Policy Number	SUR701.009
Policy Effective Date	07/15/2025

Percutaneous Left Atrial Appendage Closure Devices for Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation

Table of Contents

Related Policies (if applicable)
SUR707.033 Surgical Left Atrial Appendage Occlusion Devices for Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation

Disclaimer

Carefully check state regulations and/or the member contract.
Each benefit plan, summary plan description or contract defines which services are covered, which services are excluded, and which services are subject to dollar caps or other limitations, conditions or exclusions. Members and their providers have the responsibility for consulting the member's benefit plan, summary plan description or contract to determine if there are any exclusions or other benefit limitations applicable to this service or supply. **If there is a discrepancy between a Medical Policy and a member's benefit plan, summary plan description or contract, the benefit plan, summary plan description or contract will govern.**

Coverage

The use of a device with U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval for percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (e.g., the Watchman or Amplatzer Amulet) **may be considered medically necessary** for the prevention of stroke in individuals with atrial fibrillation (AF) when the following criteria are met:

- There is an increased risk of stroke and systemic embolism based on $CHADS_2$ or CHA_2DS_2-VASc score ≥ 2 (See **NOTE 1**) and systemic anticoagulation therapy is recommended; and
- The long-term risks of systemic anticoagulation outweigh the risks of the device implantation (see Policy Guidelines).

NOTE 1: Refer to the Description section for $CHADS_2$ and CHA_2DS_2-VASc tables. Guidelines from the American College of Chest Physicians recommend the use of oral anticoagulation for patients with AF who are at high risk of stroke (i.e., $CHADS_2$ score ≥ 2), with more individualized choice of antithrombotic therapy in patients with lower stroke risk. (5)

The use of a device with FDA approval for percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (e.g., the Watchman or Amplatzer Amulet) for stroke prevention in individuals who do not meet the above criteria **is considered experimental, investigational and/or unproven.**

The use of other percutaneous left atrial appendage closure devices, including but not limited to the Lariat and Amplatzer Cardiac Plug devices, for stroke prevention in individuals with atrial fibrillation **is considered experimental, investigational and/or unproven.**

Policy Guidelines

The balance of risks and benefits associated with percutaneous implantation of the Watchman or Amplatzer Amulet device for stroke prevention, as an alternative to systemic anticoagulation, must be made on an individual basis.

Bleeding is the primary risk associated with systemic anticoagulation. A number of risk scores have been developed to estimate the risk of significant bleeding in individuals treated with systemic anticoagulation. An example is the HAS-BLED score, which is validated to assess the annual risk of significant bleeding in individuals with atrial fibrillation treated with warfarin. Scores range from 0 to 9, based on a number of clinical characteristics (see Table PG1).

Table PG1. Clinical Components of the HAS-BLED Bleeding Risk Score

Letter	Clinical Characteristics	Points Awarded
H	Hypertension	1
A	Abnormal renal and liver function (1 point each)	1 or 2
S	Stroke	1
B	Bleeding	1
L	Labile international normalized ratios	1
E	Elderly (>65 years)	1
D	Drugs or alcohol (1 point each)	1 or 2

Adapted from Pisters et al. (2010)
HAS-BLED: Hypertension, Abnormal renal/liver function, Stroke, Bleeding history or predisposition, Labile INR (international normalized ratio), Elderly, Drugs/alcohol concomitantly.

The risk of major bleeding in individuals with scores of 3, 4, and 5 has been reported at 3.74 per 100 patient-years, 8.70 per 100 patient-years, and 12.5 per 100 patient-years, respectively. Scores of 3 or greater are considered to be associated with a high risk of bleeding, potentially signaling the need for closer monitoring of individuals for adverse events, closer monitoring of international normalized ratio, or differential dose selections of oral anticoagulants or aspirin.

