

(20208)

Medical Benefit		Effective Date: 08/01/19	Next Review Date: 05/21
Preauthorization	No	Review Dates: 05/07, 07/08, 09/09, 09/10, 01/11, 01/12, 01/13, 01/14, 09/14, 05/15, 05/16, 05/17, 05/18, 05/19, 05/20	

This protocol considers mobile cardiac outpatient telemetry investigational. If the physician feels this service is medically necessary, preauthorization is recommended.

The following protocol contains medical necessity criteria that apply for this service. The criteria are also applicable to services provided in the local Medicare Advantage operating area for those members, unless separate Medicare Advantage criteria are indicated. If the criteria are not met, reimbursement will be denied and the patient cannot be billed. Please note that payment for covered services is subject to eligibility and the limitations noted in the patient's contract at the time the services are rendered.

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With signs and/or symptoms suggestive of arrhythmia	Interventions of interest are: • Patient- or autoactivated external ambulatory event monitoring • Continuous ambulatory monitoring storing information for more than 48 hours	Comparators of interest are: • Electrocardiogram only or 24- to 48-hour Holter monitoring	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Morbid events
Individuals: • With atrial fibrillation following ablation	Interventions of interest are: • Long-term ambulatory cardiac monitoring	Comparators of interest are: • Electrocardiogram only or 24- to 48-hour Holter monitoring	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Morbid events • Medication use • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With cryptogenic stroke with negative standard workup for atrial fibrillation	Interventions of interest are: • Long-term ambulatory cardiac monitoring	Comparators of interest are: • Standard evaluation for stroke, including electrocardiogram and 24-hour Holter monitoring	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Morbid events • Medication use • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • Who are asymptomatic with risk factors for atrial fibrillation	Interventions of interest are: • Long-term ambulatory cardiac monitoring	Comparators of interest are: • No additional evaluation or standard care	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Morbid events • Medication use • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With signs and/or symptoms suggestive of arrhythmia with infrequent symptoms	Interventions of interest are: • Patient- or autoactivated implantable ambulatory event monitoring	Comparators of interest are: • No additional evaluation or standard care • Patient- or autoactivated external ambulatory event monitoring	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Morbid events • Medication use • Treatment-related morbidity

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With signs and/or symptoms suggestive of arrhythmia	Interventions of interest are: • Outpatient cardiac telemetry	Comparators of interest are: • Patient- or autoactivated external ambulatory event monitoring	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Morbid events

DESCRIPTION

Various devices are available for outpatient cardiac rhythm monitoring. These devices differ in the types of monitoring leads used, the duration and continuity of monitoring, the ability to detect arrhythmias without patient intervention, and the mechanism of delivering the information from patient to clinician. These devices may be used to evaluate symptoms suggestive of arrhythmias (e.g., syncope, palpitations), and may be used to detect atrial fibrillation (AF) in patients who have undergone cardiac ablation of AF or who have a history of cryptogenic stroke.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

AMBULATORY EVENT MONITORING

For individuals who have signs and/or symptoms suggestive of arrhythmia(s) who receive patient- or autoactivated external ambulatory event monitoring or continuous ambulatory monitoring storing information for more than 48 hours, the evidence includes one randomized controlled trial (RCT) and prospective and retrospective studies reporting on the diagnostic yield. The relevant outcomes are overall survival (OS) and morbid events. The RCT and the observational studies have consistently shown that continuous monitoring with longer recording periods detects more arrhythmias than 24- or 48-hour Holter monitoring. Particularly for patients who, without the more prolonged monitoring, would only undergo shorter term monitoring, the diagnostic yield is likely to identify arrhythmias that may have therapeutic implications. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have AF following ablation who receive long-term ambulatory cardiac monitoring, the evidence includes one RCT comparing ambulatory event monitoring with standard care and several observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, morbid events, medication use, and treatment-related morbidity. The RCT evaluating a long-term monitoring strategy after catheter ablation for AF reported significantly higher rates of AF detection. The available evidence has suggested that long-term monitoring for AF postablation is associated with improved outcomes. However, the specific type of monitoring associated with the best outcomes is not established, because different long-term monitoring devices were used across the studies. Trials demonstrating improved outcomes have used event monitors or implantable monitors. In addition, there are individual patient considerations that may make one type of monitor preferable over another. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have cryptogenic stroke with a negative standard workup for AF who receive long-term ambulatory cardiac monitoring, the evidence includes systematic reviews of RCTs comparing ambulatory event monitoring with standard care. The relevant outcomes are OS, morbid events, medication use, and treatment-related morbidity. RCTs evaluating a long-term AF monitoring strategy poststroke have reported significantly higher rates of AF detection with longer term ambulatory monitoring. The available evidence has suggested that long-term monitoring for AF after cryptogenic stroke is associated with improved outcomes, but the specific type of monitoring associated with the best outcomes is not established, because different long-term monitoring devices were used across the studies. Trials demonstrating improved outcomes have used event monitors or implantable monitors. In addition, there are individual patient considerations that may make one type of moni-

tor preferable over another. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic with risk factors for AF who receive long-term ambulatory cardiac monitoring, the evidence includes an RCT and a nonrandomized study. The relevant outcomes are OS, morbid events, medication use, and treatment-related morbidity. The studies showed use of the ambulatory monitors would result in higher AF detection compared with routine care. However, the RCT followed patients for one year and did not detect a difference in stroke occurrence between the monitored group and the standard of care group. The other studies did not discuss changes in patient management or health outcomes based on monitoring. Studies reporting on improved outcomes with longer follow-up are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

