

Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema

Policy Number: CS355.C
Effective Date: February 1, 2024

[Instructions for Use](#)

Table of Contents	Page
Application	1
Coverage Rationale	1
Definitions	2
Applicable Codes	2
Description of Services	2
Clinical Evidence	3
U.S. Food and Drug Administration	9
References	9
Policy History/Revision Information	11
Instructions for Use	11

Related Community Plan Policy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pneumatic Compression Devices
Commercial Policy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema

Application

This Medical Policy does not apply to the states listed below; refer to the state-specific policy/guideline, if noted:

State	Policy/Guideline
Indiana	Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema (for Indiana Only)
Kentucky	Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema (for Kentucky Only)
Louisiana	Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema (for Louisiana Only)
Mississippi	Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema (for Mississippi Only)
New Jersey	Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema (for New Jersey Only)
North Carolina	Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema (for North Carolina Only)
Ohio	Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema (for Ohio Only)
Pennsylvania	Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema (for Pennsylvania Only)
Tennessee	Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema (for Tennessee Only)

Coverage Rationale

Surgical procedures for the treatment or prevention of Lymphedema are unproven and not medically necessary due to insufficient evidence of safety and/or efficacy. These procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Liposuction/Lipectomy
- Microsurgical treatment
 - Lymphaticovenous Anastomosis
 - Lymphovenous bypass
- Vascularized Lymph Node Transfer

Definitions

Liposuction/Lipectomy: A procedure that uses vacuum suction to remove subcutaneous adipose tissue in certain anatomical areas (Bartow).

Lymphaticovenular/Lymphaticovenous Anastomosis: A surgical procedure that connects small lymphatic vessels to adjacent venules to shunt excess lymphatic fluid (American Society of Plastic Surgeons).

Lymphedema: The build-up of fluid in soft body tissues when the lymph system is damaged or blocked (NCI).

Vascularized Lymph Node Transfer: A surgical procedure that transfers skin, fat, and lymph nodes for lymphatic reconstruction (American Society of Plastic Surgeons).

Applicable Codes

The following list(s) of procedure and/or diagnosis codes is provided for reference purposes only and may not be all inclusive. Listing of a code in this policy does not imply that the service described by the code is a covered or non-covered health service. Benefit coverage for health services is determined by federal, state, or contractual requirements and applicable laws that may require coverage for a specific service. The inclusion of a code does not imply any right to reimbursement or guarantee claim payment. Other Policies and Guidelines may apply.

CPT Code	Description
15830	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy); abdomen, infraumbilical panniculectomy
15832	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy); thigh
15833	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy); leg
15834	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy); hip
15835	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy); buttock
15836	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy); arm
15837	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy); forearm or hand
15838	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy); submental fat pad
15839	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy); other area
15847	Excision, excessive skin and subcutaneous tissue (includes lipectomy), abdomen (e.g., abdominoplasty) (includes umbilical transposition and fascial plication) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
15876	Suction assisted lipectomy; head and neck
15877	Suction assisted lipectomy; trunk
15878	Suction assisted lipectomy; upper extremity
15879	Suction assisted lipectomy; lower extremity
38999	Unlisted procedure, hemic or lymphatic system
49906	Free omental flap with microvascular anastomosis

CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association

Description of Services

Lymphedema is a chronic, progressive, and often incurable disease in which there is impaired drainage of interstitial fluid through the lymphatic system resulting in the accumulation of fluid and hypertrophic fat. There are two types of Lymphedema. Primary Lymphedema, in which there is abnormal development of the lymphatic system, and secondary Lymphedema which is caused by damage to the lymphatic system from trauma, infections, and cancer surgeries and radiation. It is characterized by

nonpitting swelling of an extremity (that typically excludes the fingers and toes) or trunk. It is associated with wound healing impairment, recurrent skin infections, and decreased quality of life.

The first line treatment of LE is conservative management with complete decongestive therapy (CDT) which is a combination of compressive garments, skin hygiene, limb compression, manual lymphatic drainage, and exercise. Pneumatic compression may also provide additional improvement when used adjunctively. For patients whose LE is not controlled by CDT, surgical procedures such as Liposuction/Lipectomy, subcutaneous excision, and microsurgical procedures such as lymphovenous bypass (LVA) and Vascularized Lymph Node Transfer (VLNT) have been proposed (Kareh 2020; NCI 2019). LVA (also referred to as lymphovenous bypass or Lymphaticovenular Anastomosis) is a super microsurgical technique in which an anastomosis is created between the congested lymphatic vessel and a vein to improve lymphatic fluid transport.

Clinical Evidence

Complex decongestive therapy (CDT) is the gold standard for treating lymphedema. It involves Phase I decongestion (manual lymphatic drainage (MLD), compression therapy, skin care and exercise) to reduce swelling, improve limb shape and skin condition. Phase II is maintenance to continue Phase I therapies to control the condition. Late stage lymphedema may not respond to standard therapy and several types of surgical interventions have been investigated. These include, liposuction, vascularized lymph node transfer (VLNT) and lymphaticovenous anastomosis (VLA). LVA and VLNT have also been investigated for the prevention of lymphedema, and for that indication, they are done at the time of the index procedure. This is often called lymphatic microsurgical healing approach (LYMPHA). These techniques are very specialized and there is limited high quality evidence on the long term outcomes.

