

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

CLINICAL BENEFIT	<input type="checkbox"/> MINIMIZE SAFETY RISK OR CONCERN. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINIMIZE HARMFUL OR INEFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS. <input type="checkbox"/> ASSURE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF CARE. <input type="checkbox"/> ASSURE APPROPRIATE DURATION OF SERVICE FOR INTERVENTIONS. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ASSURE THAT RECOMMENDED MEDICAL PREREQUISITES HAVE BEEN MET. <input type="checkbox"/> ASSURE APPROPRIATE SITE OF TREATMENT OR SERVICE.
Effective Date:	1/1/2025

[POLICY](#)
[RATIONALE](#)
[DISCLAIMER](#)
[POLICY HISTORY](#)

[PRODUCT VARIATIONS](#)
[DEFINITIONS](#)
[CODING INFORMATION](#)

[DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND](#)
[BENEFIT VARIATIONS](#)
[REFERENCES](#)

I. POLICY

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered **medically necessary** to palliate pain in patients with osteolytic bone metastases who have failed or are poor candidates for standard treatments such as radiation or opioids.

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered **medically necessary** to treat osteoid osteomas that cannot be managed successfully with medical treatment.

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered **medically necessary** to treat localized renal cell carcinoma that is no more than 4 cm in size when either of the following criteria is met:

- To preserve kidney function in patients with significantly impaired renal function (i.e., the patient has one kidney or renal insufficiency defined by a glomerular filtration rate (GFR) of <60mL/min/m²); **AND**
- The standard surgical approach (i.e. resection of renal tissue) is likely to substantially worsen kidney function; **OR**
- The patient is not considered a surgical candidate.

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered **medically necessary** to treat an isolated peripheral non-small cell lung cancer lesion that is no more than 3 cm in size when the following criteria are met:

- Surgical resection or radiation treatment with curative intent is considered appropriate based on stage of disease, however, medical co-morbidity renders the individual unfit for those interventions; **AND**
- The tumor is located at least 1 cm from the trachea, main bronchi, esophagus, aorta, aortic arch branches, pulmonary artery and the heart.

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered **medically necessary** to treat malignant nonpulmonary tumor(s) metastatic to the lung that are no more than 3 cm in size when the following criteria are met:

- In order to preserve lung function when surgical resection or radiation treatment is likely to substantially worsen pulmonary status; OR
- The patient is not considered a surgical candidate; AND
- There is no evidence of extrapulmonary metastases; AND the tumor is located at least 1 cm from the trachea, main bronchi, esophagus, aorta, aortic arch branches, pulmonary artery and the heart.

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of differentiated thyroid carcinoma (i.e. papillary, follicular or Hürthle) for metastatic disease OR locoregional recurrence in patients with limited burden nodal disease.

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of distant metastases in recurrent or persistent medullary thyroid carcinoma.

(See the Policy Guidelines section for additional criteria.)

Radiofrequency ablation is considered **investigational** as a technique for ablation of:

- Breast tumors;
- Lung cancer not meeting the criteria above;
- Renal cell cancer not meeting the criteria above;
- Osteoid osteomas that can be managed with medical treatment;
- Painful bony metastases as initial treatment;
- Thyroid carcinoma or thyroid tumors not meeting criteria above;
- All other tumors outside the liver including, but not limited to, the head and neck, adrenal gland, ovary, and pelvic/abdominal metastases of unspecified origin

There is insufficient evidence to support a general conclusion concerning the health outcomes or benefits associated with this procedure for these indications.

POLICY GUIDELINES

Radiofrequency Ablation (RFA) of the lung

The following are additional criteria that have been developed by clinical judgment or consensus and existing guidelines for the use of RFA in metastatic tumors to the lung and include:

- No more than 3 tumors per lung should be ablated;
- Tumors should be amenable to complete ablation; AND
- Twelve months should elapse before a repeat ablation is considered.

Cross-reference:

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

MP 1.055 Radiofrequency Ablation of Primary or Metastatic Liver Tumors
MP 1.088 Cryoablation of Tumors Located in the Kidney, Lung, Breast, Pancreas, or Bone
MP 7.027 Laparoscopic, Percutaneous, and Transcervical Techniques for Uterine Fibroid Myolysis

II. Product Variations

[Top](#)

This policy is only applicable to certain programs and products administered by Capital Blue Cross please see additional information below, and subject to benefit variations as discussed in Section VI below.

