

# Protocol

## Total Artificial Hearts and Implantable Ventricular Assist Devices

(70311)

<b>Medical Benefit</b>		<b>Effective Date:</b> 07/01/15	<b>Next Review Date:</b> 05/19
<b>Preauthorization</b>	No	<b>Review Dates:</b> 01/10, 01/11, 01/12, 01/13, 05/13, 05/14, 05/15, 05/16, 05/17, 05/18	

### ***Preauthorization is not required.***

*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.*

<b>Populations</b>	<b>Interventions</b>	<b>Comparators</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
Individuals: • With end-stage heart failure	Interventions of interest are: • Ventricular assist device as bridge to heart transplant	Comparators of interest are: • Optimal medical therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With end-stage heart failure	Interventions of interest are: • Ventricular assist device as destination therapy	Comparators of interest are: • Optimal medical therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With end-stage heart failure	Interventions of interest are: • Total artificial heart as bridge to transplant	Comparators of interest are: • Optimal medical therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With end-stage heart failure	Interventions of interest are: • Total artificial heart as destination therapy	Comparators of interest are: • Optimal medical therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With cardiogenic shock	Interventions of interest are: • Percutaneous ventricular assist device	Comparators of interest are: • Intra-aortic balloon pump	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Symptoms • Morbid events • Functional outcomes

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of life</li> <li>Treatment-related mortality</li> <li>Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who undergo high-risk cardiac procedures</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percutaneous ventricular assist device</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intra-aortic balloon pump</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall survival</li> <li>Symptoms</li> <li>Morbid events</li> <li>Functional outcomes</li> <li>Quality of life</li> <li>Treatment-related mortality</li> <li>Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With cardiogenic shock refractory to intra-aortic balloon pump</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percutaneous ventricular assist device</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Optimal medical therapy</li> <li>Other mechanical circulatory support</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall survival</li> <li>Symptoms</li> <li>Change in disease status</li> <li>Functional outcomes</li> <li>Quality of life</li> <li>Treatment-related mortality</li> <li>Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>

## DESCRIPTION

A ventricular assist device (VAD) is a mechanical support attached to the native heart and vessels to augment cardiac output. The total artificial heart (TAH) replaces the native ventricles and is attached to the pulmonary artery and aorta; the native heart is typically removed. Both the VAD and TAH may be used as a bridge to heart transplantation or as destination therapy in those not candidates for transplantation. The VAD has also been used as a bridge to recovery in patients with reversible conditions affecting cardiac output.

## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

### VENTRICULAR ASSIST DEVICE

For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a VAD as a bridge to transplant, the evidence includes single-arm trials and observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. There is a substantial body of evidence from clinical trials and observational studies supporting implantable VADs as a bridge to transplant in patients with end-stage heart failure, possibly improving mortality as well as QOL. These studies have reported that substantial numbers of patients have survived to transplant in situations in which survival would not be otherwise expected. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a VAD as destination therapy, the evidence includes a trial and multiple single-arm studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. A well-designed trial, with two years of follow-up data, has demonstrated an advantage of implantable VADs as destination therapy for patients ineligible for heart transplant. Despite an increase in adverse events, both mortality and QOL appear to be improved for these patients. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

## TOTAL ARTIFICIAL HEART

For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a TAH as a bridge to transplant, the evidence includes case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Compared with VADs, the evidence for TAHs in these settings is less robust. However, based on the lack of medical or surgical options for these patients and the evidence case series provide, TAH is likely to improve outcomes for a carefully selected population with end-stage biventricular heart failure awaiting transplant who are not appropriate candidates for a left VAD. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have end-stage heart failure who receive a TAH as destination therapy, the evidence includes two case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The body of evidence for TAHs as destination therapy is too limited to draw conclusions. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## PERCUTANEOUS VENTRICULAR ASSIST DEVICE

For individuals with cardiogenic shock or who undergo high-risk cardiac procedures who receive a pVAD, the evidence includes randomized controlled trials. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Four randomized controlled trials of pVAD vs. IABP for patients in cardiogenic shock failed to demonstrate a mortality benefit and reported higher complication rates associated with pVAD use. Another randomized controlled trial comparing pVAD with IABP as an adjunct to high-risk percutaneous coronary interventions was terminated early due to futility; analysis of enrolled subjects did not demonstrate significant improvements in the pVAD group. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals with cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP who receive a pVAD, the evidence includes case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, QOL, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Case series of patients with cardiogenic shock refractory to IABP have reported improved hemodynamic parameters following pVAD placement. However, these uncontrolled series do not provide evidence that pVADs improve mortality, and high rates of complications have been reported with pVAD use. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## POLICY

### BRIDGE TO TRANSPLANTATION

Implantable ventricular assist devices (VADs) with Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval or clearance may be considered **medically necessary** as a bridge to heart transplantation for patients who are currently listed as heart transplantation candidates and not expected to survive until a donor heart can be obtained, or are undergoing evaluation to determine candidacy for heart transplantation.

Implantable VADs with FDA approval or clearance, including humanitarian device exemptions, may be considered **medically necessary** as a bridge to heart transplantation in children 16 years old or younger who are currently listed as heart transplantation candidates and not expected to survive until a donor heart can be obtained, or are undergoing evaluation to determine candidacy for heart transplantation.