In a 2021 systematic review and meta-analysis sponsored by the American Association of Plastic Surgeons, Chang et al. examined the published evidence to assess the efficacy and safety of surgical treatment of lymphedema as well as preventing secondary lymphedema of the upper (UE) and lower extremity (LE) lymphedema as well as develop consensus statements and recommendations. Treatment of lymphedema included lymphovenous bypass, vascular lymph node transplantation and liposuction and comparators included surgery and compression therapy. For the prevention of secondary lymphedema, lymphovenous bypass was included with no surgery as the comparator. Studies included randomized controlled trials, observational studies and retrospective cohort and case-controlled publications. Case series that reported relevant pre- and post-operative outcomes were also included. Seventy one articles representing 66 studies were included and of these, 43 were case series. For liposuction, based on very low quality evidence, the results showed that the combination of liposuction and controlled compression therapy reduced limb volume significantly more than controlled compression therapy alone in patients with stage I-III (International Society of Lymphology) UE lymphedema. In studies that compared lymphovenous bypass to compression therapy in the UE and LE, the results showed decreased limb volume when compared to compression therapy alone. Almost half of the 81 patients were able to stop using compression garments, and 3 case series reported a significant reduction in episodes of cellulitis. Vascularized lymph node transfer (VLNT) was reported in 4 studies of 300 patients and compared VLNT to physical therapy. These results showed significant reductions in arm volume, pain, heaviness and overall function in patients who underwent VLNT compared to physical therapy alone. In 5 studies, VLNT combined with compression garments and complex decongestive therapy and the results showed significant reduction in circumference, and incidence of cellulitis was reduced. The authors concluded that there is evidence to support surgical treatments in reducing the severity UE and LE lymphedema, but none are a cure. No consensus was reached on which procedure is more effective, This consensus review is limited by a high degree of heterogeneity among the procedures studies and combinations thereof. The authors also noted that the meta-analysis has several limitations: Only two randomized controlled trials were included. The majority of included studies were observational studies, which are at high risk of bias, and the conclusions that can be drawn from these studies are limited. Additional well designed research that includes more objective outcome reporting and longer follow up is needed to validate these findings.

Liposuction/Lipectomy

Xin et al. (2022) conducted a retrospective observational study on the therapeutic outcomes of tumescent liposuction for cancer-related lower extremity LE. The study included 62 patients with unilateral cancer related lower extremity with Stage II or Stage III LE who had received liposuction only and wore compression stockings postoperatively and followed for more than 3 months. Half of the participants were in Stage III LE, and a third had a history of recurrent superficial skin infections. The results showed the appearance of the lymphedematous extremity significantly improved by 3 months postoperatively. The preoperative, postoperative, and 3-month follow-up percent volume reduction (PVDs) were $43.2 \pm 23.7\%$, $5.5 \pm 12.2\%$, and 11.6

±18.4%, respectively. The PVD at the postoperative and 3-month follow-ups had significantly decreased compared with preoperative measurements, but it significantly increased at the 3-month follow-up compared with that immediately post operatively. At 3 month follow up, patient reported outcomes of feelings of heaviness and fatigue of the affected limb was alleviated, however feelings of stiffness, tenderness, and tightness had worsened. There were no significant differences in pain, numbness and weakness reported. The authors concluded that liposuction has a positive effect on treating cancer related LE of the lower extremity. This study is limited by the retrospective single-arm design, no comparison group and the short follow up period.

A 2020 Hayes health technology assessment, updated in 2022, reported on the use of liposuction plus compression therapy for the reductive surgical treatment of lymphedema of moderate-to-severe, nonpitting, primary or secondary lymphedema of the upper and lower extremities (UEL or LEL) in adult patients, as well as adult patients with head and neck cancer treatment-related lymphedema. The evidence included studies that reported on the following outcome measures: the efficacy of lymphatic function, limb size and volume reduction, changes in annual skin infections, changes in shoulder joint range of motion as well as patient reported changes. An overall low-quality body of evidence suggests that liposuction plus controlled congestive therapy (CCT) or complex decongestive therapy (CDT) is associated with greater limb size reduction, lower risk of infection, and improved patient-reported outcomes compared with CCT or CDT alone in patients with UEL or LEL that had not responded adequately to conservative therapies. The overall conclusion of this report is that the liposuction plus compression therapy for the reductive surgical treatment of lymphedema has potential but unproven benefit.