FEP PPO - Refer to FEP Medical Policy Manual. The FEP Medical Policy Manual can be found at: <https://www.fepblue.org/benefit-plans/medical-policies-and-utilization-management-guidelines/medical-policies>.

III. DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND

[Top](#)

Radiofrequency Ablation

RFA was initially developed to treat inoperable tumors of the liver (see evidence review MP 1.055). Recently, studies have reported on the use of RFA to treat other tumors. For some of these, RFA is being investigated as an alternative to surgery for operable tumors. Well-established local or systemic treatment alternatives are available for each of these malignancies. The hypothesized advantages of RFA for these cancers include improved local control and those common to any minimally invasive procedure (e.g., preserving normal organ tissue, decreasing morbidity, decreasing length of hospitalization).

Goals of RFA may include (1) controlling local tumor growth and preventing recurrence; (2) palliating symptoms; and (3) extending survival duration for patients with certain tumors. The effective volume of RFA depends on the frequency and duration of applied current, local tissue characteristics, and probe configuration (e.g., single vs. multiple tips). RFA can be performed as an open surgical procedure, laparoscopically or percutaneously, with ultrasound or computed tomography guidance.

Potential complications associated with RFA include those caused by heat damage to normal tissue adjacent to the tumor (e.g., intestinal damage during RFA of kidney), structural damage along the probe track (e.g., pneumothorax as a consequence of procedures on the lung), and secondary tumors (if cells seed during probe removal).

Regulatory Status

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued a statement in September 2008, concerning the regulatory status of RFA. The FDA has cleared RFA devices for the general indication of soft tissue cutting, coagulation, and ablation by thermal coagulation necrosis. Under this general indication, RFA can be used to ablate tumors, including lung tumors. Some

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

RFA devices have been cleared for additional specific treatment indications, including partial or complete ablation of nonresectable liver lesions and palliation of pain associated with metastatic lesions involving bone. The FDA has not cleared any RFA devices for the specific treatment indication of partial or complete ablation of lung tumors, citing lack of sufficient clinical data to establish safety and effectiveness for this purpose. The FDA has received reports of death and serious injuries associated with the use of RFA devices in the treatment of lung tumors.

IV. RATIONALE

[Top](#)

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Bone Tumors

For individuals who have painful osteolytic bone metastases who have failed or are poor candidates for standard treatments who receive RFA, the evidence includes cohort study and case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, QOL, medication use, and treatment-related morbidity. A prospective cohort study and case series have shown clinically significant pain relief (defined as a decrease of 2 units from baseline on the Brief Pain Inventory scale) or reduction in opioid use following treatment of painful osteolytic metastases. A multicenter, prospective study reported significant reductions in pain through the 6-month follow-up period, with 59% of patients achieving immediate improvement in pain within 3 days of RFA. The population is comprised of patients with few or no treatment options, for whom short-term pain relief is an appropriate clinical outcome. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have painful osteoid osteomas who receive RFA, the evidence includes numerous observational studies and a systematic review of these studies. The relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, quality of life, medication use, and treatment-related morbidity. In a systematic review of thermal ablation techniques, clinical success (pain-free) was achieved in 94% to 98% of patients. Most patients (89%-96%) remained pain-free when assessed during longer term follow-up. Although no randomized trials of RFA for osteoid osteomas have been performed, the uncontrolled studies have demonstrated RFA can provide adequate symptom relief with minimal complications, for a population for whom short-term symptom relief and avoidance of invasive procedures are appropriate clinical outcomes. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Localized Renal Cell Carcinoma

For individuals who have localized renal cell carcinoma that is no more than 4 cm in size who receive RFA, the evidence includes a randomized controlled trial (RCT), numerous observational studies, and systematic reviews of these studies. The relevant outcomes are overall survival, change in disease status, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. A recent meta-analysis that included only an RCT and cohort studies found that RFA was as effective as nephrectomy for small renal tumors, with a reduction in complications. Another recent meta-analysis found that partial nephrectomy was superior to ablative techniques (the