IMPLANTABLE LOOP RECORDING

For individuals who have signs and/or symptoms suggestive of arrhythmia with infrequent symptoms who receive patient- or autoactivated implantable ambulatory event monitoring, the evidence includes RCTs comparing ILRs with shorter term monitoring, usually 24- to 48-hour Holter monitoring, and many observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, morbid events, medication use, and treatment-related morbidity. Studies assessing prolonged ILRs in patients have reported high rates of arrhythmia detection compared with shorter external event or Holter monitoring. These studies have supported use of a progression in diagnostics from an external event monitor to ILR when longer monitoring is needed. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

OUTPATIENT CARDIAC TELEMETRY

For individuals who have signs and/or symptoms suggestive of arrhythmia who receive outpatient cardiac telemetry, the evidence includes an RCT and nonrandomized studies evaluating rates of arrhythmia detection using outpatient cardiac telemetry. The relevant outcomes are OS and morbid events. The available evidence has suggested that outpatient cardiac telemetry is at least as good at detecting arrhythmias as ambulatory event monitoring. However, studies have not evaluated whether the real-time monitoring feature of outpatient cardiac telemetry leads to reduced cardiac events and mortality. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

POLICY

The use of patient activated or autoactivated external ambulatory event monitors (AEMs) OR continuous ambulatory monitors that record and store information for periods longer than 48 hours may be considered **medically necessary** as a diagnostic alternative to Holter monitoring in the following situations:

- Patients who experience infrequent symptoms (less frequently than every 48 hours) suggestive of cardiac arrhythmias (i.e., palpitations, dizziness, presyncope, or syncope).
- Patients with atrial fibrillation who have been treated with catheter ablation, and in whom discontinuation of systemic anticoagulation is being considered.
- Patients with cryptogenic stroke who have a negative standard work-up for atrial fibrillation including a 24-hour Holter monitor (see Policy Guidelines).

The use of implantable AEMs, either patient activated or autoactivated, may be considered **medically necessary** in the following situations:

- In the small subset of patients who experience recurrent symptoms so infrequently that a prior trial of other external AEMs has been unsuccessful.

- In patients who require long-term monitoring for atrial fibrillation or possible atrial fibrillation (see Policy Guidelines).

The use of outpatient cardiac telemetry (also known as mobile cardiac outpatient telemetry) as a diagnostic alternative to AEMs in patients who experience infrequent symptoms (less frequently than every 48 hours) suggestive of cardiac arrhythmias (i.e., palpitations, dizziness, presyncope, or syncope) is considered **investigational**.

Other uses of AEMs, including outpatient cardiac telemetry and mobile applications, are considered **investigational**, including but not limited to the monitoring of asymptomatic patients with risk factors for arrhythmia, monitoring the effectiveness of antiarrhythmic medications and detection of myocardial ischemia by detecting ST segment changes.

POLICY GUIDELINES

The available evidence suggests that long-term monitoring for AF after cryptogenic stroke or postablation is associated with improved outcomes, but the specific type of monitoring associated with the best outcomes is not well-defined. Trials demonstrating improved outcomes have used either event monitors or implantable monitors. In addition, there are individual patient considerations that may make one type of monitor preferable over another.

Therefore, for the evaluation of patients with cryptogenic stroke who have had a negative standard work-up for AF including 24-hour Holter monitoring, or for the evaluation of AF after an ablation procedure, the use of long-term monitoring with an external event monitor, OR a continuous ambulatory monitor that records and stores information for periods longer than 48 hours, OR an implantable ambulatory monitor may be considered medically necessary for patients who meet the criteria outlined above.

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE

Except for this additional medically necessary statement, the above policy statements and guidelines apply for Medicare Advantage.

Telephonic EKG transmissions are considered **medically necessary** as a diagnostic service for the indications below:

1. Detect, characterize, and document symptomatic transient arrhythmias;
2. Initiate, revise, or discontinue arrhythmic drug therapy; or,
3. Carry-out early post-hospital monitoring of patients discharged after myocardial infarction (MI); (only if 24-hour coverage is provided).

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE POLICY GUIDELINES

24-hour attended coverage used as early post-hospital monitoring of patients discharged after MI is only covered if provision is made for such 24-hour attended coverage in the manner described below:

24-hour attended coverage means there must be, at a monitoring site or central data center, an EKG technician or other non-physician, receiving calls and/or EKG data; tape recording devices do not meet this requirement. Further, such technicians should have immediate, 24-hour access to a physician to

review transmitted data and make clinical decisions regarding the patient. The technician should also be instructed as to when and how to contact available facilities to assist the patient in case of emergencies.

BACKGROUND

CARDIAC ARRHYTHMIAS

Cardiac monitoring is routinely used in the inpatient setting to detect acute changes in heart rate or rhythm that may need urgent response. For some conditions, a more prolonged period of monitoring in the ambulatory setting is needed to detect heart rate or rhythm abnormalities that may occur infrequently. These cases may include the diagnosis of arrhythmias in patients with signs and symptoms suggestive of arrhythmias as well as the evaluation of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation (AF).

Cardiac arrhythmias may be suspected because of symptoms suggestive of arrhythmias, including palpitations, dizziness, or syncope or presyncope, or because of abnormal heart rate or rhythm noted on exam. A full discussion of the differential diagnosis and evaluation of each of these symptoms is beyond the scope of this review, but some general principles on the use of ambulatory monitoring are discussed.