In 2019a, Forte et al. conducted a comprehensive systematic review of the results of 13 studies that reported on the outcomes of lipoaspiration followed by controlled compression therapy, as well as the differences in the outcomes in patients treated with compression therapy only, for the treatment of LE of the upper extremity. Ten studies reported outcomes of patients treated with lipoaspiration followed by compressive therapy, and three studies compared this procedure with patients that had only compressive therapy. The majority of patients were at Stage II or Stage III disease. The results showed that all studies showed a potential benefit in volume reduction in patients with chronic lymphedema up to 5 years post-operatively. Two studies showed a decrease in infections and cellulitis. In the 3 studies that compared liposuction with compression to compression alone, the results showed a statistically significant difference in volume reduction at 12 month follow up, with the postoperative reduction for patients with lipoaspiration and controlled compressive therapy 103%, 115%, and 113%, compared to the group treated with controlled compressive therapy alone, which was only were 50%, 54%, and 47%. No studies showed major surgical complications. The authors concluded that lipoaspiration is better suited in later stages of disease (Stage II and III) when controlled compression therapy alone was ineffective. This study is limited by the heterogeneity between studies regarding the measurement tool used, the follow-up of results, and the protocol established.

Forte et al. (2019b) conducted a systematic review of the results of eight studies (case series) that reported on the outcomes of liposuction for the treatment of LE of the lower extremities after compression therapy. A total of 191 patients with primary or secondary LE, most Stage II or III were included. The results showed that all studies reported volume reduction following lipoaspiration. One study reported a difference in volume reduction depending on the cause of LE and showed at 24 months follow up a reduction of 79% in patients with primary LE, and a volume reduction of 101% was found in patients with secondary LE. All studies reported improvement in function, quality of life and decreased infections. The authors concluded that lipoaspiration followed by controlled compression therapy has the potential to improve LE for patients in Stage II or Stage III disease when controlled compression therapy was ineffective. This study is limited by the lack of a comparison group and heterogeneity between studies regarding the measurement tool used, the follow-up of results, and the protocol established.

Microsurgical Procedures

In a 2023 systematic review and meta-analysis, Meuli et al. reported on the outcomes of the two most common microsurgical treatments for lymphedema. One hundred and fifty three articles, comprised of 6496 patients that documented outcomes following lymphovenous anastomosis (LVA) and vascularized lymph node transfers (VLNTs) in adult patients were included. The most frequently reported outcomes were reductions in circumference and volume and the number of skin infections per year. The results showed that among the 29 studies (1,002 patients) that reported reduced circumference, 20 investigated VLNT, 8 LVA and one investigated a combination of both and showed a 36% reduction. Regarding volume change, 12 studies (587 patients) provided sufficient data and 5 of these 12 studies investigated LVA, 6 investigated VLNT, and 1 investigated a combination of both techniques and showed an overall reduction in excess volume -32.7%. Regarding skin infections, 8 studies contained sufficient data and five out of these eight studies investigated VLNT and three investigated LVA. The overall change

in the number of cutaneous infections episode per year for the 248 patients included was -1.9. The authors concluded that LVA and VLT are effective in the treatment for reducing severity of lymphedema. This review is limited by a lack of randomized controlled trials and heterogeneity of results reporting.

Lymphaticovenous Anastomosis (LVA)/Lymphovenous Bypass

Gupta et al. (2021) conducted a systematic review to analyze the outcomes of LVA for primary or secondary upper extremity (UE) lymphedema in various stages. Sixteen studies comprising 349 patients and 244 upper limbs were included. The authors reported on post operative limb circumference/volume reduction and differential, and patient reported improvements in quality of life and symptoms. Studies on filariasis-related lymphedema were excluded. The results showed, among 14 studies that reported on objective improvements, 11 stratified outcomes by UE, and improvements were seen in more than 90% of the patients. Seven studies reported on the results based on the Campisi stage of lymphedema, and 2 reported LVA resulted in better outcomes when done in the earlier stages. The authors concluded that LVA is a safe and effective emerging treatment for UE lymphedema refractory to decompressive treatment, and large controlled studies are required to validate these findings which are limited by lack of comparison to contemporary comparison groups undergoing a different intervention.

A 2020 Hayes health technology assessment, updated in 2022, regarding lymphovenous anastomosis for the treatment of primary and secondary lymphedema that has not responded adequately to conservative therapies, focused on the effectiveness on lymphatic function, limb size reduction and subjective changes such as decreased infections and changes in the use of compression garments. Based on a moderate sized body of low-quality evidence, it was concluded that LVA appears to be safe with a low risk of complications. There was an overall positive impact on baseline limb circumference, excess volume and patient reported outcomes such as the use of compression garments and infections. There is insufficient evidence to come to a conclusion regarding the efficacy compared to other surgical procedures or non-surgical procedures. This suggests the potential benefit of LVA, and prospective comparative or randomized controlled trials are warranted. The report overall conclusion is that this technique has potential but unproven benefit.

Vascularized Lymph Node Transfer (VLNT)

VLNT is the free transfer of lymph nodes from a donor site into a lymphedematous limb to reconstruct physiological lymphatic return. Donor sites are either from the peripheral regional lymph node basin, or from within the peritoneal cavity. While precise mechanisms are unknown, VLNT is thought to promote the formation of lymphatic vessels from pre-existing lymphatic vessels and wick lymphatic fluid for transport into proximal lymphatic channels, or act as pumps to push lymphatic fluid into the venous circulation.