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

study included RFA, but also cryoablation and microwave ablation) in overall mortality and local recurrence but not in cancer-specific mortality. It also found fewer complications and improved renal function with ablation. A meta-analysis from 2022 found that PN was superior to ablation (RFA, cryoablation, and microwave ablation) in local recurrence. Overall complications, decline in renal function, and cancer-specific mortality rates did not differ between ablation and nephrectomy. Although inconsistent, the evidence does suggest that, for small renal tumors, RFA may result in a similar rate of disease progression with a lower complication rate than nephrectomy. However, comparative trials are needed to determine with greater certainty the effects of these treatments in the same patient population. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Inoperable Primary Pulmonary and Non-pulmonary Tumors

For individuals who have inoperable primary pulmonary tumors or non-pulmonary tumors metastatic to the lung who receive RFA, the evidence includes prospective observational studies and systematic reviews of these studies. The relevant outcomes are overall survival, change in disease status, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. A multicenter study found that, for tumors less than 3.5 cm in size, RFA can lead to a complete response in as many as 88% of patients for at least 1 year. Two-year survival rates have been reported to range from 41% to 75% in case series, with 5-year survival rates of 20% to 27%. In general, the evidence suggests that RFA results in adequate survival and tumor control in patients who are not surgical candidates, with low morbidity rates. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Breast Tumors

For individuals who have breast tumors who receive RFA, the evidence includes observational studies and systematic reviews of these studies. The relevant outcomes are change in disease status, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. Evidence has reported varied and incomplete ablation rates with concerns about post-ablation tumor cell viability. Long-term improvements in health outcomes have not been demonstrated. Additionally, available studies do not permit comparisons with conventional breast-conserving procedures. Further studies, with long-term follow-up, should focus on whether RFA of the breast for small tumors can provide local control and survival rates compared with conventional breast-conserving treatment. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Benign Thyroid Tumors

For individuals who have benign thyroid tumors who receive RFA, the evidence includes RCTs, prospective studies, case series, and systematic reviews of these studies. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, QOL, medication use, and treatment-related morbidity. Systematic reviews have demonstrated that RFA results in a significant reduction in thyroid nodule size with a 2020 review showing that these changes remain durable through at least 36 months. Complication rates are generally low but include voice changes. The data are limited by significant heterogeneity in meta-analyses, a lack of generalizability to populations outside Republic of Korea and Italy, and a lack of comparators more relevant to practice in the United

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

States. Further studies comparing RFA to percutaneous ethanol injection or surgery would be more informative in determining the potential utility of RFA in patients with symptomatic or large benign thyroid tumors as these are the recommended treatment options per the American Thyroid Association. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Thyroid Carcinoma

Thyroid carcinoma is uncommon with mortality rates being generally low. NCCN Thyroid Carcinoma guidelines list RFA as a potential treatment for select patients. The American Thyroid Association Management Guidelines (2015) for Adult Patients with Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer notes that differentiated thyroid cancer, comprising the vast majority of all thyroid cancers, is becoming increasingly prevalent. Guidelines include radiofrequency ablation as one of the localized thermal ablative treatments as potentially beneficial in select patients with metastatic differentiated thyroid cancer.

Miscellaneous Solid Tumors

For individuals who have miscellaneous tumors (e.g., head and neck, pancreas) who receive RFA, the evidence includes a few case series, prospective studies, and retrospective comparative studies. The relevant outcomes are change in disease status, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. There is a limited evidence base for each tumor type. Reporting on outcomes or comparisons with other treatments is limited. These studies do not permit conclusions on the health benefits of RFA. The evidence is insufficient to determine the impact of technology on health outcomes.

V. DEFINITIONS

[Top](#)

ADJUVANT refers to a substance, especially a drug, added to a prescription to assist in the action of the main ingredient.

ALKYLATING AGENT is any substance that contains an alkyl radical and is capable of replacing a free hydrogen atom in an organic compound. This type of chemical reaction results in interference with mitosis and cell division, especially in the proliferating tissue. The agents are especially helpful in the treatment of cancer.