Arrhythmias are an important potential cause of syncope or near syncope, which in some cases may be described as dizziness. An electrocardiogram (ECG) is generally indicated whenever there is suspicion of a cardiac cause of syncope. Some arrhythmic causes will be apparent on ECG. However, for patients in whom an ECG is not diagnostic, longer monitoring may be indicated. The 2009 joint guidelines from the European Society of Cardiology and three other medical specialty societies suggested that, in individuals with clinical or ECG features suggesting an arrhythmic syncope, ECG monitoring is indicated; the guidelines also stated that the “duration (and technology) of monitoring should be selected according to the risk and the predicted recurrence rate of syncope.”¹ Similarly, guidelines from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2014) on the evaluation of transient loss of consciousness, have recommended the use of an ambulatory ECG in individuals with a suspected arrhythmic cause of syncope. The type and duration of monitoring recommended is based on the individual’s history, particularly the frequency of transient loss of consciousness.² The Holter monitor is recommended if transient loss of consciousness occurs several times a week. If the frequency of transient loss of consciousness is every one to two weeks, an external event recorder is recommended; and if the frequency is less than once every two weeks, an implantable event recorder is recommended.

Similar to syncope, the evaluation and management of palpitations is patient-specific. In cases where the initial history, examination, and ECG findings are suggestive of an arrhythmia, some form of ambulatory ECG monitoring is indicated. A position paper from the European Heart Rhythm Association (2011) indicated that, for individuals with palpitations of unknown origin who have clinical features suggestive of arrhythmia, referral for specialized evaluation with consideration for ambulatory ECG monitoring is indicated.³

AF DETECTION

AF is the most common arrhythmia in adults. It may be asymptomatic or be associated with a broad range of symptoms, including lightheadedness, palpitations, dyspnea, and a variety of more nonspecific symptoms (e.g., fatigue, malaise). It is classified as paroxysmal, persistent, or permanent based on symptom duration. Diagnosed AF may be treated with antiarrhythmic medications with the goal of rate or rhythm control. Other treatments include direct cardioversion, catheter-based radiofrequency- or cryo-energy-based ablation, or one of several surgical techniques, depending on the patient’s comorbidities and associated symptoms.

Stroke in AF occurs primarily as a result of thromboembolism from the left atrium. The lack of atrial contractions in AF leads to blood stasis in the left atrium, and this low flow state increases the risk of thrombosis. The area of the left atrium with the lowest blood flow in AF, and therefore the highest risk of thrombosis, is the left atrial

appendage. Multiple clinical trials have demonstrated that anticoagulation reduces the ischemic stroke risk in patients at moderate- or high-risk of thromboembolic events. Oral anticoagulation in patients with AF reduces the risk of subsequent stroke and was recommended by American Heart Association, American College of Cardiology, and Heart Rhythm Society (2014) joint guidelines on patients with a history of stroke or transient ischemic attack.⁴

Ambulatory ECG monitoring may play a role in several situations in the detection of AF. In patients who have undergone ablative treatment for AF, if ongoing AF can be excluded with reasonable certainty, including paroxysmal AF which may not be apparent on ECG during an office visit, anticoagulation therapy could potentially be stopped. In some cases where identifying paroxysmal AF is associated with potential changes in management, longer term monitoring may be considered. There are well-defined management changes that occur in patients with AF. However, until relatively recent the specific role of long-term (i.e., more than 48 hours) monitoring in AF was not well-described.

Patients with cryptogenic stroke are often monitored for the presence of AF because AF is estimated to be the cause of cryptogenic stroke in more than 10% of patients, and AF increases the risk of stroke.^{5,6} Paroxysmal AF confers an elevated risk of stroke, just as persistent and permanent AF do. In individuals with a high-risk of stroke, particularly those with a history of ischemic stroke that is unexplained by other causes, prolonged monitoring to identify paroxysmal AF has been investigated.

CARDIAC RHYTHM AMBULATORY MONITORING DEVICES

Ambulatory cardiac monitoring with a variety of devices permits the evaluation of cardiac electrical activity over time, in contrast to a static ECG, which only permits the detection of abnormalities in cardiac electrical activity at a single point in time.

A Holter monitor is worn continuously and records cardiac electrical output continuously throughout the recording period. Holter monitors are capable of recording activity for 24 to 72 hours. Traditionally, most Holter monitors have three channels based on three ECG leads. However, some currently available Holter monitors have up to 12 channels. Holter monitors are an accepted intervention in a variety of settings where a short period (24-48 hours) of comprehensive cardiac rhythm assessment is needed (e.g., suspected arrhythmias when symptoms [syncope, palpitations] are occurring daily). These devices are not the focus of this review.

Various classes of devices are available for situations where longer monitoring than can be obtained with a traditional Holter monitor is needed. Because there may be many devices within each category, a comprehensive description of each is beyond our scope. Devices vary in how data are transmitted to the location where the ECG output is interpreted. Data may be transmitted via cellular phone or landline, or by direct download from the device after its return to the monitoring center. The device classes are described in Table 1.

