjust ventilator settings.
5. Children treated with tracheostomy for sleep related breathing disorders benefit from polysomnography as part of the evaluation prior to decannulation. These children should be followed clinically after decannulation to assess for recurrence of symptoms of sleep related breathing disorders.
6. Polysomnography is indicated in the following respiratory disorders only if there is a clinical suspicion for an accompanying sleep related breathing disorder: chronic asthma, cystic fibrosis, pulmonary hypertension, bronchopulmonary dysplasia, or chest wall abnormality such as kyphoscoliosis.

Recommendations against PSG Use:
1. Nap (abbreviated) polysomnography is not recommended for the evaluation of obstructive sleep apnea syndrome in children. (Option)
2. Children considered for treatment with supplemental oxygen do not routinely require polysomnography for management of oxygen therapy. (Option)
Regarding home/portable testing, the guideline states, “Unattended testing outside the sleep laboratory in children has been used predominantly in research settings. There is a paucity of research comparing it to traditional in-laboratory attended sleep studies or other objective clinical outcomes, and there are insufficient data upon which to base reliable clinical recommendations for children at this time.”

The authors concluded that current evidence in pediatric sleep medicine indicates that PSG has clinical utility in the diagnosis and management of sleep related breathing disorders, and that accurate diagnosis in the pediatric population is best accomplished by integration of PSG findings with clinical evaluation.

American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS): A Clinical Practice Guideline: Polysomnography for Sleep-Disordered Breathing Prior to Tonsillectomy in Children (Roland, et al., 2011) provides recommendations for using PSG in assessing children, aged 2 to 18 years, who are candidates for tonsillectomy, with or without adenoidectomy. Recommendations pertaining to indications for PSG include the following:

- **Indications for PSG:** Before performing tonsillectomy, the clinician should refer children with sleep disordered breathing (SDB) for PSG if they exhibit any of the following: obesity, Down syndrome, craniofacial abnormalities, neuromuscular disorders, sickle cell disease, or mucopolysaccharidoses. This recommendation is based on observational studies with a preponderance of benefit over harm.

- **Advocating for PSG:** The clinician should advocate for PSG prior to tonsillectomy for SDB in children without any of the comorbidities listed above for whom the need for surgery is uncertain or when there is discordance between tonsillar size on physical examination and the reported severity of SDB. This recommendation is based on observational and case-control studies with a preponderance of benefit over harm.

- **Unattended PSG with portable monitoring device:** In children for whom PSG is indicated to assess SDB prior to tonsillectomy, clinicians should obtain laboratory-based PSG, when available. This recommendation is based on diagnostic studies with limitations and a preponderance of benefit over harm.

American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP): The 2012 AAP Clinical Practice Guideline, Diagnosis and Management of Childhood Obstructive sleep Apnea Syndrome key action statement for adenotonsillectomy states that if a child is determined to have OSA, has a clinical examination consistent with adenotonsillar hypertrophy, and does not have a contraindication to surgery, the clinician should recommend adenotonsillectomy as the first line of treatment. If the child has OSA but does not have adenotonsillar hypertrophy, other treatment should be considered. Clinical judgment is required to determine the benefits of adenotonsillectomy compared with other treatments in obese children with varying degrees of adenotonsillar hypertrophy. (Evidence Quality: Grade B, Recommendation Strength: Recommendation).

Currently available CPAP devices are FDA approved for home use for children who weigh more than 30 kilograms (66 pounds). Limited data is available on CPAP compliance in children. A small prospective study by Marcus et al. (2006) randomly assigned 29 children, ages two to 16, to six months of CPAP vs. BPAP. One third of the children dropped out before six months. Of the remaining 21 children for whom adherence data could be downloaded, the mean nightly use was 5.3 ± 2.5 hours. Parental assessment of adherence was considerably higher than actual use. PAP was highly effective, with a reduction of the AHI from 27 ± 32/hour to 3 ± 5/hour. Results were similar for children who received CPAP vs. BPAP. The authors concluded that PAP is effective in children with OSA, but adherence is an important issue. The authors suggested that additional research be conducted to develop methods to improve adherence and to develop other treatment alternatives for children who do not respond to tonsillectomy and adenoidectomy and are unable to tolerate CPAP.