VI. BENEFIT VARIATIONS

[Top](#)

The existence of this medical policy does not mean that this service is a covered benefit under the member's health benefit plan. Benefit determinations should be based in all cases on the applicable health benefit plan language. Medical policies do not constitute a description of benefits. A member's health benefit plan governs which services are covered, which are excluded, which are subject to benefit limits, and which require preauthorization. There are different benefit plan designs in each product administered by Capital Blue Cross. Members and providers should consult the member's health benefit plan for information or contact Capital Blue Cross for benefit information.

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

VII. DISCLAIMER

[Top](#)

Capital Blue Cross' medical policies are developed to assist in administering a member's benefits, do not constitute medical advice and are subject to change. Treating providers are solely responsible for medical advice and treatment of members. Members should discuss any medical policy related to their coverage or condition with their provider and consult their benefit information to determine if the service is covered. If there is a discrepancy between this medical policy and a member's benefit information, the benefit information will govern. If a provider or a member has a question concerning the application of this medical policy to a specific member's plan of benefits, please contact Capital Blue Cross' Provider Services or Member Services. Capital Blue Cross considers the information contained in this medical policy to be proprietary and it may only be disseminated as permitted by law.

VIII. CODING INFORMATION

[Top](#)

Note: This list of codes may not be all-inclusive, and codes are subject to change at any time. The identification of a code in this section does not denote coverage as coverage is determined by the terms of member benefit information. In addition, not all covered services are eligible for separate reimbursement.

Investigational; therefore, not covered:

Procedure Codes							
41530							

Covered when medically necessary:

Procedure Codes							
20982	32998	50542	50592	60660	60661		

ICD-10- CM Diagnosis Codes							
C34.01	C34.02	C34.11	C34.12	C34.2	C34.31	C34.32	C64.1
C64.2	C73	C78.01	C78.02	C79.51	D16.01	D16.02	D16.11
D16.12	D16.21	D16.22	D16.31	D16.32	D16.4	D16.5	D16.6
D16.7	D16.8						

IX. REFERENCES

[Top](#)

1. Levy J, Hopkins T, Morris J, et al. Radiofrequency Ablation for the Palliative Treatment of Bone Metastases: Outcomes from the Multicenter OsteoCool Tumor Ablation Post-

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

- Market Study (OPuS One Study) in 100 Patients. J Vasc Interv Radiol. Nov 2020; 31(11): 1745-1752. PMID 33129427*
- Goetz MP, Callstrom MR, Charboneau JW, et al. Percutaneous image-guided radiofrequency ablation of painful metastases involving bone: a multicenter study. *J Clin Oncol. Jan 15 2004; 22(2): 300-6. PMID 14722039*
 - Gronemeyer DH, Schirp S, Gevarguez A. Image-guided radiofrequency ablation of spinal tumors: preliminary experience with an expandable array electrode. *Cancer J. Jan-Feb 2002; 8(1): 33-9. PMID 11898806*
 - Kojima H, Tanigawa N, Kariya S, et al. Clinical assessment of percutaneous radiofrequency ablation for painful metastatic bone tumors. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol. Nov-Dec 2006; 29(6): 1022-6. PMID 16988875*
 - Tordjman M, Perronne L, Madelin G, et al. CT-guided radiofrequency ablation for osteoid osteomas: a systematic review. *Eur Radiol. Nov 2020; 30(11): 5952-5963. PMID 32518986*
 - Lanza E, Thouvenin Y, Viala P, et al. Osteoid osteoma treated by percutaneous thermal ablation: when do we fail? A systematic review and guidelines for future reporting. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol. Dec 2014; 37(6): 1530-9. PMID 24337349*
 - Albisinni U, Facchini G, Spinnato P, et al. Spinal osteoid osteoma: efficacy and safety of radiofrequency ablation. *Skeletal Radiol. Aug 2017; 46(8): 1087-1094. PMID 28497160*
 - Lassalle L, Campagna R, Corcos G, et al. Therapeutic outcome of CT-guided radiofrequency ablation in patients with osteoid osteoma. *Skeletal Radiol. Jul 2017; 46(7): 949-956. PMID 28429047*
 - Rimondi E, Mavrogenis AF, Rossi G, et al. Radiofrequency ablation for non-spinal osteoid osteomas in 557 patients. *Eur Radiol. Jan 2012; 22(1): 181-8. PMID 21842430*
 - Sahin C, Oc Y, Ediz N, et al. The safety and the efficacy of computed tomography guided percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of osteoid osteoma. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc. Sep 2019; 53(5): 360-365. PMID 31371131*
 - Knudsen M, Riishede A, Lucke A, et al. Computed tomography-guided radiofrequency ablation is a safe and effective treatment of osteoid osteoma located outside the spine. *Dan Med J. May 2015; 62(5). PMID 26050823*
 - Rosenthal DI, Hornicek FJ, Torriani M, et al. Osteoid osteoma: percutaneous treatment with radiofrequency energy. *Radiology. Oct 2003; 229(1): 171-5. PMID 12944597*
 - Uhlig J, Strauss A, Rucker G, et al. Partial nephrectomy versus ablative techniques for small renal masses: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol. Mar 2019; 29(3): 1293-1307. PMID 30255245*
 - Katsanos K, Mailli L, Krokidis M, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of thermal ablation versus surgical nephrectomy for small renal tumours. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol. Apr 2014; 37(2): 427-37. PMID 24482030*
 - El Dib R, Touma NJ, Kapoor A. Cryoablation vs radiofrequency ablation for the treatment of renal cell carcinoma: a meta-analysis of case series studies. *BJU Int. Aug 2012; 110(4): 510-6. PMID 22304329*
 - Liu SY, Chu CM, Kong AP, et al. Radiofrequency ablation compared with laparoscopic adrenalectomy for aldosterone-producing adenoma. *Br J Surg. Oct 2016; 103(11): 1476-86. PMID 27511444*