Li et al. (2021) completed a systematic literature review and meta-analysis on intra-abdominal vascularized lymph node transfer for the treatment of LE. Primary outcomes were circumference/volume reduction, episodes of cellulitis reduction and lymph flow assessment. Secondary outcomes included donor and recipient site complications. Twenty-one studies (one non-randomized controlled trial, 3 retrospective cohort studies, 5 prospective case series, and 12 retrospective case series) with omental/gastroepiploic, jejunal, ileocecal, and appendicular donor sites totaling 594 patients met the inclusion criteria. The results showed a mean reduction in circumference and volume rate ranged from 0.38% to 70.8%. Significant reduction in infectious episodes was reported in 10 studies. The pooled donor-site complication rate was 1.4%, and the pooled recipient-site complication rate was 3.2%. No donor site lymph dysfunction was reported. The authors concluded that low quality evidence suggests there is improvement in lymphedema following intra-abdominal VLNT. However, they also note that these results were of low quality with great heterogeneity across almost all data. Further research with high quality randomized trials are needed to confirm these findings.

In a 2021 systematic review and meta-analysis, Ward et al. evaluated the effectiveness of VLNT in reducing UE and LE volume, and cellulitis episodes in patients with cancer treatment related lymphedema (CTRL). Thirty-one studies totaling 581 patients in which VLNT was the sole therapeutic procedure for CTRL, and reported limb volume, frequency of infection episodes and/or lymphedema specific quality-of-life data, were included. The results showed for the UE, after VLNT the pooled circumferential reduction rates (CRRs) were 42.7% above elbow, and 34.1% below elbow. For the LE, there was a CCR of 46.8% above knee and 54.6% below knee. In addition, patients experienced approximately 2 fewer cellulitis episodes per year, and had improved lymphoedema-Specific Quality of Life scores. The authors concluded that VLNT reduces limb volume and cellulitis and improves quality of life, however most studies analyzed were of low quality, and had limited to small numbers of participants and lacked long term follow up. Furthermore, there was an overall high degree of heterogeneity across all studies as it related to VLNT, and further methodologically rigorous RCTs that include standardization of reporting are required.

A 2020 Hayes health technology assessment (updated in 2022) on lymph tissue transfer for the physiological microsurgical treatment of lymphedema concluded that an overall low quality body of evidence, LNT and VLNT is associated with better limb size reduction and improved patient reported outcomes when compared with other modalities. However, most of the limitations in the evidence are to be expected given the difficulties of conducting RCTs of complex, individualized microsurgical procedures in a highly heterogeneous condition such as lymphedema. Despite the lack of well-designed controlled trials and the weaknesses in the design of the available studies, the current evidence suggests a benefit of LNT in selected patients with lymphedema who have not responded adequately to standard nonsurgical therapies.

Preventive Microsurgical Procedures/Immediate Lymphatic Reconstruction/Lymphatic Microsurgical Preventive Healing Approach (LYMPHA)

Chungsiriwattana et al. (2023) conducted a retrospective data review of 29 patients with melanoma or non-melanoma of the lower extremities that underwent tumor resection with Inguinal lymph node dissection (ILND), and compared long term incidence of lymphedema and oncological outcomes in patients that received lymphaticovenous anastomosis (LVA) at the time of surgery with those that only has surgery. Seven patients underwent immediate LVA at the groin after the ILND (intervention) and the remaining 22 patients underwent resection of the tumor and ILND (control). Outcomes were followed for up to seven years. The results showed 12 cases of lymphedema in the control group and 3 in the LVA group and. The intervention group had a longer median time to lymphedema occurrence than the control group (70 vs. 17 months). Oncological outcomes showed that tumors recurred in 71.4% of patients in the intervention group compared to 31.8% in the control group. Metastases occurred in 5 cases in the intervention group compared to 8 in the control group. The overall median survival time was 44 months. For the intervention group, The intervention group had significantly shorter 2 and 5-year recurrence free survival (RFS) and metastatic free survival (MFS) rates. The median survival time was 26 months and 82 months in the intervention and control groups respectively. The authors concluded that while this procedure appears feasible, there was no statistically significant difference in lymphedema occurrence rates. Furthermore, there are significant concerns that LVA results in systematic spread of the original cancer via the lymphatic pathway. This study is limited by a small number of participants and longer term studies are needed to further evaluate LVA at the groin following ILND for preventing lymphedema of the lower extremities.