Use Outside the U.S.
A European Respiratory Society (ERS) task force report evaluated non-CPAP therapies, including mandibular advancement devices (MADs), for the treatment of OSA (Randerath et al., 2011). The report states that MADs reduce sleep apneas and subjective daytime sleepiness and improve quality of life compared to control treatments. CPAP is more effective at reducing the number of sleep apneas, but the positive effects on symptoms and health are similar, and patients generally prefer MAD over CPAP. The device should be custom-made, evaluated, and should advance the mandible at least 50% of maximal protrusion. The authors noted that
a titration procedure is essential, since the improvement in symptoms is not a precise indicator of treatment success, and long-term follow-up should be performed. Tongue retaining devices (TRD), however, were not recommended for patients with OSA. They may be used, however, in selected patients with mild to moderate OSA when other treatments have failed or are not possible. Patients may have a trial with the device if treatment effect is monitored and strict follow-up is performed.

Guidance issued by the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE, United Kingdom) in 2007 states that the current evidence on soft palate implants for OSA raises no major safety concerns, but there is inadequate evidence that the procedure is efficacious in the treatment of this potentially serious condition for which other treatments exist. The guidance states that soft palate implants should therefore not be used to treat this condition.

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE, United Kingdom) issued interventional procedure guidance on radiofrequency ablation of the soft palate in 2005, stating that current evidence suggests that, although there are no major safety concerns associated with the procedure as a treatment for snoring, evidence on the short-term efficacy is limited and long-term outcomes are uncertain. The NICE guidance states that this procedure should not be used without special arrangements for audit, consent and research.

Summary
There is adequate evidence to demonstrate that most portable monitoring/home sleep apnea studies accurately predict AHI suggestive of OSA with high positive likelihood ratios and low negative likelihood ratios in patients with a high pretest probability of OSA. Comparative effectiveness studies that have evaluated clinical outcomes of patients managed with home testing vs. those managed with PSG demonstrate similar outcomes in terms of functional improvement (e.g., sleepiness scores, activity level, vigilance, productivity), and adherence to positive airway pressure (PAP) treatment. There is insufficient evidence in the published medical literature to determine the diagnostic accuracy of Type IV studies, however. Home sleep apnea studies are not indicated for individuals with significant co-morbid medical conditions that may degrade the accuracy of portable testing, however, Home testing has not been evaluated for, and/or does not include the diagnostic data necessary for those suspected of having other sleep disorders.

Full-night or split-night facility-based PSG may be indicated for those with suspected OSA who have significant medical comorbidities that could degrade the accuracy of home/portable testing, or are suspected to have sleep disorders other than OSA. Facility-based PSG may also be indicated when portable monitoring is technically inadequate or fails to establish the diagnosis in an individual with a high pretest probability of OSA, or when the individual and caregiver/companion is incapable of operating home testing equipment.

Positive airway pressure (PAP) is the most effective and widespread treatment for OSA, and has been demonstrated to be effective in reducing or abolishing apneic episodes in patients with OSA and in alleviating associated symptoms. Bi-Level PAP (BPAP) is a treatment option when high pressures are needed and the patient experiences difficulty exhaling against a fixed pressure and may be an option for patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or hypoventilations syndromes. BPAP with a backup respiratory rate or adaptive servoventilation may be indicated for the management of treatment-emergent central sleep apnea (also referred to as complex sleep apnea). Based on recently published evidence, however, ASV is contraindicated in patients with predominantly central sleep apnea who have symptomatic chronic heart failure (NYHA Class III-IV) and/or reduced left ventricular ejection fraction ≤45%. Mandibular repositioning appliances (MRA) have been demonstrated to be effective in the treatment of OSA, although comparative studies demonstrate a greater improvement with PAP when compared to MRA. Tongue-retaining appliances (TRAs) are generally used only in patients with contraindication to the use of MRAs.

Patients who fail or cannot comply with conservative treatment may be candidates for surgical interventions, including uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP), maxillomandibular advancement (MMA), and multi-level or stepwise surgery (MLS). Numerous additional procedures and devices have been proposed for the treatment of OSA, including laser assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP), uvulectomy, cautery-assisted palatal stiffening operation (CAPSO), Pillar™ Palatal Implant System, radiofrequency volumetric tissue reduction (RFVTR) (Somnoplasty™, tongue-base suspension using the AIRVance System, transpalatal advancement pharyngoplasty, the Provent™ Professional Sleep Apnea Therapy Device, electrosleep therapy, Injection Snoreplasty, atrial overdrive pacing, or Inspire® Upper Airway Stimulation. There is insufficient evidence in the
published medical literature to demonstrate the safety, efficacy and long-term outcomes of these devices/procedures in the treatment of OSA.