Table 1. Ambulatory Cardiac Rhythm Monitoring Devices

Device Class	Description	Device Examples
Noncontinuous devices with memory (event recorder)	Devices not worn continuously but rather activated by patient and applied to skin in the precordial area when symptoms develop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zio® Event Card (iRhythm Technologies) • REKA E100™ (REKA Health)
Continuous recording devices with longer recording periods	Devices continuously worn and continuously record via ≥1 cardiac leads and store data longer than traditional Holter (14 d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zio® Patch system (iRhythm Technologies)
External memory loop devices (patient- or autotriggered)	Devices continuously worn and store a single channel of ECG data in a refreshed memory. When the device is activated, the ECG is then recorded from the memory loop for the <i>preceding</i> 30-90 s and for next 60 s or so. Devices may be activated by a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patient-triggered: Explorer™ Looping Monitor (LifeWatch Services) • Autotriggered: LifeStar AF Express™ Auto-Detect Looping Monitor (LifeWatch

Device Class	Description	Device Examples
	patient when symptoms occur (patient-triggered) or by an automated algorithm when changes suggestive of an arrhythmia are detected (autotriggered).	Services) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autotriggered or patient-triggered: King of Hearts Express® AF (Card Guard Scientific Survival)
Implantable memory loop devices (patient- or autotriggered)	Devices similar in design to external memory loop devices but implanted under the skin in the precordial region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autotriggered or patient-triggered: Reveal® XT ICM (Medtronic) and Confirm Rx Insertable™ Cardiac Monitor (Abbott) • Autotriggered: BioMonitor, Biotronik)
Mobile cardiac outpatient telemetry	Continuously recording or autotriggered memory loop devices that transmit data to a central recording station with real-time monitoring and analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CardioNet MCOT (BioTelemetry) • LifeStar Mobile Cardiac Telemetry (LifeWatch Services) • SEEQ Mobile Cardiac Telemetry (Medtronic)

ECG: electrocardiogram.

There are also devices that combine features of multiple classes. For example, the LifeStar ACT Ex Holter (LifeWatch Services) is a three-channel Holter monitor, but is converted to a mobile cardiac telemetry system if a diagnosis is inconclusive after 24 to 48 hours of monitoring. The BodyGuardian® Heart Remote Monitoring System (Preventice Services) is an external autotriggered memory loop device that can be converted to a real-time monitoring system. The eCardio Verité™ system (eCardio) can switch between a patient-activated event monitor and a continuous telemetry monitor. The Spiderflash-T (LivaNova) is an example of an external autotriggered or patient-triggered loop recorder, but like the Zio® Patch, can record two channels for 14 to 40 days.

REGULATORY STATUS

Some of the newer devices are described in the Background section for informational purposes. Because there may be many devices within each category, a comprehensive description of individual devices is beyond the scope of this review. U.S. Food and Drug Administration product codes include: DSH, DXH, DQK, DSI, MXD, MHX.

Services that are the subject of a clinical trial do not meet our Technology Assessment and Medically Necessary Services Protocol criteria and are considered investigational. *For explanation of experimental and investigational, please refer to the Technology Assessment and Medically Necessary Services Protocol.*

It is expected that only appropriate and medically necessary services will be rendered. We reserve the right to conduct prepayment and postpayment reviews to assess the medical appropriateness of the above-referenced procedures. **Some of this protocol may not pertain to the patients you provide care to, as it may relate to products that are not available in your geographic area.**

REFERENCES

We are not responsible for the continuing viability of web site addresses that may be listed in any references below.