Total artificial hearts (TAHs) with FDA-approved devices may be considered **medically necessary** as a bridge to heart transplantation for patients with biventricular failure who have no other reasonable medical or surgical treatment options, who are ineligible for other univentricular or biventricular support devices, and are currently listed as heart transplantation candidates or are undergoing evaluation to determine candidacy for heart transplantation, and not expected to survive until a donor heart can be obtained.

## DESTINATION THERAPY

Implantable VADs with FDA approval or clearance may be considered **medically necessary** as destination therapy with end-stage heart failure patients who are ineligible for human heart transplant and who meet the following REMATCH Study criteria:

- New York Heart Association (NYHA) class IV heart failure for 60 or more days, OR patients in NYHA class III or IV for 28 days, received 14 or more days of support with intra-aortic balloon pump or dependent on intra-venous inotropic agents, with two failed weaning attempts.

In addition, patients must not be candidates for human heart transplant for one or more of the following reasons:

- Age greater than 65 years; OR
- Insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus with end-organ damage; OR
- Chronic renal failure (serum creatinine greater than 2.5 mg/dL for 90 or more days); OR
- Presence of other clinically significant condition.

## POSTCARDIOTOMY SETTING/BRIDGE TO RECOVERY

- Implantable VADs with FDA approval or clearance may be considered **medically necessary** in the postcardiotomy setting in patients who are unable to be weaned off cardiopulmonary bypass

## OTHER INDICATIONS

Other applications of implantable VADs or TAHs are considered **investigational**, including, but not limited to, the use of TAHs as destination therapy. The use of non-FDA approved or cleared implantable VADs or TAHs is considered **investigational**.

Percutaneous VADs are considered **investigational** for all indications.

## POLICY GUIDELINES

Only two VADs have approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the pediatric population. The DeBakey VAD<sup>®</sup> Child device and the Berlin Heart EXCOR Pediatric VAD have FDA approval through the humanitarian device exemption (HDE) process. The DeBakey VAD is indicated for use in children ages five to 16 years who are awaiting a heart transplant (i.e., a bridge to transplant) while the Berlin Heart EXCOR VAD is indicated for children with severe isolated left ventricular or biventricular dysfunction who are candidates for cardiac transplant and require circulatory support.

In general, candidates for bridge-to-transplant implantable VADs are those who are considered appropriate heart transplant candidates but who are unlikely to survive the waiting period until a human heart donor is available. Some studies have included the following hemodynamic selection criteria: either a left atrial pressure of 20 mm Hg or a cardiac index of less than 2.0 L/min/m while receiving maximal medical support. Patients with VADs are classified by the United Network for Organ Sharing as Status I (i.e., persons who are most ill and are considered the highest priority for transplant).

The median duration for time on the device is between 20 and 120 days.

Contraindications for bridge to transplant VADs and TAHs include conditions that would generally exclude patients for heart transplant. Such conditions are chronic irreversible hepatic, renal, or respiratory failure; systemic infection; coagulation disorders and inadequate psychosocial support. Due to potential problems with

adequate function of the VAD or TAH, implantation is also contraindicated in patients with uncorrected valvular disease. See also the Heart Transplant Protocol for further discussion of heart transplant candidacy.

In addition, patients must have sufficient space in the thorax and/or abdominal cavity for the device. In the case of the CardioWest™ temporary Total Artificial Heart, this excludes patients with body surface areas less than 1.7 m<sup>2</sup> or who have a distance between the sternum and 10<sup>th</sup> anterior rib of less than 10 cm as measured by computed tomography scan.

## MEDICARE ADVANTAGE

### VADs

VADs are **medically necessary** postcardiotomy (following open-heart surgery). They must have received approval from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for that purpose, and they are used according to the FDA-approved labeling instructions.

VADs are **medically necessary** as bridge-to-transplant. They must have received approval from the FDA for that purpose, and be used according to the FDA-approved labeling instructions. All of the following criteria must also be met in order for a VAD to be **medically necessary** as a bridge-to-transplant:

- a. The patient is approved for heart transplantation by a Medicare-approved heart transplant center and is active on the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network (OPTN) heart transplant waitlist,
- b. The implanting site, if different than the Medicare-approved transplant center, must receive written permission from the Medicare-approved heart transplant center under which the patient is listed prior to implantation of the VAD.

VADs used for destination therapy are **medically necessary** only if they have received approval from the FDA for that purpose, and the device is used according to the FDA-approved labeling instructions.

VADs are **medically necessary** for patients who have chronic end-stage heart failure (New York Heart Association Class IV end-stage left ventricular failure) who are not candidates for heart transplantation, and meet all of the following conditions:

- a. Have failed to respond to optimal medical management (including beta-blockers and ACE inhibitors if tolerated) for 45 of the last 60 days, or have been balloon pump-dependent for seven days, or IV (intravenous) inotrope-dependent for 14 days; and,
- b. Have a left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) less than 25%, and,
- c. Have demonstrated functional limitation with a peak oxygen consumption of 14 ml/kg/min or less unless balloon pump- or inotrope-dependent or physically unable to perform the test.

### ARTIFICIAL HEARTS

An artificial heart may have potential to be covered when performed under coverage with evidence development (CED) for the following indications:

- 1) bridge to transplant (BTT).
- 2) destination therapy (DT)

## MEDICARE ADVANTAGE POLICY GUIDELINES

### FACILITY CRITERIA

Facilities which are approved to provide VAD as destination therapy are listed at this web site:

<https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Medicare-General-Information/MedicareApprovedFacilities/VAD-Destination-Therapy-Facilities.html>.