Ciudad et al. (2022) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of the current evidence on the use of preventive lymphatic surgery (PLS) for reducing the risk of cancer related lymphedema (CRL). Twenty-four studies comprising 830 LVA procedures on 1,547 patients fulfilled the inclusion criteria. Eighteen studies were observational studies, two were randomized control studies, one was a case series, and three were abstracts or conference presentations. 1,247 patients (80.6%) underwent axillary lymph node dissection (ALND), three-hundred patients (19.4%) underwent ilioinguinal, para-aortic, inguinofemoral lymph node dissection, and/or wide tissue excision of the inguinal region (the type of cancer was highly heterogeneous). The results showed in single-cohort studies, the pooled cumulative rate of upper extremity lymphedema after ALND and PLS was 5.15% with no significant heterogeneity across studies. The pooled cumulative rate of lower extremity lymphedema after oncological surgical treatment and PLS was 6.66%. In double-arm studies for upper limb lymphedema, the pooled analysis showed that PLS reduced the rate of lymphedema after ALND by 18.7 per 100 patients' heterogeneity was substantial and had significant clinical relevance. For lower limb lymphedema the pooled analysis showed that PLS reduced the rate of lymphedema after ilioinguinal lymph node dissection by 30.3 per 100 patients treated with no significant heterogeneity across the studies. The authors concluded that PLS is a promising treatment for the prevention of lymphedema following cancer related lymph node dissection. This systematic review is limited by the highly heterogeneous nature of the included studies. This includes different diagnostic methods, levels and regions of LND, type of LVA, different follow up periods, and patient characteristics such as past radiation therapy. High-quality studies are necessary to determine the outcomes and determine recommendations regarding the use of preventive lymphatic surgery.

In a 2022 single-arm meta-analysis, Chun et al. evaluated the effectiveness of immediate lymphatic reconstruction (ILR) to prevent secondary LE and provide suggestions for using the LYMPHA approach. This meta-analysis included 789 patients across 13 studies, and included upper and lower limb ILR, 10 studies address ILR for breast cancer axillary lymph node dissection (ALND) and 3 addressed malignant melanoma inguinal lymphadenectomy. The results showed for upper extremity LE, the pooled analysis indicated that 2.75% of patients developed LE after ALND with ILR. The average pooled follow up time was 11.6 months and that the incidence of LE started to increase immediately post operatively at 0.92%, 2.19% at 6 months and 2.50% at 12 months, and continued to increase beyond 12 months with the highest incident rate between one and two years. For lower extremity following lymphadenectomy, the results showed 3.6% of patients developed LE after inguinal lymphadenectomy with ILR for malignant melanoma treatment. The authors acknowledge there is a limitation to LYMPHA for lower extremity ILR due to the availability of recipient veins with appropriate size, arc of rotation, and venous valvular

sufficiency. The authors concluded that ILR is a promising technique to mitigate LE. Future research should address standardization of techniques and focusing on specific patient populations and show the short-term efficacy and long-term outcomes. The findings are limited by lack of comparison group.

In a 2022 systematic review and meta-analysis, Hill et al. analyzed the current evidence on the effects of immediate lymphatic reconstruction (ILR) on the incidence of breast cancer-related lymphedema (BCRL) following ALND. Eleven studies totaling 417 breast cancer patients met the inclusion criteria. These studies included one randomized control trial, and ten observational studies. Four of the 11 studies with control groups could be included in a meta-analysis. The results showed 24 of 417 (5.7%) patients developed BCRL following ILR. Meta-analysis revealed that in the ILR group, 6 of 90 patients (6.7%) developed lymphedema, whereas in the control group, 17 of 50 patients (34%) developed lymphedema. Patients in the ILR group had a risk ratio of 0.22 (CI, 0.09 -0.52) of lymphedema with a number needed to treat (NNT) of four. The authors concluded that ILR can prevent BCRL, however the findings are limited by lack of randomization. Randomized control trials are underway to validate these findings. ILR may prove to be a beneficial intervention for improving the quality of life of breast cancer survivors.

In a 2020 ECRI clinical evidence assessment regarding LYMPHA for Preventing Lymphedema, it was concluded that based on low-quality but consistent evidence from one systematic review (SR) with meta-analysis and one nonrandomized comparative study, LYMPHA procedures performed during axillary lymph node dissection (ALND) reduce lymphedema rates compared to ALND alone in patients with breast cancer, and larger, prospective controlled studies are needed to verify these findings and to determine whether it improves outcomes for patients with other cancer types who undergo lymph node dissection.

In a 2019 Cochrane systematic review of randomized controlled trials, Markkula et al. assessed and compared the efficacy of surgical interventions for the prevention of lymphedema in the arm after breast cancer treatment and to assess and compare to the treatment of existing lymphedema. Two studies involving 95 participants reported on the effectiveness of lymphaticovenular anastomosis for the prevention of breast cancer related lymphedema compared to non-surgical management and showed that LVA appears to result in a reduction in the incidence of lymphedema. Both studies had an unclear risk of bias and did not report secondary outcomes. The overall certainty of the evidence was low. One study involving 36 participants reported on the effectiveness of vascularized lymph node transfer for the treatment of existing lymphedema compared to no treatment, and showed that for participants with stage 2 lymphedema, there were reductions in limb volume, pain scores, heaviness sensation and overall function. Overall, the evidence was very low. The authors concluded that there is currently not enough high-quality evidence to support the widespread adoption of lymphaticovenular anastomosis or vascularized lymph node transfer techniques for the prevention or treatment of lymphedema. Well-designed randomized controlled trials that compare the effectiveness of surgical treatments to each other, and against the current gold standard non-surgical treatments are needed.