1. Task Force for the Diagnosis Management of Syncope, European Society of Cardiology, European Heart Rhythm Association, et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of syncope (version 2009). *Eur Heart J*. Nov 2009;30(21):2631-2671. PMID 19713422.
2. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Transient loss of consciousness ('blackouts') in over 16s [CG109]. 2014; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg109>. Accessed March 15, 2018.
3. Raviele A, Giada F, Bergfeldt L, et al. Management of patients with palpitations: a position paper from the European Heart Rhythm Association. *Europace*. Jul 2011;13(7):920-934. PMID 21697315.
4. January CT, Wann LS, Alpert JS, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS guideline for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on practice guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. *Circulation*. Dec 2 2014;130(23):2071-2104. PMID 24682348.
5. Mittal S, Movsowitz C, Steinberg JS. Ambulatory external electrocardiographic monitoring: focus on atrial fibrillation. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Oct 18 2011;58(17):1741-1749. PMID 21996384.
6. Christensen LM, Krieger DW, Hojberg S, et al. Paroxysmal atrial fibrillation occurs often in cryptogenic ischaemic stroke. Final results from the SURPRISE study. *Eur J Neurol*. Jun 2014;21(6):884-889. PMID 24628954.
7. Hoefman E, Bindels PJ, van Weert HC. Efficacy of diagnostic tools for detecting cardiac arrhythmias: systematic literature search. *Neth Heart J*. Nov 2010;18(11):543-551. PMID 21113379.
8. Steinhubl, SS, Waalen, JJ, Edwards, AA, Ariniello, LL, Mehta, RR, Ebner, GG, Carter, CC, Baca-Motes, KK, Felicione, EE, Sarich, TT, Topol, EE. Effect of a Home-Based Wearable Continuous ECG Monitoring Patch on Detection of Undiagnosed Atrial Fibrillation: The mStoPS Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*, 2018 Jul 13; 320(2). PMID 29998336.
9. Farris, GG, Smith, BB, Oates, EE, Colon, CC, Doppalapudi, HH. New atrial fibrillation diagnosed by 30-day rhythm monitoring. *Am. Heart J.*, 2019 Jan 15;209:29-35. PMID 30639611.
10. Turakhia MP, Hoang DD, Zimetbaum P, et al. Diagnostic utility of a novel leadless arrhythmia monitoring device. *Am J Cardiol*. Aug 15 2013;112(4):520-524. PMID 23672988.
11. Barrett PM, Komatireddy R, Haaser S, et al. Comparison of 24-hour Holter monitoring with 14-day novel adhesive patch electrocardiographic monitoring. *Am J Med*. Jan 2014;127(1):95 e11-97. PMID 24384108.
12. Solomon MD, Yang J, Sung SH, et al. Incidence and timing of potentially high-risk arrhythmias detected through long term continuous ambulatory electrocardiographic monitoring. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord*. Feb 17 2016;16(1):35. PMID 26883019.
13. Bolourchi M, Batra AS. Diagnostic yield of patch ambulatory electrocardiogram monitoring in children (from a national registry). *Am J Cardiol*. Mar 1 2015;115(5):630-634. PMID 25591894.
14. Eisenberg EE, Carlson SK, Doshi RH, et al. Chronic ambulatory monitoring: results of a large single-center experience. *J Innovations Cardiac Rhythm Manage*. Nov 2014;5:1818-1823.
15. Schreiber D, Sattar A, Drigalla D, et al. Ambulatory cardiac monitoring for discharged emergency department patients with possible cardiac arrhythmias. *West J Emerg Med*. Mar 2014;15(2):194-198. PMID 24672611.
16. Eysenck, WW, Freemantle, NN, Sulke, NN. A randomized trial evaluating the accuracy of AF detection by four external ambulatory ECG monitors compared to permanent pacemaker AF detection. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*, 2019 Feb 12. PMID 30741360.
17. Health Quality Ontario. Long-Term Continuous Ambulatory ECG Monitors and External Cardiac Loop Recorders for Cardiac Arrhythmia: A Health Technology Assessment. *Ont Health Technol Assess Ser*. Feb 2017; 17(1):1-56. PMID 28194254.
18. Balmelli N, Naegeli B, Bertel O. Diagnostic yield of automatic and patient-triggered ambulatory cardiac event recording in the evaluation of patients with palpitations, dizziness, or syncope. *Clin Cardiol*. Apr 2003;26(4):173-176. PMID 12708623.

19. Ermis C, Zhu AX, Pham S, et al. Comparison of automatic and patient-activated arrhythmia recordings by implantable loop recorders in the evaluation of syncope. *Am J Cardiol.* Oct 1 2003;92(7):815-819. PMID 14516882.
20. Reiffel JA, Schwarzberg R, Murry M. Comparison of autotriggered memory loop recorders versus standard loop recorders versus 24-hour Holter monitors for arrhythmia detection. *Am J Cardiol.* May 1 2005;95(9):1055-1059. PMID 15842970.
21. Dagres N, Kottkamp H, Piorkowski C, et al. Influence of the duration of Holter monitoring on the detection of arrhythmia recurrences after catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation: implications for patient follow-up. *Int J Cardiol.* Mar 18 2010;139(3):305-306. PMID 18990460.
22. Pokushalov E, Romanov A, Corbucci G, et al. Ablation of paroxysmal and persistent atrial fibrillation: 1-year follow-up through continuous subcutaneous monitoring. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.* Apr 2011;22(4):369-375. PMID 20958836.
23. Chao TF, Lin YJ, Tsao HM, et al. CHADS(2) and CHA(2)DS(2)-VASc scores in the prediction of clinical outcomes in patients with atrial fibrillation after catheter ablation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Nov 29 2011;58(23):2380-2385. PMID 22115643.
24. Kapa S, Epstein AE, Callans DJ, et al. Assessing arrhythmia burden after catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation using an implantable loop recorder: the ABACUS study. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.* Aug 2013;24(8):875-881. PMID 23577826.
25. Verma A, Champagne J, Sapp J, et al. Discerning the incidence of symptomatic and asymptomatic episodes of atrial fibrillation before and after catheter ablation (DISCERN AF): a prospective, multicenter study. *JAMA Intern Med.* Jan 28 2013;173(2):149-156. PMID 23266597.
26. Themistoclakis S, Corrado A, Marchlinski FE, et al. The risk of thromboembolism and need for oral anticoagulation after successful atrial fibrillation ablation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Feb 23 2010;55(8):735-743. PMID 20170810.
27. Gumbinger C, Krumsdorf U, Veltkamp R, et al. Continuous monitoring versus HOLTHER ECG for detection of atrial fibrillation in patients with stroke. *Eur J Neurol.* Feb 2012;19(2):253-257. PMID 21895885.
28. Lazzaro MA, Krishnan K, Prabhakaran S. Detection of atrial fibrillation with concurrent holter monitoring and continuous cardiac telemetry following ischemic stroke and transient ischemic attack. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.* Feb 2012;21(2):89-93. PMID 20656504.
29. Cotter PE, Martin PJ, Ring L, et al. Incidence of atrial fibrillation detected by implantable loop recorders in unexplained stroke. *Neurology.* Apr 23 2013;80(17):1546-1550. PMID 23535493.
30. Miller DJ, Khan MA, Schultz LR, et al. Outpatient cardiac telemetry detects a high rate of atrial fibrillation in cryptogenic stroke. *J Neurol Sci.* Jan 15 2013;324(1-2):57-61. PMID 23102659.
31. Sposato LA, Cipriano LE, Saposnik G, et al. Diagnosis of atrial fibrillation after stroke and transient ischaemic attack: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Neurol.* Apr 2015;14(4):377-387. PMID 25748102.
32. Kishore A, Vail A, Majid A, et al. Detection of atrial fibrillation after ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Stroke.* Feb 2014;45(2):520-526. PMID 24385275.
33. Kamel H, Navi BB, Eljovich L, et al. Pilot randomized trial of outpatient cardiac monitoring after cryptogenic stroke. *Stroke.* Feb 2013;44(2):528-530. PMID 23192756.
34. Higgins P, MacFarlane PW, Dawson J, et al. Noninvasive cardiac event monitoring to detect atrial fibrillation after ischemic stroke: a randomized, controlled trial. *Stroke.* Sep 2013;44(9):2525-2531. PMID 23899913.
35. Sinha AM, Diener HC, Morillo CA, et al. Cryptogenic Stroke and underlying Atrial Fibrillation (CRYSTAL AF): design and rationale. *Am Heart J.* Jul 2010;160(1):36-41 e31. PMID 20598970.
36. Sanna T, Diener HC, Passman RS, et al. Cryptogenic stroke and underlying atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med.* Jun 26 2014;370(26):2478-2486. PMID 24963567.
37. Brachmann J, Morillo CA, Sanna T, et al. Uncovering atrial fibrillation beyond short-term monitoring in cryptogenic stroke patients: three-year results from the Cryptogenic Stroke and Underlying Atrial Fibrillation Trial. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* Jan 2016;9(1):e003333. PMID 26763225.