Prospective VAD recipients must receive all information and support necessary to participate in shared decision making and to provide appropriate informed consent.

## BACKGROUND

### HEART FAILURE

Heart failure may be the consequence of a number of differing etiologies, including ischemic heart disease, cardiomyopathy, congenital heart defects, or rejection of a heart transplant. The reduction of cardiac output is considered to be severe when systemic circulation cannot meet the body's needs under minimal exertion. Heart transplantation improves quality of life and has survival rates at one, five, and 10 years of 88%, 74%, and 55%, respectively.<sup>1</sup> The number of candidates for transplants exceeds supply of donor organs; thus the interest in the development of mechanical devices.

#### Treatment

##### *Total Artificial Hearts*

Initial research into mechanical assistance for the heart focused on the TAH, a biventricular device that completely replaces the function of the diseased heart. An internal battery required frequent recharging from an external power source. Many systems use a percutaneous power line, but a transcutaneous power-transfer coil allows for a system without lines traversing the skin, possibly reducing the risk of infection. Because the native heart must be removed, failure of the device is synonymous with cardiac death.

A fully bioprosthetic TAH, which is fully implanted in the pericardial sac and is electrohydraulically actuated, has been developed and tested in two patients but is currently experimental.<sup>2</sup>

##### *Ventricular Assist Devices*

Implantable VADs are attached to the native heart, which may have enough residual capacity to withstand a device failure in the short term. In reversible heart failure conditions, the native heart may regain some function, and weaning and explanting of the mechanical support system after months of use has been described. VADs can be classified as internal or external, electrically or pneumatically powered, and pulsatile or continuous-flow. Initial devices were pulsatile, mimicking the action of a beating heart. More recent devices may use a pump, which provides continuous-flow. Continuous devices may move blood in rotary or axial flow.

At least one VAD system developed is miniaturized and generates an artificial pulse, the HeartMate 3 Left Ventricular Assist System.<sup>3</sup>

Surgically implanted VADs represent a method of providing mechanical circulatory support for patients not expected to survive until a donor heart becomes available for transplant or for whom transplantation is contraindicated or unavailable. VADs are most commonly used to support the left ventricle, but right ventricular and biventricular devices may be used. The device is larger than most native hearts, and therefore the size of the patient is an important consideration; the pump may be implanted in the thorax or abdomen or remain external to the body. Inflow to the device is attached to the apex of the failed ventricle, while outflow is attached to the corresponding great artery (aorta for left ventricle, pulmonary artery for right ventricle). A small portion of

ventricular wall is removed for insertion of the outflow tube; extensive cardiectomy affecting the ventricular wall may preclude VAD use.

#### *Percutaneous VADs*

Devices in which most of the system's components are external to the body are for short-term use (six hours to 14 days) only, due to the increased risk of infection and need for careful, in-hospital monitoring. Some circulatory assist devices are placed percutaneously (i.e., are not implanted). They may be referred to as percutaneous VADs (pVADs). A pVAD is placed through the femoral artery. Two different pVADs have been developed, the TandemHeart and the Impella device. In the TandemHeart system, a catheter is introduced through the femoral vein and passed into the left atrium via transeptal puncture. Oxygenated blood is then pumped from the left atrium into the arterial system via the femoral artery. The Impella device is introduced through a femoral artery catheter. In this device, a small pump is contained within the catheter placed into the left ventricle. Blood is pumped from the left ventricle, through the device, and into the ascending aorta. Adverse events associated with pVAD include access-site complications such as bleeding, aneurysms, or leg ischemia. Cardiovascular complications can also occur, such as perforation, myocardial infarction, stroke, and arrhythmias.

There are several situations in which pVADs may be beneficial: (1) cardiogenic shock that is refractory to medications and intra-aortic balloon pump, (2) cardiogenic shock as an alternative to intra-aortic balloon pump, and (3) invasive cardiac procedures in high-risk patients who need circulatory support.

Intra-aortic balloon pumps are outside the scope of this protocol.

## REGULATORY STATUS

A number of mechanical circulatory support devices have been approved or cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). These devices are summarized in Table 1 and discussed in the following sections.

Table 1. Available Mechanical Circulatory Support Devices

Device	Manufacturer	Date of Initial Approval	Method of FDA Clearance	Indication
<b>VADs</b>				
Thoratec® IVAD	Thoratec	Aug 2004	PMA	Bridge to transplant and postcardiotomy
DeBakey VAD® Child	MicroMed	Feb 2004	HDE	Bridge to transplant in children five-16 years of age
HeartMate II®	Thoratec	Apr 2008	PMA	Bridge to transplant and destination
CentriMag®	Levitronix (now Thoratec)	Oct 2008	HDE	Postcardiotomy
Berlin Heart EXCOR® Pediatric VAD	Berlin	Dec 2011	HDE	Bridge to transplant
HeartWare® Ventricular Assist System	HeartWare	Dec 2012	PMA	Bridge to transplant
<b>pVADs</b>				
Impella®	Abiomed	May 2008	510(k)	Partial circulatory support using extracorporeal bypass control unit for ≤ six hours
TandemHeart®	Cardiac Assist	Sep 2005	510(k)	Temporary left ventricular bypass of ≤ six hours

FDA: U.S. Food and Drug Administration; HDE: humanitarian device exemption; PMA: premarket approval; pVAD: percutaneous ventricular assist devices; VAD: ventricular assist devices.