A 2019 Hayes health technology assessment, updated in 2022 regarding microsurgery for primary prevention of breast cancer related lymphedema, evaluated the LYMPHA procedure for efficacy and safety. It was concluded that based on an overall low-quality body of evidence, the LYMPHA procedure appears to have a positive impact on the prevention of lymphedema resulting in a relatively low incidence of transient or persistent lymphedema. There is a reasonable degree of uncertainty with this finding, given the lack of comparative evidence and retrospective nature of many studies. Future research should focus on long-term safety and efficacy of LYMPHA, determination of which patients are most likely to benefit from this preventative microsurgical approach, experimental study designs that support the earlier trial evidence, the impact of the procedure on additional conventional preventive therapies, patient quality of life, and related adverse events. The report overall conclusion is that this technique has potential but unproven benefit.

Head and Neck Cancer Treatment Related Lymphedema

A 2020 Hayes health technology assessment, updated in 2022, reported on the use of liposuction plus compression therapy for the reductive surgical treatment of lymphedema of moderate-to-severe, nonpitting, primary or secondary lymphedema of the upper and lower extremities (UEL or LEL) in adult patients, as well as adult patients with head and neck cancer treatment-related lymphedema. A very small body of low-quality evidence in patients with head and neck cancer-related lymphedema suggests that liposuction compared with no liposuction does have a positive impact on patient-reported subjective outcomes assessed 6 months after surgery.

Tyker et al. (2019) conducted a systematic review to evaluate all established treatment modalities for lymphedema resulting from head and neck cancer treatment. The authors concluded that the overall poor study quality limited the ability to draw conclusions regarding the benefit of these treatments. All studies had limitations of short follow-up times, lack of blinding and

randomization of participants, heterogenous patient populations, and low numbers of participants. Large multicenter RCTs which directly compare treatment modalities are required.

Alamoudi et al. (2018) conducted a randomized controlled trial at an oncology center in tertiary hospital setting to review the outcomes of submental liposuction in head and neck cancer patients with post treatment lymphedema and to compare the outcomes with a control group. Twenty one patients met the inclusion criteria, however, one died before completing post operative evaluation and was excluded in the final results. All participants had completed radiation therapy and eleven underwent neck dissection and radiation with or without chemotherapy, had been disease free for one year and had no previous facial plastic surgery procedures. Outcome measures included patient reported results in the form of two validated surveys, the Derriford Appearance Scale (DAS59) which objectively measures psychological symptoms associated with aesthetic disfigurement and deformities, and the Modified Blepharoplasty Outcome Evaluation (MBOE) which was modified from the Blepharoplasty Outcome Evaluation to meet the needs of the submental region. The surveys were completed preoperatively, at the time of surgery, and six months or more postoperatively. The results showed for both the DAS59 and MBOE scores, overall there was a statistically significant improvement in the intervention group compared to the control group. The authors concluded that submental liposuction is safe and effective and improves QOL and self-perception in patients with lymphedema secondary to head and neck radiation therapy. This study is limited by the lack of a comparison group to non-surgical therapies as well as a lack of objective assessment by blinded reviewers. Further research comparing liposuction in the submental region to established treatment as well as long term outcomes is required to validate these findings.

Clinical Practice Guidelines

American Association of Plastic Surgeons (AAPS)

In the 2021 consensus guidelines on surgical treatment of lymphedema (Chang et al.) the AAPS concluded the following: LVA and VLNT:

- There is evidence to support that lymphaticovenous anastomosis can be effective in reducing severity of lymphedema (Grade 1C) with a large number of studies demonstrating better outcomes in patients with earlier stage of disease.
- There is evidence to support that vascularized lymph node transfer can be effective in reducing the severity of lymphedema (Grade 1B).
- There is no consensus on which procedure is more effective.
- Neither procedure is a cure for lymphedema.

Prophylactic Lymphovenous Bypass:

- Few studies show this procedure reduces the incidence of lymphedema and further studies with longer follow up are required (Grade 1B).

Liposuction

- Debulking procedures such as liposuction are effective in addressing the nonfluid component such as fat involving lymphedema (Grade 1C).
- There is a role for liposuction combined with physiologic procedures (physical therapy and compression), although the timing of each procedure is currently unresolved (Grade 1C).

This guideline also states that lymphatic procedures are highly complex and surgery should be performed at a high volume center with training in microsurgery to lower the incidence of complications.

Additional consensus recommendations:

- A consensus on staging of lymphedema and preoperative and postoperative evaluations is needed.
- More quantitative methods for measuring fat, fluid, and physiologic measures and immunologic function are required.
- There is a need for better designed studies that include more objective reporting of outcomes and longer follow-up.

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN)

The 2023 NCCN Survivorship guideline contains a section on lymphedema diagnosis and management and lists treatment options as compression garments, manual lymphatic drainage and supervised progressive resistance and range of motion training. It does not mention liposuction or microsurgical treatments. It also states that for select patients, consider referral to a lymphedema surgeon, in consultation with a certified lymphedema therapist and/or physiatrist specializing in lymphedema.