38. Gladstone DJ, Spring M, Dorian P, et al. Atrial fibrillation in patients with cryptogenic stroke. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 26 2014;370(26):2467-2477. PMID 24963566.
39. Ritter MA, Kochhauser S, Duning T, et al. Occult atrial fibrillation in cryptogenic stroke: detection by 7-day electrocardiogram versus implantable cardiac monitors. *Stroke*. May 2013;44(5):1449-1452. PMID 23449264.
40. Etgen T, Hochreiter M, Mundel M, et al. Insertable cardiac event recorder in detection of atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke: an audit report. *Stroke*. Jul 2013;44(7):2007-2009. PMID 23674523.
41. Tung CE, Su D, Turakhia MP, et al. Diagnostic yield of extended cardiac patch monitoring in patients with stroke or TIA. *Front Neurol*. Jan 2014;5:266. PMID 25628595.
42. Rosenberg MA, Samuel M, Thosani A, et al. Use of a noninvasive continuous monitoring device in the management of atrial fibrillation: a pilot study. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol*. Mar 2013;36(3):328-333. PMID 23240827.
43. Savelieva I, Camm AJ. Clinical relevance of silent atrial fibrillation: prevalence, prognosis, quality of life, and management. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. Jun 2000;4(2):369-382. PMID 10936003.
44. Israel CW, Gronefeld G, Ehrlich JR, et al. Long-term risk of recurrent atrial fibrillation as documented by an implantable monitoring device: implications for optimal patient care. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jan 07 2004;43(1):47-52. PMID 14715182.
45. Page RL, Wilkinson WE, Clair WK, et al. Asymptomatic arrhythmias in patients with symptomatic paroxysmal atrial fibrillation and paroxysmal supraventricular tachycardia. *Circulation*. Jan 1994;89(1):224-227. PMID 8281651.
46. Hart RG, Pearce LA, Rothbart RM, et al. Stroke with intermittent atrial fibrillation: incidence and predictors during aspirin therapy. *Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation Investigators*. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jan 2000;35(1):183-187. PMID 10636278.
47. Hohnloser SH, Pajitnev D, Pogue J, et al. Incidence of stroke in paroxysmal versus sustained atrial fibrillation in patients taking oral anticoagulation or combined antiplatelet therapy: an ACTIVE W Substudy. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Nov 27 2007;50(22):2156-2161. PMID 18036454.
48. Ganesan AN, Chew DP, Hartshorne T, et al. The impact of atrial fibrillation type on the risk of thromboembolism, mortality, and bleeding: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J*. May 21 2016;37(20):1591-1602. PMID 26888184.
49. Fitzmaurice DA, Hobbs FD, Jowett S, et al. Screening versus routine practice in detection of atrial fibrillation in patients aged 65 or over: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. Aug 25 2007;335(7616):383. PMID 17673732.
50. Halcox JPJ, Wareham K, Cardew A, et al. Assessment of Remote Heart Rhythm Sampling Using the AliveCor Heart Monitor to Screen for Atrial Fibrillation: The REHEARSE-AF Study. *Circulation*. Nov 7 2017;136(19):1784-1794. PMID 28851729.
51. Turakhia MP, Ullal AJ, Hoang DD, et al. Feasibility of extended ambulatory electrocardiogram monitoring to identify silent atrial fibrillation in high-risk patients: the Screening Study for Undiagnosed Atrial Fibrillation (STUDY-AF). *Clin Cardiol*. May 2015;38(5):285-292. PMID 25873476.
52. Solbiati M, Casazza G, Dipaola F, et al. The diagnostic yield of implantable loop recorders in unexplained syncope: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Cardiol*. Mar 15 2017;231:170-176. PMID 28052814.
53. Burkowicz J, Merzenich C, Grassme K, et al. Insertable cardiac monitors in the diagnosis of syncope and the detection of atrial fibrillation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. Aug 2016;23(12):1261-1272. PMID 26864396.
54. Da Costa A, Defaye P, Romeyer-Bouchard C, et al. Clinical impact of the implantable loop recorder in patients with isolated syncope, bundle branch block and negative workup: a randomized multicentre prospective study. *Arch Cardiovasc Dis*. Mar 2013;106(3):146-154. PMID 23582676.
55. Farwell DJ, Freemantle N, Sulke AN. Use of implantable loop recorders in the diagnosis and management of syncope. *Eur Heart J*. Jul 2004;25(14):1257-1263. PMID 15246645.