## TOTAL ARTIFICIAL HEART

In October 2004, the temporary CardioWest™ Total Artificial Heart (SynCardia Systems, Tucson, AZ) was approved by the FDA through the premarket approval (PMA) process for use as a bridge to transplant in cardiac transplant-eligible candidates at risk of imminent death from biventricular failure. This device is also intended for use inside the hospital. In April 2010, FDA approved a name change to SynCardia Temporary Total Artificial Heart. FDA product code: LOZ.

In September 2006, the AbioCor® Implantable Replacement Heart System (Abiomed, Danvers, MA) was approved by FDA through the HDE process for use in severe biventricular end-stage heart disease patients who are not cardiac transplant candidates and who:

- are younger than 75 years of age;
- require multiple inotropic support;
- are not treatable by left VAD destination therapy; and
- are not weanable from biventricular support if on such support.

In addition to meeting other criteria, patients who are candidates for the AbioCor® TAH must undergo a screening process to determine if their chest volume is large enough to hold the device. The device is too large for approximately 90% of women and for many men. FDA HDE: H040006.

## VENTRICULAR ASSIST DEVICES

In December 1995, the Thoratec® Ventricular Assist Device System (Thoratec Corp., Pleasanton, CA) was approved by FDA through the PMA process for use as a bridge to transplantation in patients suffering from end-stage heart failure. The patient should meet all of the following criteria:

- candidate for cardiac transplantation,
- imminent risk of dying before donor heart procurement, and
- dependence on, or incomplete response to, continuous vasopressor support.

In May 1998, supplemental approval for this device was given for the indication for postcardiotomy patients unable to be weaned from cardiopulmonary bypass. In June 2001, supplemental approval was given for a portable external driver to permit excursions within a two-hour travel radius of the hospital when accompanied by a trained caregiver. In November 2003, supplemental approval was given to market the device as Thoratec® Paracorporeal VAD. In August 2004, supplemental approval was given to a modified device to be marketed as the Thoratec® Implantable VAD for the same indications. In January 2008, supplemental approval was given to rescind Paracorporeal VAD use.

In February 2004, the DeBakey VAD® Child pump was approved by FDA through the HDE process for both home and hospital use for children between the ages of five and 16 years who have end-stage ventricular failure requiring temporary mechanical blood circulation until a heart transplant is performed.

In April 2008, the continuous-flow HeartMate® II LVAS device (Thoratec, Pleasanton, CA) was approved by FDA through the PMA process for use as a bridge to transplantation in cardiac transplant candidates at risk of imminent death from nonreversible left ventricular failure. The HeartMate® II LVAS device is intended for use both inside and outside the hospital. In January 2010, the device received the added indication as destination therapy for use in patients with New York Heart Association class IIIB or IV end-stage left ventricular failure who have received optimal medical therapy for at least 45 of the last 60 days and are not candidates for cardiac transplantation.



In October 2008, device CentriMag® Right Ventricular Assist Device (Levitronix, Zurich) was approved by FDA under the HDE process to provide temporary circulatory support for up to 14 days for patients in cardiogenic shock due to acute right-sided heart failure.

In December 2011, the Berlin Heart EXCOR® Pediatric VAD was approved by FDA under the HDE for pediatric patients with severe isolated left ventricular or biventricular dysfunction who are candidates for cardiac transplant and require circulatory support.

In December 2012, FDA approved the HeartWare® Ventricular Assist System (HeartWare, Miami Lakes, FL) through the PMA process. The device is approved as a bridge to cardiac transplantation in patients at risk for death from refractory end-stage left ventricular heart failure.

FDA product code: DSQ.

#### PERCUTANEOUS VADs (CIRCULATORY ASSIST DEVICES)

In May 2008, the Impella® Recover LP 2.5 Percutaneous Cardiac Support System (Abiomed, Aachen, Germany) was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process for short-term (less than six hours) use in patients requiring circulatory support.

In March 2015, the Impella 2.5 System received approval through the PMA process for temporary ventricular support during high-risk percutaneous coronary interventions.

The TandemHeart® (Cardiac Assist, Pittsburgh) received a similar 510(k) approval for short-term circulatory support in September 2005. FDA product code: KFM.

Several other devices are in clinical trials or awaiting FDA review.