Description

Atrial Fibrillation and Stroke

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common type of irregular heartbeat, affecting at least 2.7 million people in the U.S. Risk of AF has been found to be lower in Black, Hispanic and Asian patients relative to White patients, including following adjustment for demographic and AF risk factors. (1, 2) Stroke is the most serious complication of AF. The estimated incidence of stroke in nontreated patients with AF is 5% per year; despite a lower risk of AF, Black and Hispanic patients have an increased risk of stroke compared with White patients. (3, 4) Stroke associated with AF is primarily embolic, tends to be more severe than the typical ischemic stroke and causes higher rates of mortality and disability. As a result, stroke prevention is a main goal of AF treatment.

Stroke in AF occurs primarily as a result of thromboembolism from the left atrium. The lack of atrial contractions in AF leads to blood stasis in the left atrium, and this low flow state increases the risk for thrombosis. The area of the left atrium with the lowest blood flow in AF, and, therefore, the highest risk of thrombosis is the left atrial appendage (LAA). It has been estimated that 90% of left atrial thrombi occur in the LAA.

Treatment

Pharmacologic

The main treatment for stroke prevention in AF is anticoagulation, which has proven efficacy. The risk for stroke among patients with AF is evaluated using several factors. Two commonly used scores, the $CHADS_2$ score and the CHA_2DS_2-VASc score are described below in Table 1. Warfarin or newer anticoagulant medications, including dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban are options for stroke prevention. In nonvalvular AF, newer anticoagulants have demonstrated noninferiority to warfarin in clinical trials. While anticoagulation is effective for stroke prevention, it carries an increased risk of bleeding. Also, warfarin requires frequent monitoring and adjustments as well as lifestyle changes. Newer agents do not require the frequent monitoring seen with warfarin therapy. The 2018 American College of Chest Physicians guidelines (updated from 2012) recommend that CHA_2DS_2-VASc be used to evaluate stroke risk, and patients initially identified as having a low stroke risk should not be given antithrombotic therapy. In addition, they recommend bleeding risk assessments be given to every patient at every patient contact and that “potentially modifiable bleeding risk factors” should be the initial focus.

Table 1. $CHADS_2$ and CHA_2DS_2-VASc Scores to Predict Ischemic Stroke Risk in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation

Letter	Clinical Characteristics	Points Awarded
C	Congestive heart failure (signs/symptoms of heart failure confirmed with objective evidence of cardiac dysfunction)	1
H	Hypertension (resting blood pressure >140/90 mmHg on at least 2 occasions or current antihypertensive pharmacologic treatment)	1
A	Age ≥75 years	1 ($CHADS_2$)

		2 (CHA_2DS_2-VAS_c)
D	Diabetes (fasting glucose >125 mg/dL or treatment with oral hypoglycemic agent and/or insulin)	1
S	Stroke or transient ischemic attack (includes any history of cerebral ischemia)	2
V	Vascular disease (prior myocardial infarction, peripheral arterial disease, or aortic plaque)	1
A	Age 65-74 years	1
Sc	Sex category of female (female sex confers higher risk)	1

Adapted from Lip et al. (2018) (5) and January et al. (2014). (6)

Bleeding is the primary risk associated with systemic anticoagulation. Risk scores have been developed to estimate the risk of significant bleeding in patients treated with systemic anticoagulation, such as the HAS-BLED score, which has been validated to assess the annual risk of significant bleeding in patients with AF treated with warfarin. (7) The score ranges from 0 to 9, based on clinical characteristics, including the presence of hypertension, renal and liver function, history of stroke, bleeding, labile international normalized ratios, age, and drug/alcohol use. Scores of 3 or greater are considered to be associated with a high risk of bleeding, potentially signaling the need for closer monitoring of patients for adverse risks, closer monitoring of international normalized ratios, or differential dose selections of oral anticoagulants or aspirin. (6)

Surgery

Surgical removal, or exclusion, of the LAA is often performed in patients with AF who are undergoing open heart surgery for other reasons. Percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (LAAC) devices have been developed as a nonpharmacologic alternative to anticoagulation for stroke prevention in AF. The devices may prevent stroke by occluding the LAA, thus preventing thrombus formation.