American Venous Forum (AVF), American Vein and Lymphatic Society (AVLS), and the Society for Vascular Medicine (SVM)

In 2022, the AVF created a work group to develop a consensus statement regarding current practices on the diagnosis and treatment of lymphedema (Lurie et al.). The criteria for consensus panel participation included publications and presentations on lymphedema, participation with a specialty society, and significant representation of lymphedema patients in the expert's clinical practice. Participants included academic, private and hospital-based practice settings, as well as an international panel of experts. It was acknowledged that there is high variability in lymphedema care among experts in the field. Consensus was reached for the following treatments:

- The regular use of compression garments reduces progression of lymphedema.
- Sequential pneumatic compression (SPC) should be recommended.
- Manual lymphatic Drainage (MLD) should be a mandatory component of the management of patients with lymphedema.

There was no consensus reached regarding surgical treatments.

International Society of Lymphology (ISL)

In a 2020 consensus document on the diagnosis and treatment of peripheral lymphedema, the ISL states the following:

- No treatment has undergone rigorous, randomized, stratified, long-term, controlled studies, and there remains some degree of uncertainty, ambiguity, and flexibility along with dissatisfaction with current lymphedema diagnosis and management.
- In carefully selected patients following full evaluation, microsurgical and supermicrosurgical procedures are an adjunct to CDT or when CDT has clearly been unsuccessful.
- Liposuction, lymphaticovenous anastomosis and lymph node transfer operations coupled with appropriate lymphedema therapy and compression are effective when used to treat properly selected lymphedema patients and performed by an experienced lymphedema surgeon.
- Debulking is mainly for the treatment of the most severe forms of fibrosclerotic lymphedema (elephantiasis) and in cases of advanced genital lymphedema.

National Lymphedema Network (NLN)

In a 2011 position statement, the NLN states that surgical treatment for lymphedema is associated with significant risks and may result in reduced swelling for an unknown time. CDT usually produces good management in compliant patients, and surgery is rarely a necessary consideration. When it is considered, it should always be done by a specialized surgeon with experience in lymphedema, and in conjunction with CDT. Surgical treatments do not eliminate the need for compression garments and Phase II maintenance.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

In a 2022 interventional procedures guidance document, NICE states that the evidence regarding the safety and efficacy of liposuction for chronic lymphedema is adequate and should only be used for patients with lymphedema that has been non-responsive to conventional treatments. Patient selection must be done by a multidisciplinary team that specializes in managing lymphedema and should only be done in specialist centers with training and expertise in this procedure. The procedure is not curative, and effectiveness relies on lifelong wearing of compression garments.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

This section is to be used for informational purposes only. FDA approval alone is not a basis for coverage.

The FDA has approved a number of devices for use for liposuction. Refer to the following website for more information (use product codes MUU): <http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm>. (Accessed June 19, 2023)

References

Alamoudi U, Taylor B, MacKay C, et al. Submental liposuction for the management of lymphedema following head and neck cancer treatment: a randomized controlled trial. *J Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2018 Mar 26;47(1):22.

American Society of Plastic Surgeons. Lymphedema Treatment Glossary. Available at: <https://www.plasticsurgery.org/reconstructive-procedures/lymphedema-treatment/glossary>. Accessed June 19, 2023.

Bartow MJ, Raggio BS. Liposuction. [Updated 2023 Feb 14]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023 Jan-. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK563135/>.

Chang DW, Dayan J, Greene AK, et al. Surgical treatment of lymphedema: a systematic review and meta-analysis of Controlled Trials. Results of a Consensus Conference. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2021 Apr 1;147(4):975-993.

Chun MJ, Saeg F, Meade A, et al. Immediate lymphatic reconstruction for prevention of secondary lymphedema: A meta-analysis. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg*. 2022 Mar;75(3):1130-1141.

Chungsiriwattana W, Kongkunnvat N, Kamnerdnakta S, et al. Immediate inguinal lymphaticovenous anastomosis following lymphadenectomy in skin cancer of lower extremities. *Asian J Surg*. 2023 Jan;46(1):299-305.

Ciudad P, Escandón JM, Bustos VP, et al. Primary prevention of cancer-related lymphedema using preventive lymphatic surgery: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Indian J Plast Surg*. 2022 Feb 25;55(1):18-25.

Dionyssiou D, Sarafis A, Tsimponis A, et al. Long-term outcomes of lymph node transfer in secondary lymphedema and its correlation with flap characteristics. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2021 Dec 9;13(24):6198.

ECRI Institute. Clinical Evidence Assessment. Lymphatic Microsurgical Preventive Healing Approach (LYMPHA) for Preventing Lymphedema. June 2020.

Executive Committee of the International Society of Lymphology (ISL). The diagnosis and treatment of peripheral lymphedema: 2020 Consensus Document of the International Society of Lymphology. *Lymphology*. 2020;53(1):3-19.

Fallahian F, Tadisina KK, Xu KY. Efficacy of microsurgical treatment of primary lymphedema: a systematic review. *Ann Plast Surg*. 2022 Feb 1;88(2):195-199.

Forte AJ, Huayllani MT, Boczar D, et al. Lipoaspiration and controlled compressive therapy in lymphedema of the upper extremity: A Comprehensive Systematic Review. *Cureus*. 2019a Sep 27;11(9):e5787.