#### RELATED PROTOCOLS

Heart Transplant

Heart/Lung Transplant

---

Services that are the subject of a clinical trial do not meet our Technology Assessment Protocol criteria and are considered investigational. *For explanation of experimental and investigational, please refer to the Technology Assessment 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. Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network, Scientific Registry of Transplant Recipients. 2008 Annual Report of the U.S. Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network and the Scientific Registry of Transplant Recipients: Transplant Data 1998-2007. Rockville, MD U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Healthcare Systems Bureau, Division of Transplantation; 2008.
2. Carpentier A, Latremouille C, Cholley B, et al. First clinical use of a bioprosthetic total artificial heart: report of two cases. *Lancet*. Oct 17 2015; 386(10003):1556-1563. PMID 26231456
3. Netuka I, Sood P, Pya Y, et al. Fully magnetically levitated left ventricular assist system for treating advanced HF: a multicenter study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Dec 15 2015; 66(23):2579-2589. PMID 26670056
4. Acharya D, Loyaga-Rendon RY, Pamboukian SV, et al. Ventricular assist device in acute myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Apr 26 2016; 67(16):1871-1880. PMID 27102502
5. Wever-Pinzon O, Drakos SG, McKellar SH, et al. Cardiac recovery during long-term left ventricular assist device support. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Oct 04 2016; 68(14):1540-1553. PMID 27687196
6. Topkara VK, Garan AR, Fine B, et al. Myocardial recovery in patients receiving contemporary left ventricular assist devices: results from the Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support (INTERMACS). *Circ Heart Fail*. Jul 2016; 9(7). PMID 27402861
7. Birks EJ, Tansley PD, Hardy J, et al. Left ventricular assist device and drug therapy for the reversal of heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 2 2006; 355(18):1873-1884. PMID 17079761
8. Birks EJ, George RS, Hedger M, et al. Reversal of severe heart failure with a continuous-flow left ventricular assist device and pharmacological therapy: a prospective study. *Circulation*. Feb 1 2011; 123(4):381-390. PMID 21242487
9. Maybaum S, Mancini D, Xydas S, et al. Cardiac improvement during mechanical circulatory support: a prospective multicenter study of the LVAD Working Group. *Circulation*. May 15, 2007; 115(19):2497-2505. PMID 17485581
10. Takayama H, Soni L, Kalesan B, et al. Bridge-to-decision therapy with a continuous-flow external ventricular assist device in refractory cardiogenic shock of various causes. *Circ Heart Fail*. Sep 2014; 7(5):799-806. PMID 25027874
11. Mohamedali B, Bhat G, Yost G, et al. Survival on biventricular mechanical support with the Centrimag(R) as a bridge to decision: a single-center risk stratification. *Perfusion*. Apr 2015; 30(3):201-208. PMID 25524992
12. TEC Assessment Program. Ventricular assist devices in bridging to heart transplantation. 1996; Volume 11; Tab 26. PMID
13. Goldstein DJ, Oz MC, Rose EA. Implantable left ventricular assist devices. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 19 1998; 339(21):1522-1533. PMID 9819452
14. Strueber M, O'Driscoll G, Jansz P, et al. Multicenter evaluation of an intrapericardial left ventricular assist system. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Mar 22 2011; 57(12):1375-1382. PMID 21414534
15. Aaronson KD, Slaughter MS, Miller LW, et al. Use of an intrapericardial, continuous-flow, centrifugal pump in patients awaiting heart transplantation. *Circulation*. Jun 26 2012; 125(25):3191-3200. PMID 22619284
16. Slaughter MS, Pagani FD, McGee EC, et al. HeartWare ventricular assist system for bridge to transplant: combined results of the bridge to transplant and continued access protocol trial. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. Jul 2013; 32(7):675-683. PMID 23796152
17. Frazier OH, Gemmato C, Myers TJ, et al. Initial clinical experience with the HeartMate II axial-flow left ventricular assist device. *Tex Heart Inst J*. 2007; 34(3):275-281. PMID 17948075
18. John R, Kamdar F, Liao K, et al. Improved survival and decreasing incidence of adverse events with the HeartMate II left ventricular assist device as bridge-to-transplant therapy. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Oct 2008; 86(4):1227-1234; discussion 1234-1225. PMID 18805167
19. Miller LW, Pagani FD, Russell SD, et al. Use of a continuous-flow device in patients awaiting heart transplantation. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 30 2007; 357(9):885-896. PMID 17761592

20. Patel ND, Weiss ES, Schaffer J, et al. Right heart dysfunction after left ventricular assist device implantation: a comparison of the pulsatile HeartMate I and axial-flow HeartMate II devices. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Sep 2008; 86(3):832-840; discussion 832-840. PMID 18721570
21. Struber M, Sander K, Lahpor J, et al. HeartMate II left ventricular assist device; early European experience. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* Aug 2008; 34(2):289-294. PMID 18571932
22. Kirklin JK, Naftel DC, Stevenson LW, et al. INTERMACS database for durable devices for circulatory support: first annual report. *J Heart Lung Transplant.* Oct 2008; 27(10):1065-1072. PMID 18926395
23. Starling RC, Naka Y, Boyle AJ, et al. Results of the post-U.S. Food and Drug Administration-approval study with a continuous flow left ventricular assist device as a bridge to heart transplantation: a prospective study using the INTERMACS (Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support). *J Am Coll Cardiol.* May 10, 2011; 57(19):1890-1898. PMID 21545946
24. Aaronson KD, Eppinger MJ, Dyke DB, et al. Left ventricular assist device therapy improves utilization of donor hearts. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Apr 17 2002; 39(8):1247-1254. PMID 11955839
25. Frazier OH, Rose EA, McCarthy P, et al. Improved mortality and rehabilitation of transplant candidates treated with a long-term implantable left ventricular assist system. *Ann Surg.* Sep 1995; 222(3):327-336; discussion 336-328. PMID 7677462
26. Bank AJ, Mir SH, Nguyen DQ, et al. Effects of left ventricular assist devices on outcomes in patients undergoing heart transplantation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* May 2000; 69(5):1369-1374; discussion 1375. PMID 10881807
27. Shuhaiber JH, Hur K, Gibbons R. The influence of preoperative use of ventricular assist devices on survival after heart transplantation: propensity score matched analysis. *BMJ.* Feb 10 2010; 340:c392. PMID 20147346
28. Alba AC, McDonald M, Rao V, et al. The effect of ventricular assist devices on long-term post-transplant outcomes: a systematic review of observational studies. *Eur J Heart Fail.* Jul 2011; 13(7):785-795. PMID 21551162
29. Deo SV, Sung K, Daly RC, et al. Cardiac transplantation after bridged therapy with continuous flow left ventricular assist devices. *Heart Lung Circ.* Mar 2014; 23(3):224-228. PMID 23954004
30. Grimm JC, Sciortino CM, Magruder JT, et al. Outcomes in patients bridged with univentricular and biventricular devices in the modern era of heart transplantation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Jul 2016; 102(1):102-108. PMID 27068177
31. Dickstein K, Cohen-Solal A, Filippatos G, et al. ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2008: the Task Force for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute and Chronic Heart Failure 2008 of the European Society of Cardiology. Developed in collaboration with the Heart Failure Association of the ESC (HFA) and endorsed by the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine (ESICM). *Eur Heart J.* Oct 2008; 29(19):2388-2442. PMID 18799522
32. Fraser CD, Jr., Jaquiss RD, Rosenthal DN, et al. Prospective trial of a pediatric ventricular assist device. *N Engl J Med.* Aug 09 2012; 367(6):532-541. PMID 22873533
33. Wehman B, Stafford KA, Bittle GJ, et al. Modern outcomes of mechanical circulatory support as a bridge to pediatric heart transplantation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Jun 2016; 101(6):2321-2327. PMID 26912304
34. Bulic A, Maeda K, Zhang Y, et al. Functional status of United States children supported with a left ventricular assist device at heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant.* Aug 2017; 36(8):890-896. PMID 28363739
35. Blume ED, Rosenthal DN, Rossano JW, et al. Outcomes of children implanted with ventricular assist devices in the United States: First analysis of the Pediatric Interagency Registry for Mechanical Circulatory Support (PediMACS). *J Heart Lung Transplant.* May 2016; 35(5):578-584. PMID 27009673
36. Almond CS, Morales DL, Blackstone EH, et al. Berlin Heart EXCOR pediatric ventricular assist device for bridge to heart transplantation in US children. *Circulation.* Apr 23 2013; 127(16):1702-1711. PMID 23538380
37. Jordan LC, Ichord RN, Reinhartz O, et al. Neurological complications and outcomes in the Berlin Heart EXCOR(R) pediatric investigational device exemption trial. *J Am Heart Assoc.* Jan 2015; 4(1):e001429. PMID 25613996
38. Chen S, Lin A, Liu E, et al. Outpatient outcomes of pediatric patients with left ventricular assist devices. *ASAIO J.* Mar-Apr 2016; 62(2):163-168. PMID 26720740