Several versions of LAA occlusion devices have been developed. The PLAATO system (ev3 Endovascular) was the first device to be approved by the FDA for LAA occlusion. The device was discontinued in 2007 for commercial reasons, and intellectual property was sold to manufacturers of the Watchman system. The Watchman Left Atrial Appendage System (Boston Scientific) is a self-expanding nickel titanium device. It has a polyester covering and fixation barbs for attachment to the endocardium. Implantation is performed percutaneously through a catheter delivery system, using venous access and transseptal puncture to enter the left atrium. Transesophageal echocardiography and fluoroscopy are used to guide the procedure. Following implantation, patients receive anticoagulation with warfarin or alternative agents for approximately 1 to 2 months. After this period, patients are maintained on antiplatelet agents (i.e., aspirin and/or clopidogrel) indefinitely. The Watchman FLX device is a next-generation Watchman device that is also FDA-approved for LAAC. This device is based on the design of the Watchman device, is fully recapturable and repositionable, and was made to occlude a wider

size range of LAA than the original Watchman device. (8) The Amplatzer cardiac plug (St. Jude Medical), is FDA-approved for closure of atrial septal defects but not for LAAC. A second-generation device developed for the specific indication of LAAC, the Amplatzer Amulet (Abbott), received FDA approval in August 2021. (9) The Amplatzer Amulet consists of a nitinol mesh disc to seal the ostium of the LAA and a nitinol mesh distal lobe, to be positioned within the LAA. The device is preloaded within a delivery sheath. The Percutaneous LAA Transcatheter Occlusion device (ev3) has also been evaluated in research studies but has not received FDA approval.

The Lariat Loop Applicator is a suture delivery device approved by the FDA, intended to close a variety of surgical wounds. It is not specifically approved for LAAC. While the Watchman and other devices are implanted in the endocardium, the Lariat is a non-implant epicardial device.

In September 2021, the FDA sent a letter to healthcare providers indicating that women undergoing percutaneous LAA closure may be at higher risk of adverse procedural outcomes than men. (10) This was based on an analysis of registry data from 49,357 patients who underwent LAA closure with the Watchman device. (11) When adjusted for multiple confounding factors, the study found women were more likely than men to experience any adverse event, major adverse events, and major bleeding. Women also had a significantly higher risk of death (adjusted odds ratio [OR], 2.01; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.31 to 3.09) but absolute risk was low for both women and men (0.3% vs. 0.1%). In their letter, the FDA stated that they believe the benefits continue to outweigh the risks for approved LAA closure devices when used in accordance with their instructions for use.

Outcome Measures

The optimal study design for evaluating the efficacy of percutaneous LAAC for the prevention of stroke in AF is a randomized controlled trial (RCT) that includes clinically relevant measures of health outcomes. The rate of ischemic stroke during follow-up is the primary outcome of interest, along with rates of systemic embolization, cardiac events, bleeding complications, and death. For the LAAC devices, the appropriate comparison group could be oral anticoagulation, no therapy (for patients who have a prohibitive risk for oral anticoagulation), or open surgical repair.

Ideally, percutaneous LAAC devices would represent an alternative to oral anticoagulation for the prevention of stroke in patients with AF. However, during the postimplantation period the LAAC device may be associated with increased thrombogenicity, therefore, anticoagulation is used during the periprocedural period. Most studies evaluating percutaneous LAAC devices have included patients who are eligible for anticoagulation.

Regulatory Status

In 2002, the PLAATO system (ev3 Endovascular) was the first device to be approved by the FDA for LAA occlusion. The device was discontinued in 2007 for commercial reasons, and intellectual property was sold to manufacturers of the Watchman system.