Forte AJ, Huayllani MT, Boczar D, et al. Lipoaspiration for the Treatment of Lower Limb Lymphedema: A Comprehensive Systematic Review. *Cureus*. 2019b Oct 15;11(10):e5913.

Garza R 3rd, Skoracki R, Hock K, et al. A comprehensive overview on the surgical management of secondary lymphedema of the upper and lower extremities related to prior oncologic therapies. *BMC Cancer*. 2017 Jul 5;17(1):468.

Gupta N, Verhey EM, Torres-Guzman RA, et al. Outcomes of lymphovenous anastomosis for upper extremity lymphedema: a systematic review. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 2021 Aug 25;9(8):e3770.

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Assessment. Lymph Tissue Transfer for the Physiological Microsurgical Treatment of Lymphedema. August 2020; Updated September 2022.

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Assessment. Microsurgery for Primary Prevention of Breast Cancer Related Lymphedema. October 2019; Updated November 2022.

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Assessment. Lymphovenous Anastomosis for the Physiological Microsurgical Treatment of Lymphedema. June 2020; Updated June 2022.

Hayes, Inc., Health Technology Assessment. Liposuction for the Reductive Surgical Treatment of Lymphedema. October 2020; Updated December 2022.

Hill WKF, Deban M, Platt A, et al. Immediate lymphatic reconstruction during axillary node dissection for breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 2022 May 9;10(5):e4291.

International Society of Lymphology (ISL). The Diagnosis and Treatment of Peripheral Lymphedema: 2020 Consensus Document. Available at: <https://isl.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2021-09/Consensus%20Document-SM.pdf>. Accessed June 19, 2023.

Kareh AM, Xu KY. Surgical Management of Lymphedema. *Mo Med*. 2020 Mar-Apr;117(2):143-148.

Li Y, Dong R, Li Z, et al. Intra-abdominal vascularized lymph node transfer for treatment of lymphedema: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Microsurgery*. 2021 Nov;41(8):802-815.

Lurie F, Malgor RD, Carman T, et al. The American Venous Forum, American Vein and Lymphatic Society and the Society for Vascular Medicine expert opinion consensus on lymphedema diagnosis and treatment. *Phlebology*. 2022 May;37(4):252-266.

Markkula SP, Leung N, Allen VB, et al. Surgical interventions for the prevention or treatment of lymphoedema after breast cancer treatment. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019 Feb 19;2(2):CD011433.

MedicineNet. Medical Definition of Liposuction. <https://www.medicinenet.com/liposuction/definition.htm>.

Meuli JN, Guiotto M, Elmers J, et al. Outcomes after microsurgical treatment of lymphedema: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Surg*. 2023 May 1;109(5):1360-1372.

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Survivorship. Version 1.2023. March 24, 2023.

National Cancer Institute (NCI). Side Effects of Cancer treatment. Lymphedema. 2019. Available at: https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/treatment/side-effects/lymphedema/lymphedema-hp-pdq#_75. Accessed June 19, 2023.

National Lymphedema Network. Lymphedema. 2022. Available at: <https://lymphnet.org/what-is-lymphedema>. Accessed May 4, 2022.

National Lymphedema Network. Position Paper. The Diagnosis and Treatment of Lymphedema. 2011.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). NICE guidelines [IPG723]. Liposuction for chronic lymphoedema. April 2022.

Tyker A, Franco J, Massa ST, et al. Treatment for lymphedema following head and neck cancer therapy: A systematic review. *Am J Otolaryngol*. 2019 Sep-Oct;40(5):761-769.

Ward J, King I, Monroy-Iglesias M, et al. A meta-analysis of the efficacy of vascularized lymph node transfer in reducing limb volume and cellulitis episodes in patients with cancer treatment-related lymphoedema. *Eur J Cancer*. 2021 Jul;151:233-244.

Xin J, Sun Y, Xia S, et al. Liposuction in cancer-related lower extremity lymphedema: an investigative study on clinical applications. *World J Surg Oncol*. 2022 Jan 5;20(1).

Policy History/Revision Information

Date	Summary of Changes
02/01/2024	<p>Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Updated definition of “Liposuction/Lipectomy” <p>Supporting Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Updated <i>Description of Services</i>, <i>Clinical Evidence</i>, and <i>References</i> sections to reflect the most current informationArchived previous policy version CS355.B

Instructions for Use

This Medical Policy provides assistance in interpreting UnitedHealthcare standard benefit plans. When deciding coverage, the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage must be referenced as the terms of the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage may differ from the standard benefit plan. In the event of a conflict, the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage govern. Before using this policy, please check the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage. UnitedHealthcare reserves the right to modify its Policies and Guidelines as necessary. This Medical Policy is provided for informational purposes. It does not constitute medical advice.

UnitedHealthcare may also use tools developed by third parties, such as the InterQual[®] criteria, to assist us in administering health benefits. The UnitedHealthcare Medical Policies are intended to be used in connection with the independent professional medical judgment of a qualified health care provider and do not constitute the practice of medicine or medical advice.