56. Krahn AD, Klein GJ, Yee R, et al. Randomized assessment of syncope trial: conventional diagnostic testing versus a prolonged monitoring strategy. *Circulation*. Jul 3 2001;104(1):46-51. PMID 11435336.
57. Afzal MR, Gunda S, Waheed S, et al. Role of outpatient cardiac rhythm monitoring in cryptogenic stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol*. Oct 2015;38(10):1236-1245. PMID 26172621.
58. Podoleanu C, DaCosta A, Defaye P, et al. Early use of an implantable loop recorder in syncope evaluation: a randomized study in the context of the French Healthcare System (FRESH study). *Arch Cardiovasc Dis*. Oct 2014;107(10):546-552. PMID 25241220.
59. Giada F, Gulizia M, Francese M, et al. Recurrent unexplained palpitations (RUP) study comparison of implantable loop recorder versus conventional diagnostic strategy. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. May 15 2007;49(19):1951-1956. PMID 17498580.
60. Magnusson, PP, Olszowka, MM, Wallhagen, MM, Koyi, HH. Outcome of implantable loop recorder evaluation. *Cardiol J*, 2017 Aug 26;25(3). PMID 28840588.
61. Maines, MM, Zorzi, AA, Tomasi, GG, Angheben, CC, Catanzariti, DD, Piffer, LL, Del Greco, MM. Clinical impact, safety, and accuracy of the remotely monitored implantable loop recorder Medtronic Reveal LINQTM. *Europace*, 2017 Oct 11;20(6). PMID 29016753.
62. Ciconte G, Saviano M, Giannelli L, et al. Atrial fibrillation detection using a novel three-vector cardiac implantable monitor: the atrial fibrillation detect study. *Europace*. Jul 1 2017;19(7):1101-1108. PMID 27702865.
63. Bhanu J, McMahon CG, Hall P, et al. Long-term cardiac monitoring in older adults with unexplained falls and syncope. *Heart*. May 1 2016;102(9):681-686. PMID 26822427.
64. Nolker G, Mayer J, Boldt LH, et al. Performance of an Implantable Cardiac Monitor to Detect Atrial Fibrillation: Results of the DETECT AF Study. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Dec 2016;27(12):1403-1410. PMID 27565119.
65. Sanders P, Purerfellner H, Pokushalov E, et al. Performance of a new atrial fibrillation detection algorithm in a miniaturized insertable cardiac monitor: Results from the Reveal LINQ Usability Study. *Heart Rhythm*. Jul 2016;13(7):1425-1430. PMID 26961298.
66. Ziegler PD, Rogers JD, Ferreira SW, et al. Real-world experience with insertable cardiac monitors to find atrial fibrillation in cryptogenic stroke. *Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2015;40(3-4):175-181. PMID 26314298.
67. Edvardsson N, Garutti C, Rieger G, et al. Unexplained syncope: implications of age and gender on patient characteristics and evaluation, the diagnostic yield of an implantable loop recorder, and the subsequent treatment. *Clin Cardiol*. Oct 2014;37(10):618-625. PMID 24890550.
68. Hindricks G, Pokushalov E, Urban L, et al. Performance of a new leadless implantable cardiac monitor in detecting and quantifying atrial fibrillation: Results of the XPECT trial. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. Apr 2010;3(2):141-147. PMID 20160169.
69. Hanke T, Charitos EI, Stierle U, et al. Twenty-four-hour holter monitor follow-up does not provide accurate heart rhythm status after surgical atrial fibrillation ablation therapy: up to 12 months experience with a novel permanently implantable heart rhythm monitor device. *Circulation*. Sep 15 2009;120(11 Suppl):S177-184. PMID 19752365.
70. Mittal S, Sanders P, Pokushalov E, et al. Safety profile of a miniaturized insertable cardiac monitor: results from two prospective trials. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol*. Dec 2015;38(12):1464-1469. PMID 26412309.
71. Rothman SA, Laughlin JC, Seltzer J, et al. The diagnosis of cardiac arrhythmias: a prospective multi-center randomized study comparing mobile cardiac outpatient telemetry versus standard loop event monitoring. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Mar 2007;18(3):241-247. PMID 17318994.
72. Derkac WM, Finkelmeier JR, Horgan DJ, et al. Diagnostic yield of asymptomatic arrhythmias detected by mobile cardiac outpatient telemetry and autotrigger looping event cardiac monitors. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Dec 2017;28(12):1475-1478. PMID 28940881.