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

17. Marshall HR, Shakeri S, Hosseiny M, et al. Long-Term Survival after Percutaneous Radiofrequency Ablation of Pathologically Proven Renal Cell Carcinoma in 100 Patients. *J Vasc Interv Radiol.* Jan 2020; 31(1): 15-24. PMID 31767409
18. Andrews JR, Atwell T, Schmit G, et al. Oncologic Outcomes Following Partial Nephrectomy and Percutaneous Ablation for cT1 Renal Masses. *Eur Urol.* Aug 2019; 76(2): 244-251. PMID 31060824
19. Park BK, Gong IH, Kang MY, et al. RFA versus robotic partial nephrectomy for T1a renal cell carcinoma: a propensity score-matched comparison of mid-term outcome. *Eur Radiol.* Jul 2018; 28(7): 2979-2985. PMID 29426988
20. Dai Y, Covarrubias D, Uppot R, et al. Image-Guided Percutaneous Radiofrequency Ablation of Central Renal Cell Carcinoma: Assessment of Clinical Efficacy and Safety in 31 Tumors. *J Vasc Interv Radiol.* Dec 2017; 28(12): 1643-1650. PMID 28673657
21. Dvorak P, Hoffmann P, Brodak M, et al. Percutaneous radiofrequency and microwave ablation in the treatment of renal tumors - 10 years of experience. *Wideochir Inne Tech Maloinwazyjne.* Dec 2017; 12(4): 394-402. PMID 29362655
22. Pantelidou M, Challacombe B, McGrath A, et al. Percutaneous Radiofrequency Ablation Versus Robotic-Assisted Partial Nephrectomy for the Treatment of Small Renal Cell Carcinoma. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol.* Nov 2016; 39(11): 1595-1603. PMID 27435582
23. Iannuccilli JD, Dupuy DE, Beland MD, et al. Effectiveness and safety of computed tomography-guided radiofrequency ablation of renal cancer: a 14-year single institution experience in 203 patients. *Eur Radiol.* Jun 2016; 26(6): 1656-64. PMID 26373755
24. Schlijper RC, Grutters JP, Houben R, et al. What to choose as radical local treatment for lung metastases from colo-rectal cancer: surgery or radiofrequency ablation?. *Cancer Treat Rev.* Feb 2014; 40(1): 60-7. PMID 23768754
25. Ratko TA, Vats V, Brock J, et al. Local Nonsurgical Therapies for Stage I and Symptomatic Obstructive Non- Small-Cell Lung Cancer (Comparative Effectiveness Review No. 112). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2013.
26. Bilal H, Mahmood S, Rajashanker B, et al. Is radiofrequency ablation more effective than stereotactic ablative radiotherapy in patients with early stage medically inoperable non-small cell lung cancer?. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg.* Aug 2012; 15(2): 258-65. PMID 22581864
27. Chan VO, McDermott S, Malone DE, et al. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of lung tumors: evaluation of the literature using evidence-based techniques. *J Thorac Imaging.* Feb 2011; 26(1): 18-26. PMID 20829720
28. Huang L, Han Y, Zhao J, et al. Is radiofrequency thermal ablation a safe and effective procedure in the treatment of pulmonary malignancies?. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* Mar 2011; 39(3): 348-51. PMID 20663679
29. Zemlyak A, Moore WH, Bilfinger TV. Comparison of survival after sublobar resections and ablative therapies for stage I non-small cell lung cancer. *J Am Coll Surg.* Jul 2010; 211(1): 68-72. PMID 20610251
30. Lencioni R, Crocetti L, Cioni R, et al. Response to radiofrequency ablation of pulmonary tumours: a prospective, intention-to-treat, multicentre clinical trial (the RAPTURE study). *Lancet Oncol.* Jul 2008; 9(7): 621-8. PMID 18565793