There is general agreement that in-laboratory PSG is the diagnostic test of choice in children. The vast majority of children with OSA have hypertrophy of the tonsils and adenoids, and the current first-line treatment, adenotonsillectomy, has been shown to be curative in 75–100% of cases. Children may be candidates for CPAP when adenotonsillectomy is unsuccessful is contraindicated, or when definitive surgery is indicated but must await complete dental and facial development.

Coding/Billing Information

**Note:** 1) This list of codes may not be all-inclusive.
2) Deleted codes and codes which are not effective at the time the service is rendered may not be eligible for reimbursement.

**DIAGNOSTIC TESTING**

**Home/Portable Testing**

Covered when medically necessary for the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea in an adult (age 18 or older). Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered for the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea in a child (less than age 18):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT® Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95800</td>
<td>Sleep study, unattended, simultaneous recording; heart rate, oxygen saturation, respiratory analysis (eg, by airflow or peripheral arterial tone) and sleep time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95801</td>
<td>Sleep study, unattended, simultaneous recording; minimum of heart rate, oxygen saturation, and respiratory analysis (eg, by airflow or peripheral arterial tone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95806†</td>
<td>Sleep study, unattended, simultaneous recording of, heart rate, oxygen saturation, respiratory airflow, and respiratory effort (eg, thoracoabdominal movement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Note: Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered when billed with a Modifier 52 to report SleepStrip™

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCPCS Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G0398</td>
<td>Home sleep study test (HST) with type II portable monitor, unattended; minimum of 7 channels: EEG, EOG, EMG, ECG/heart rate, airflow, respiratory effort and oxygen saturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G0399</td>
<td>Home sleep test (HST) with type III portable monitor, unattended; minimum of 4 channels: 2 respiratory movement/airflow, 1 ECG/heart rate and 1 oxygen saturation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In-Facility Polysomnography (PSG) Testing**

Covered when medically necessary for the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT®* Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95782</td>
<td>Polysomnography; younger than 6 years, sleep staging with 4 or more additional parameters of sleep, attended by a technologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95783</td>
<td>Polysomnography; younger than 6 years, sleep staging with 4 or more additional parameters of sleep, with initiation of continuous positive airway pressure therapy or bi-level ventilation, attended by a technologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95808</td>
<td>Polysomnography; any age, sleep staging with 1-3 additional parameters of sleep, attended by a technologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95810</td>
<td>Polysomnography; age 6 years or older, sleep staging with 4 or more additional parameters of sleep, attended by a technologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95811</td>
<td>Polysomnography; age 6 years or older, sleep staging with 4 or more additional parameters of sleep, with initiation of continuous positive airway pressure therapy or bi-level ventilation, attended by a technologist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered when used to report an abbreviated cardiorespiratory sleep study to acclimate an individual to PAP (e.g., PAP-Nap study):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT®* Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95807-52</td>
<td>Sleep study, simultaneous recording of ventilation, respiratory effort, ECG or heart rate, and oxygen saturation, attended by a technologist (reduced services)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maintenance of Wakefulness Testing, Multiple Sleep Latency Testing**

Covered when medically necessary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT®* Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95805</td>
<td>Multiple sleep latency or maintenance of wakefulness testing, recording, analysis and interpretation of physiological measurements of sleep during multiple trials to assess sleepiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actigraphy Testing**

Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT®* Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95803</td>
<td>Actigraphy testing, recording, analysis, interpretation, and report (minimum of 72 hours to 14 consecutive days of recording)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TREATMENT OF OBSTRUCTIVE SLEEP APNEA**