39. Conway J, Al-Aklabi M, Granoski D, et al. Supporting pediatric patients with short-term continuous-flow devices. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. May 2016; 35(5):603-609. PMID 27009672
40. Davies RR, Russo MJ, Hong KN, et al. The use of mechanical circulatory support as a bridge to transplantation in pediatric patients: an analysis of the United Network for Organ Sharing database. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Feb 2008; 135(2):421-427, 427 e421. PMID 18242279
41. TEC Assessment Program. Left ventricular assist devices as destination therapy for end-stage heart failure. 2002; Volume 17; Tab 19.
42. Rose EA, Gelijns AC, Moskowitz AJ, et al. Long-term mechanical left ventricular assistance for end-stage heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 15 2001; 345(20):1435-1443. PMID 11794191
43. Park SJ, Tector A, Piccioni W, et al. Left ventricular assist devices as destination therapy: a new look at survival. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Jan 2005; 129(1):9-17. PMID 15632819
44. Long JW, Kfoury AG, Slaughter MS, et al. Long-term destination therapy with the HeartMate XVE left ventricular assist device: improved outcomes since the REMATCH study. *Congest Heart Fail*. May-Jun 2005; 11(3):133-138. PMID 15947534
45. Rogers JG, Butler J, Lansman SL, et al. Chronic mechanical circulatory support for inotrope-dependent heart failure patients who are not transplant candidates: results of the INTrEPID Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Aug 21 2007; 50(8):741-747. PMID 17707178
46. Estep JD, Starling RC, Horstmanshof DA, et al. Risk assessment and comparative effectiveness of left ventricular assist device and medical management in ambulatory heart failure patients: results from the ROADMAP Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Oct 20 2015; 66(16):1747-1761. PMID 26483097
47. Starling RC, Estep JD, Horstmanshof DA, et al. Risk Assessment and comparative effectiveness of left ventricular assist device and medical management in ambulatory heart failure patients: The ROADMAP Study 2-year results. *JACC Heart Fail*. Jul 2017; 5(7):518-527. PMID 28396040
48. Jorde UP, Kushwaha SS, Tatooles AJ, et al. Results of the destination therapy post-food and drug administration approval study with a continuous flow left ventricular assist device: a prospective study using the INTERMACS registry (Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support). *J Am Coll Cardiol*. May 6, 2014; 63(17):1751-1757. PMID 24613333
49. Arnold SV, Jones PG, Allen LA, et al. Frequency of poor outcome (death or poor quality of life) after left ventricular assist device for destination therapy: results from the INTERMACS Registry. *Circ Heart Fail*. Aug 2016; 9(8). PMID 27507111
50. Mehra MR, Naka Y, Uriel N, et al. A fully magnetically levitated circulatory pump for advanced heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 02 2017; 376(5):440-450. PMID 27959709
51. Rogers JG, Pagani FD, Tatooles AJ, et al. Intrapericardial left ventricular assist device for advanced heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 02 2017; 376(5):451-460. PMID 28146651
52. Slaughter MS, Rogers JG, Milano CA, et al. Advanced heart failure treated with continuous-flow left ventricular assist device. *N Engl J Med*. Dec 3 2009; 361(23):2241-2251. PMID 19920051
53. Nativi JN, Drakos SG, Kucheryavaya AY, et al. Changing outcomes in patients bridged to heart transplantation with continuous-versus pulsatile-flow ventricular assist devices: an analysis of the registry of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. Aug 2011; 30(8):854-861. PMID 21571550
54. Dell'Aquila AM, Schneider SR, Stypmann J, et al. Survival results after implantation of intrapericardial third-generation centrifugal assist device: an INTERMACS-matched comparison analysis. *Artif Organs*. May 2014; 38(5):383-390. PMID 24117675
55. Pruijsten RV, Lok SI, Kirkels HH, et al. Functional and haemodynamic recovery after implantation of continuous-flow left ventricular assist devices in comparison with pulsatile left ventricular assist devices in patients with end-stage heart failure. *Eur J Heart Fail*. Mar 2012; 14(3):319-325. PMID 22294758
56. Lim KM, Constantino J, Gurev V, et al. Comparison of the effects of continuous and pulsatile left ventricular-assist devices on ventricular unloading using a cardiac electromechanics model. *J Physiol Sci*. Jan 2012; 62(1):11-19. PMID 22076841