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

31. Zhu JC, Yan TD, Glenn D, et al. Radiofrequency ablation of lung tumors: feasibility and safety. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Apr 2009; 87(4): 1023-8. PMID 19324122
32. Pennathur A, Abbas G, Gooding WE, et al. Image-guided radiofrequency ablation of lung neoplasm in 100 consecutive patients by a thoracic surgical service. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Nov 2009; 88(5): 1601-6; discussion 1607-8. PMID 19853119
33. Xia LY, Hu QL, Xu WY. Efficacy and Safety of Radiofrequency Ablation for Breast Cancer Smaller Than 2 cm: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Oncol.* 2021; 11: 651646. PMID 34012918
34. Peek MCL, Ahmed M, Napoli A, et al. Minimally invasive ablative techniques in the treatment of breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Hyperthermia.* Mar 2017; 33(2): 191-202. PMID 27575566
35. Zhao Z, Wu F. Minimally-invasive thermal ablation of early-stage breast cancer: a systemic review. *Eur J Surg Oncol.* Dec 2010; 36(12): 1149-55. PMID 20889281
36. Soukup B, Bismohun S, Reefy S, et al. The evolving role of radiofrequency ablation therapy of breast lesions. *Anticancer Res.* Sep 2010; 30(9): 3693-7. PMID 20944155
37. Ito T, Oura S, Nagamine S, et al. Radiofrequency Ablation of Breast Cancer: A Retrospective Study. *Clin Breast Cancer.* Aug 2018; 18(4): e495-e500. PMID 29079443
38. Li P, Xiao-Yin T, Cui D, et al. Evaluation of the safety and efficacy of percutaneous radiofrequency ablation for treating multiple breast fibroadenoma. *J Cancer Res Ther.* Dec 2016; 12(Supplement): C138-C142. PMID 28230006
39. Wilson M, Korourian S, Boneti C, et al. Long-term results of excision followed by radiofrequency ablation as the sole means of local therapy for breast cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol.* Oct 2012; 19(10): 3192-8. PMID 22911363
40. Kinoshita T, Iwamoto E, Tsuda H, et al. Radiofrequency ablation as local therapy for early breast carcinomas. *Breast Cancer.* Jan 2011; 18(1): 10-7. PMID 20072824
41. Imoto S, Wada N, Sakemura N, et al. Feasibility study on radiofrequency ablation followed by partial mastectomy for stage I breast cancer patients. *Breast.* Apr 2009; 18(2): 130-4. PMID 19324550
42. Garbay JR, Mathieu MC, Lamuraglia M, et al. Radiofrequency thermal ablation of breast cancer local recurrence: a phase II clinical trial. *Ann Surg Oncol.* Nov 2008; 15(11): 3222-6. PMID 18709415
43. Haugen BR, Alexander EK, Bible KC, et al. 2015 American Thyroid Association Management Guidelines for Adult Patients with Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer: The American Thyroid Association Guidelines Task Force on Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer. *Thyroid.* Jan 2016; 26(1): 1-133. PMID 26462967
44. Cho SJ, Baek JH, Chung SR, et al. Long-Term Results of Thermal Ablation of Benign Thyroid Nodules: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Endocrinol Metab (Seoul).* Jun 2020; 35(2): 339-350. PMID 32615718
45. Chen F, Tian G, Kong D, et al. Radiofrequency ablation for treatment of benign thyroid nodules: A PRISMA-compliant systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes. *Medicine (Baltimore).* Aug 2016; 95(34): e4659. PMID 27559968