Covered when medically necessary for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. Not Medically Necessary/Not Covered for the treatment of snoring in the absence of obstructive sleep apnea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT®* Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21193</td>
<td>Reconstruction of mandibular rami, horizontal, vertical, C, or L osteotomy; without bone graft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21194</td>
<td>Reconstruction of mandibular rami, horizontal, vertical, C, or L osteotomy; with bone graft (includes obtaining graft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21195</td>
<td>Reconstruction of mandibular rami and/or body, sagittal split; without internal rigid fixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21196</td>
<td>Reconstruction of mandibular rami and/or body, sagittal split; with internal rigid fixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPCS Codes</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4604</td>
<td>Tubing with integrated heating element for use with positive airway pressure device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7027</td>
<td>Combination oral/nasal mask, used with continuous positive airway pressure device, each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7028</td>
<td>Oral cushion for combination oral/nasal mask, replacement only, each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7029</td>
<td>Nasal pillows for combination oral/nasal mask, replacement only, pair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7030</td>
<td>Full face mask used with positive airway pressure device, each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7031</td>
<td>Face mask interface, replacement for full face mask, each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7032</td>
<td>Cushion for use on nasal mask interface, replacement only, each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7033</td>
<td>Pillow for use on nasal cannula type interface, replacement only, pair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7034†</td>
<td>Nasal interface (mask or cannula type) used with positive airway pressure device, with or without head strap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7035</td>
<td>Headgear used with positive airway pressure device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7036</td>
<td>Chinstrap used with positive airway pressure device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7037</td>
<td>Tubing used with positive airway pressure device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7038</td>
<td>Filter, disposable, used with positive airway pressure device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7039</td>
<td>Filter, non-disposable, used with positive airway pressure device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7044</td>
<td>Oral interface used with positive airway pressure device, each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7045</td>
<td>Exhalation port with or without swivel used with accessories for positive airway devices, replacement only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7046</td>
<td>Water chamber for humidifier, used with positive airway pressure device, replacement, each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0470</td>
<td>Respiratory assist device, bi-level pressure capability, without back-up rate feature, used with noninvasive interface, e.g., nasal or facial mask (intermittent assist device with continuous positive airway pressure device)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0485</td>
<td>Oral device/appliance used to reduce upper airway collapsibility, adjustable or non-adjustable, prefabricated, includes fitting and adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0486</td>
<td>Oral device/appliance used to reduce upper airway collapsibility, adjustable or non-adjustable, custom fabricated, includes fitting and adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0561</td>
<td>Humidifier, non-heated, used with positive airway pressure device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0562</td>
<td>Humidifier, heated, used with positive airway pressure device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0601</td>
<td>Continuous airway pressure (CPAP) device</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Note: Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered when used to report interface consisting of boil and bite mouthpiece connected to nasal inserts (e.g., CPAP PRO®)
Covered when medically necessary for the treatment of treatment-emergent central sleep apnea:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCPCS Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E0471</td>
<td>Respiratory assist device, bi-level pressure capability, with back-up rate feature, used with noninvasive interface, eg, nasal or facial mask (intermittent assist device with continuous positive airway pressure device)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0472</td>
<td>Respiratory assist device, bi-level pressure capability, with backup rate feature, used with invasive interface, eg, tracheostomy tube (intermittent assist device with continuous positive airway pressure device)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT® Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30801</td>
<td>Ablation, soft tissue of inferior turbinates, unilateral or bilateral, any method (eg, electrocautery, radiofrequency ablation, or tissue volume reduction); superficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30802</td>
<td>Ablation, soft tissue of inferior turbinates, unilateral or bilateral, any method (eg, electrocautery, radiofrequency ablation, or tissue volume reduction); intramural (ie, submucosal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33206</td>
<td>Insertion of new or replacement of permanent pacemaker with transvenous electrode(s); atrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41512</td>
<td>Tongue base suspension, permanent suture technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41530</td>
<td>Submucosal ablation of the tongue base, radiofrequency, 1 or more sites, per session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42140†</td>
<td>Uvullectomy, excision of the uvula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42160</td>
<td>Destruction of lesion, palate or uvula (thermal, cryo or chemical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42950</td>
<td>Pharyngoplasty (plastic or reconstructive operation on pharynx)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Note: Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered when used to report uvullectomy as a stand-alone procedure for the treatment of OSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCPCS Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C9727</td>
<td>Insertion of implants into the soft palate; minimum of three implants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2080</td>
<td>Laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea when used to report any non-covered service/procedure outlined in this Coverage Policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT® Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42299</td>
<td>Unlisted procedure, palate, uvula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42999</td>
<td>Unlisted procedure, pharynx, adenoids, or tonsils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64568</td>
<td>Incision for implantation cranial nerve neurostimulator electrode array and pulse generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64999</td>
<td>Unlisted procedure, nervous system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95999</td>
<td>Unlisted neurological or neuromuscular diagnostic procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0466T</td>
<td>Insertion of chest wall respiratory sensor electrode or electrode array, including connection to pulse generator (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure) (Code effective 01/01/2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCPCS Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1399</td>
<td>Durable medical equipment, miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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