57. Kato TS, Chokshi A, Singh P, et al. Effects of continuous-flow versus pulsatile-flow left ventricular assist devices on myocardial unloading and remodeling. *Circ Heart Fail*. Sep 2011; 4(5):546-553. PMID 21765125
58. Ventura PA, Alharethi R, Budge D, et al. Differential impact on post-transplant outcomes between pulsatile- and continuous-flow left ventricular assist devices. *Clin Transplant*. Jul-Aug 2011; 25(4):E390-395. PMID 21401721
59. Al-Sarie M, Rauf A, Kfoury AG, et al. Myocardial structural and functional response after long-term mechanical unloading with continuous flow left ventricular assist device: axial versus centrifugal flow. *JACC Heart Fail*. Jul 2016; 4(7):570-576. PMID 27179831
60. Copeland JG, Smith RG, Arabia FA, et al. Cardiac replacement with a total artificial heart as a bridge to transplantation. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 26 2004; 351(9):859-867. PMID 15329423
61. Copeland JG, Copeland H, Gustafson M, et al. Experience with more than 100 total artificial heart implants. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Mar 2012; 143(3):727-734. PMID 22245242
62. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of Safety and Probable Benefit - H040006: AbioCor Implantable Replacement Heart. 2006; [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf4/H040006b.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf4/H040006b.pdf). Accessed July 31, 2017.
63. Dowling RD, Gray LA, Jr., Etoch SW, et al. Initial experience with the AbioCor implantable replacement heart system. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Jan 2004; 127(1):131-141. PMID 14752423
64. Torregrossa G, Morshuis M, Varghese R, et al. Results with SynCardia total artificial heart beyond 1 year. *ASAIO J*. Nov-Dec 2014; 60(6):626-634. PMID 25158888
65. Romeo F, Acconcia MC, Sergi D, et al. Percutaneous assist devices in acute myocardial infarction with cardiogenic shock: Review, meta-analysis. *World J Cardiol*. Jan 26 2016; 8(1):98-111. PMID 26839661
66. Cheng JM, den Uil CA, Hoeks SE, et al. Percutaneous left ventricular assist devices vs. intra-aortic balloon pump counterpulsation for treatment of cardiogenic shock: a meta-analysis of controlled trials. *Eur Heart J*. Sep 2009; 30(17):2102-2108. PMID 19617601
67. Burkhoff D, Cohen H, Brunckhorst C, et al. A randomized multicenter clinical study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the TandemHeart percutaneous ventricular assist device versus conventional therapy with intra-aortic balloon pumping for treatment of cardiogenic shock. *Am Heart J*. Sep 2006; 152(3):469 e461-468. PMID 16923414
68. Seyfarth M, Sibbing D, Bauer I, et al. A randomized clinical trial to evaluate the safety and efficacy of a percutaneous left ventricular assist device versus intra-aortic balloon pumping for treatment of cardiogenic shock caused by myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Nov 4 2008; 52(19):1584-1588. PMID 19007597
69. Thiele H, Sick P, Boudriot E, et al. Randomized comparison of intra-aortic balloon support with a percutaneous left ventricular assist device in patients with revascularized acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock. *Eur Heart J*. Jul 2005; 26(13):1276-1283. PMID 15734771
70. Ouweneel DM, Eriksen E, Sjauw KD, et al. Percutaneous mechanical circulatory support versus intra-aortic balloon pump in cardiogenic shock after acute myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jan 24 2017; 69(3):278-287. PMID 27810347
71. O'Neill WW, Schreiber T, Wohns DH, et al. The current use of Impella 2.5 in acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock: results from the USpella Registry. *J Interv Cardiol*. Feb 2014; 27(1):1-11. PMID 24329756
72. Basir MB, Schreiber TL, Grines CL, et al. Effect of early initiation of mechanical circulatory support on survival in cardiogenic shocks. *Am J Cardiol*. Mar 15 2017; 119(6):845-851. PMID 28040188
73. Griffith BP, Anderson MB, Samuels LE, et al. The RECOVER I: a multicenter prospective study of Impella 5.0/LD for postcardiotomy circulatory support. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Feb 2013; 145(2):548-554. PMID 22405676
74. Lemaire A, Anderson MB, Lee LY, et al. The Impella device for acute mechanical circulatory support in patients in cardiogenic shock. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Jan 2014; 97(1):133-138. PMID 24090575