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

46. Fuller CW, Nguyen SA, Lohia S, et al. Radiofrequency ablation for treatment of benign thyroid nodules: systematic review. *Laryngoscope*. Jan 2014; 124(1): 346-53. PMID 24122763
47. Kim JH, Yoo WS, Park YJ, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Radiofrequency Ablation for Treatment of Locally Recurrent Thyroid Cancers Smaller than 2 cm. *Radiology*. Sep 2015; 276(3): 909-18. PMID 25848897
48. Owen RP, Khan SA, Negassa A, et al. Radiofrequency ablation of advanced head and neck cancer. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. May 2011; 137(5): 493-8. PMID 21576561
49. Brook AL, Gold MM, Miller TS, et al. CT-guided radiofrequency ablation in the palliative treatment of recurrent advanced head and neck malignancies. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. May 2008; 19(5): 725-35. PMID 18440462
50. Owen RP, Silver CE, Ravikumar TS, et al. Techniques for radiofrequency ablation of head and neck tumors. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Jan 2004; 130(1): 52-6. PMID 14732768
51. Rey VE, Labrador R, Falcon M, et al. Transvaginal Radiofrequency Ablation of Myomas: Technique, Outcomes, and Complications. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A*. Jan 2019; 29(1): 24-28. PMID 30198831
52. Yin G, Chen M, Yang S, et al. Treatment of uterine myomas by radiofrequency thermal ablation: a 10-year retrospective cohort study. *Reprod Sci*. May 2015; 22(5): 609-14. PMID 25355802
53. Liu B, Mo C, Wang W, et al. Treatment outcomes of percutaneous radiofrequency ablation versus adrenalectomy for adrenal metastases: a retrospective comparative study. *J Endocrinol Invest*. Sep 2020; 43(9): 1249-1257. PMID 32166699
54. Yang MH, Tyan YS, Huang YH, et al. Comparison of radiofrequency ablation versus laparoscopic adrenalectomy for benign aldosterone-producing adenoma. *Radiol Med*. Oct 2016; 121(10): 811-9. PMID 27300650
55. Hasegawa T, Takaki H, Kodama H, et al. Three-year Survival Rate after Radiofrequency Ablation for Surgically Resectable Colorectal Lung Metastases: A Prospective Multicenter Study. *Radiology*. Mar 2020; 294(3): 686-695. PMID 31934829
56. Locklin JK, Mannes A, Berger A, et al. Palliation of soft tissue cancer pain with radiofrequency ablation. *J Support Oncol*. Sep-Oct 2004; 2(5): 439-45. PMID 15524075
57. Rosenthal DI. Radiofrequency treatment. *Orthop Clin North Am*. Jul 2006; 37(3): 475-84, viii. PMID 16846772
58. Liapi E, Geschwind JF. Transcatheter and ablative therapeutic approaches for solid malignancies. *J Clin Oncol*. Mar 10 2007; 25(8): 978-86. PMID 17350947
59. Spiliotis JD, Datsis AC, Michalopoulos NV, et al. Radiofrequency ablation combined with palliative surgery may prolong survival of patients with advanced cancer of the pancreas. *Langenbecks Arch Surg*. Jan 2007; 392(1): 55-60. PMID 17089173
60. Zou YP, Li WM, Zheng F, et al. Intraoperative radiofrequency ablation combined with 125 iodine seed implantation for unresectable pancreatic cancer. *World J Gastroenterol*. Oct 28 2010; 16(40): 5104-10. PMID 20976848