73. Kadish AH, Reiffel JA, Clauser J, et al. Frequency of serious arrhythmias detected with ambulatory cardiac telemetry. *Am J Cardiol.* May 1 2010;105(9):1313-1316. PMID 20403485.
74. Joshi AK, Kowey PR, Prystowsky EN, et al. First experience with a Mobile Cardiac Outpatient Telemetry (MCOT) system for the diagnosis and management of cardiac arrhythmia. *Am J Cardiol.* Apr 1 2005;95(7):878-881. PMID 15781022.
75. Olson JA, Fouts AM, Padanilam BJ, et al. Utility of mobile cardiac outpatient telemetry for the diagnosis of palpitations, presyncope, syncope, and the assessment of therapy efficacy. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.* May 2007;18(5):473-477. PMID 17343724.
76. Saarel EV, Doratotaj S, Sterba R. Initial experience with novel mobile cardiac outpatient telemetry for children and adolescents with suspected arrhythmia. *Congenit Heart Dis.* Jan-Feb 2008;3(1):33-38. PMID 18373747.
77. Tayal AH, Tian M, Kelly KM, et al. Atrial fibrillation detected by mobile cardiac outpatient telemetry in cryptogenic TIA or stroke. *Neurology.* Nov 18 2008;71(21):1696-1701. PMID 18815386.
78. Favilla CG, Ingala E, Jara J, et al. Predictors of finding occult atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke. *Stroke.* May 2015;46(5):1210-1215. PMID 25851771.
79. Kalani R, Bernstein R, Passman R, et al. Low yield of mobile cardiac outpatient telemetry after cryptogenic stroke in patients with extensive cardiac imaging. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.* Sep 2015;24(9):2069-2073. PMID 26139455.
80. Narasimha D, Hanna N, Beck H, et al. Validation of a smartphone-based event recorder for arrhythmia detection. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol.* Mar 1 2018. PMID 29493801.
81. Dörr, MM, Nohturfft, VV, Brasier, NN, Bosshard, EE, Djurdjevic, AA, Gross, SS, Raichle, CC, Rhinisperger, MM, Stöckli, RR, Eckstein, JJ. The WATCH AF Trial: SmartWATCHes for Detection of Atrial Fibrillation. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol*, 2019 Feb 21;5(2). PMID 30784691.
82. Steinberg JS, Varma N, Cygankiewicz I, et al. 2017 ISHNE-HRS expert consensus statement on ambulatory ECG and external cardiac monitoring/telemetry. *Heart Rhythm.* Jul 2017;14(7):e55-e96. PMID 28495301.
83. January, CC, Wann, LL, Calkins, HH, Field, MM, Chen, LL, Furie, KK, Cigarroa, JJ, Heidenreich, PP, Cleveland, JJ, Murray, KK, Ellinor, PP, Shea, JJ, Ezekowitz, MM, Tracy, CC, Yancy, CC. 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. *Heart Rhythm*, 2019 Feb 1. PMID 30703530.
84. Shen WK, Sheldon RS, Benditt DG, et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/HRS Guideline for the Evaluation and Management of Patients With Syncope: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Aug 1 2017;70(5):620-663. PMID 28286222.
85. Al-Khatib, SS, Stevenson, WW, Ackerman, MM, Bryant, WW, Callans, DD, Curtis, AA, Deal, BB, Dickfeld, TT, Field, MM, Fonarow, GG, Gillis, AA, Granger, CC, Hammill, SS, Hlatky, MM, Joglar, JJ, Kay, GG, Matlock, DD, Myerburg, RR, Page, RR. 2017 AHA/ACC/HRS guideline for management of patients with ventricular arrhythmias and the prevention of sudden cardiac death: Executive summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. *Heart Rhythm*, 2017 Nov 4;15(10). PMID 29097320.
86. Calkins H, Kuck KH, Cappato R, et al. 2012 HRS/EHRA/ECAS expert consensus statement on catheter and surgical ablation of atrial fibrillation: recommendations for patient selection, procedural techniques, patient management and follow-up, definitions, endpoints, and research trial design. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol.* Mar 2012;33(2):171-257. PMID 22382715.
87. Calkins H, Hindricks G, Cappato R, et al. 2017 HRS/EHRA/ECAS/APHS/SOLAECE expert consensus statement on catheter and surgical ablation of atrial fibrillation: Executive summary. *J Arrhythm.* Oct 2017;33(5):369-409. PMID 29021841.

88. Task Force members, Brignole M, Vardas P, et al. Indications for the use of diagnostic implantable and external ECG loop recorders. *Europace*. May 2009;11(5):671-687. PMID 19401342.
89. Culebras A, Messe SR, Chaturvedi S, et al. Summary of evidence-based guideline update: prevention of stroke in nonvalvular atrial fibrillation: report of the Guideline Development Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. *Neurology*. Feb 25 2014;82(8):716-724. PMID 24566225.
90. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Electrocardiographic Services (20.15). 2004; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?MCDId=16&ExpandComments=n&McdName=Thomson+Micromedex+DrugDex+%C2%AE+Compendium+Revision+Request+-+CAG-00391&NCDId=179>. Accessed April 9, 2019.
91. National Government Services, Inc. (Primary Geographic Jurisdiction 06 & K - Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Connecticut, New York - Entire State, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont) Local Coverage Determination (LCD): Category III CPT® Codes (L33392), Revision Effective Date for services performed on or after 10/03/2019.
92. National Government Services, Inc. (Primary Geographic Jurisdiction 06 & K - Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Connecticut, New York - Entire State, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont) Local Coverage Article: Billing and Coding: Category III CPT® Codes (A56195), Revision Effective Date 01/01/2020.