75. Lauten A, Engstrom AE, Jung C, et al. Percutaneous left-ventricular support with the Impella-2.5-assist device in acute cardiogenic shock: results of the Impella-EUROSHOCK-registry. *Circ Heart Fail.* Jan 2013; 6(1):23-30. PMID 23212552
76. Briasoulis A, Telila T, Palla M, et al. Meta-analysis of usefulness of percutaneous left ventricular assist devices for high-risk percutaneous coronary interventions. *Am J Cardiol.* Aug 1 2016; 118(3):369-375. PMID 27265673
77. O'Neill WW, Kleiman NS, Moses J, et al. A prospective, randomized clinical trial of hemodynamic support with Impella 2.5 versus intra-aortic balloon pump in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention: the PROTECT II study. *Circulation.* Oct 2 2012; 126(14):1717-1727. PMID 22935569
78. Kovacic JC, Kini A, Banerjee S, et al. Patients with 3-vessel coronary artery disease and impaired ventricular function undergoing PCI with Impella 2.5 hemodynamic support have improved 90-day outcomes compared to intra-aortic balloon pump: a sub-study of the PROTECT II trial. *J Interv Cardiol.* Feb 2015; 28(1):32-40. PMID 25689546
79. Dangas GD, Kini AS, Sharma SK, et al. Impact of hemodynamic support with Impella 2.5 versus intra-aortic balloon pump on prognostically important clinical outcomes in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention (from the PROTECT II randomized trial). *Am J Cardiol.* Jan 15 2014; 113(2):222-228. PMID 24527505
80. Reddy YM, Chinitz L, Mansour M, et al. Percutaneous left ventricular assist devices in ventricular tachycardia ablation: multicenter experience. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* Apr 2014; 7(2):244-250. PMID 24532564
81. Aryana A, Gearoid O'Neill P, Gregory D, et al. Procedural and clinical outcomes after catheter ablation of unstable ventricular tachycardia supported by a percutaneous left ventricular assist device. *Heart Rhythm.* Jul 2014; 11(7):1122-1130. PMID 24732372
82. Kovacic JC, Nguyen HT, Karajikar R, et al. The Impella Recover 2.5 and TandemHeart ventricular assist devices are safe and associated with equivalent clinical outcomes in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Jul 01 2013; 82(1):E28-37. PMID 21234916
83. Dixon SR, Henriques JP, Mauri L, et al. A prospective feasibility trial investigating the use of the Impella 2.5 system in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention (The PROTECT I Trial): initial U.S. experience. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Feb 2009; 2(2):91-96. PMID 19463408
84. Schreiber T, Wah Htun W, Blank N, et al. Real-world supported unprotected left main percutaneous coronary intervention with impella device; data from the USpella registry. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Apr 18 2017. PMID 28417594
85. Sjauw KD, Konorza T, Erbel R, et al. Supported high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention with the Impella 2.5 device the Europella registry. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Dec 15 2009; 54(25):2430-2434. PMID 20082934
86. Maini B, Naidu SS, Mulukutla S, et al. Real-world use of the Impella 2.5 circulatory support system in complex high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention: the USpella Registry. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Nov 1 2012; 80(5):717-725. PMID 22105829
87. Alasnag MA, Gardi DO, Elder M, et al. Use of the Impella 2.5 for prophylactic circulatory support during elective high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention. *Cardiovasc Revasc Med.* Sep-Oct 2011; 12(5):299-303. PMID 21454139
88. Kar B, Gregoric ID, Basra SS, et al. The percutaneous ventricular assist device in severe refractory cardiogenic shock. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Feb 8 2011; 57(6):688-696. PMID 20950980
89. Rihal CS, Naidu SS, Givertz MM, et al. 2015 SCAI/ACC/HFSA/STS clinical expert consensus statement on the use of percutaneous mechanical circulatory support devices in cardiovascular care: endorsed by the American Heart Association, the Cardiological Society of India, and Sociedad Latino Americana de Cardiologia Intervencion; Affirmation of Value by the Canadian Association of Interventional Cardiology-Association Canadienne de Cardiologie d'intervention. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* May 19, 2015; 65(19):e7-e26. PMID 25861963
90. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of heart failure: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Oct 15 2013; 62(16):e147-239. PMID 23747642

91. Peura JL, Colvin-Adams M, Francis GS, et al. Recommendations for the use of mechanical circulatory support: device strategies and patient selection: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. Nov 27 2012; 126(22):2648-2667. PMID 23109468
92. Heart Failure Society of America, Lindenfeld J, Albert NM, et al. HFSA 2010 Comprehensive Heart Failure Practice Guideline. *J Card Fail*. Jun 2010; 16(6):e1-194. PMID 20610207
93. Ponikowski P, Voors AA, Anker SD, et al. 2016 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure: The Task Force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Developed with the special contribution of the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur Heart J*. Jul 14 2016; 37(27):2129-2200. PMID 27206819
94. Feldman D, Pamboukian SV, Teuteberg JJ, et al. The 2013 International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation Guidelines for mechanical circulatory support: executive summary. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. Feb 2013; 32(2):157-187. PMID 23352391
95. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Ventricular Assist Devices (20.9.1). 2014; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=360&ver=1>. Accessed August 8, 2017.
96. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Artificial Hearts and Related Devices (20.9), Implementation Date 9/30/2014.