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

61. Cantore M, Girelli R, Mambrini A, et al. Combined modality treatment for patients with locally advanced pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Br J Surg*. Aug 2012; 99(8): 1083-8. PMID 22648697
62. Rombouts SJ, Vogel JA, van Santvoort HC, et al. Systematic review of innovative ablative therapies for the treatment of locally advanced pancreatic cancer. *Br J Surg*. Feb 2015; 102(3): 182-93. PMID 25524417
63. Kameyama S, Murakami H, Masuda H, et al. Minimally invasive magnetic resonance imaging-guided stereotactic radiofrequency thermocoagulation for epileptogenic hypothalamic hamartomas. *Neurosurgery*. Sep 2009; 65(3): 438-49; discussion 449. PMID 19687687
64. Vavra P, Dostalík J, Zacharoulis D, et al. Endoscopic radiofrequency ablation in colorectal cancer: initial clinical results of a new bipolar radiofrequency ablation device. *Dis Colon Rectum*. Feb 2009; 52(2): 355-8. PMID 19279436
65. Mylona S, Karagiannis G, Patsoura S, et al. Palliative treatment of rectal carcinoma recurrence using radiofrequency ablation. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. Aug 2012; 35(4): 875-82. PMID 22167304
66. Ripley RT, Gajdos C, Reppert AE, et al. Sequential radiofrequency ablation and surgical debulking for unresectable colorectal carcinoma: thermo-surgical ablation. *J Surg Oncol*. Feb 2013; 107(2): 144-7. PMID 22927225
67. Howington JA, Blum MG, Chang AC, et al. Treatment of stage I and II non-small cell lung cancer: Diagnosis and management of lung cancer, 3rd ed: American College of Chest Physicians evidence-based clinical practice guidelines. *Chest*. May 2013; 143(5 Suppl): e278S-e313S. PMID 23649443
68. Donington J, Ferguson M, Mazzone P, et al. American College of Chest Physicians and Society of Thoracic Surgeons consensus statement for evaluation and management for high-risk patients with stage I non-small cell lung cancer. *Chest*. Dec 2012; 142(6): 1620-1635. PMID 23208335
69. Campbell S, Uzzo RG, Allaf ME, et al. Renal Mass and Localized Renal Cancer: AUA Guideline. *J Urol*. Sep 2017; 198(3): 520-529. PMID 28479239
70. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Non-small cell lung cancer. Version 5.2023.
71. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Thyroid Carcinoma. Version 4.2023.
72. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Kidney Cancer. Version 1.2024.
73. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Colon Cancer. Version 4.2023.
74. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guidelines): Head and Neck Cancers. Version 1.2024.
75. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guidelines): Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma. Version 2.2023.
76. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Computed tomography-guided thermocoagulation of osteoid osteoma [IPG53]. 2004

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION OF MISCELLANEOUS SOLID TUMORS EXCLUDING LIVER TUMORS
POLICY NUMBER	MP 1.084

77. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of renal cancer [IPG353]. 2010
78. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation for primary and secondary lung cancers [IPG372]. 2010
79. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Ultrasound-guided percutaneous radiofrequency ablation for benign thyroid nodules [IPG562]. 2016;
80. Chung SR, Suh CH, Baek JH, et al. Safety of radiofrequency ablation of benign thyroid nodules and recurrent thyroid cancers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Hyperthermia* 2017;33:920-930
81. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Medical Policy Reference Manual. 7.01.95, Radiofrequency Ablation of Miscellaneous Solid Tumors Excluding Liver Tumors. October 2023.

X. POLICY HISTORY

[Top](#)

MP 1.084	08/06/2020 Consensus Review. Policy statements unchanged. References updated.
	12/03/2021 Minor Review. Added as potentially medically necessary criteria for the treatment of both differentiated thyroid carcinoma and medullary thyroid carcinoma (previously investigational); FEP language updated; added NCCN statement; update diagnosis codes and references.
	12/19/2022 Consensus Review. No changes to policy statement. Updated cross references, rationale, references. Removed code 0404T from INV and added code 50542 as MN.
	11/20/2023 Consensus Review. No changes to policy statement. Updated references. Coding reviewed, no changes.
	12/11/2024 Administrative Update. Added codes 60660-60661. Effective 1/1/2025.
	12/17/2024 Administrative Update. Removed NCCN statement.

[Top](#)

Health care benefit programs issued or administered by Capital Blue Cross and/or its subsidiaries, Capital Advantage Insurance Company®, Capital Advantage Assurance Company® and Keystone Health Plan® Central. Independent licensees of the BlueCross BlueShield Association. Communications issued by Capital Blue Cross in its capacity as administrator of programs and provider relations for all companies.