In 2015, the Watchman™ Left Atrial Appendage Closure Technology (Boston Scientific) was approved by the FDA through the premarket approval process by the Left Atrial Appendage Versus Warfarin Therapy for Prevention of Stroke in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation RCT. (12) In 2020, the Watchman FLX device (Boston Scientific) was approved by the FDA based on the single-arm, nonrandomized PINNACLE FLX study. (8)

The Amplatzer™ Amulet™ Left Atrial Appendage Occluder (Abbott) received FDA approval in 2021 through the premarket approval process based on results from the Amplatzer Amulet Left Atrial Appendage Occluder Randomized Controlled Trial (Amulet IDE Trial). (9) The Watchman and Amplatzer Amulet devices are indicated to reduce the risk of thromboembolism from the LAA in individuals with nonvalvular AF who:

- Are at increased risk for stroke and systemic embolism based on $CHADS_2$ or CHA_2DS_2-VASc scores and are recommended for anticoagulation therapy;
- Are deemed by their physicians to be suitable for anticoagulation therapy; and
- Have an appropriate rationale to seek a nonpharmacologic alternative to anticoagulation therapy, taking into account the safety and effectiveness of the device compared to anticoagulation therapy.

FDA product code: NGV.

Several other devices are being evaluated for LAA occlusion but are not approved in the U.S. for percutaneous LAAC. In 2006, the Lariat™ Loop Applicator device (SentreHEART [now AtriCure]), a suture delivery system, was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process. The intended use is to facilitate suture placement and knot tying in surgical applications where soft tissues are being approximated or ligated with a pretied polyester suture. The Amplatzer Cardiac Plug device (St. Jude Medical [now Abbott]) and WaveCrest™ (Johnson & Johnson Biosense Webster) have CE approval in Europe for LAAC but are not currently approved in the U.S. for this indication.

Rationale

Medical policies assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are length of life, quality of life, and ability to function, including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to individuals and managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance, and quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent 1 or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable

intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. RCTs are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration-approved Percutaneous Left Atrial Appendage Closure Devices

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved left atrial appendage (LAA) closure (LAAC) devices (e.g., Watchman or Amplatzer Amulet device) in individuals who have atrial fibrillation (AF) and are at increased risk for embolic stroke is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this policy.

Populations

The relevant population of interest is individuals with AF. AF causes a low flow state in the left atrium which increases the risk of thromboembolism. Strokes in individuals with AF occur primarily due to thromboembolism from the left atrium. Individuals with AF who are not treated have a 5% estimated incidence of stroke.

Interventions

The therapy being considered is percutaneous LAAC with a Watchman or Amulet device. Watchman devices include the Watchman percutaneous LAAC device and the Watchman FLX device (a next generation device based on the design of the original Watchman device). (8) The devices are made of nickel titanium and are implanted percutaneously through a catheter, into the left atrium. The Watchman devices come in 5 sizes and self-expand to occlude the LAA. By occluding the LAA, thrombus formation is prevented, potentially preventing stroke. Following implantation of the device, the recipient receives anticoagulation for 1 to 2 months. Once it is established that there is no peridevice leak or thrombus development, the recipient is then placed on antiplatelet agents indefinitely. The Amplatzer Amulet is a second-generation device based on the first-generation Amplatzer Cardiac Plug (discussed below). The Amplatzer Amulet consists of a nitinol mesh disc to seal the ostium of the LAA and a nitinol mesh distal lobe, to be positioned within the LAA. The device is preloaded within a delivery sheath. Following device placement (confirmed by transesophageal echocardiography and fluoroscopy), individuals are discharged on either dual antiplatelet therapy or aspirin plus oral anticoagulation.

Comparators

The current treatment for stroke prevention in individuals with AF is systemic anticoagulation. While anticoagulants are effective in preventing stroke, the increased risk of bleeding is a potential harm. Warfarin requires frequent monitoring and lifestyle changes. Other

anticoagulants found to be noninferior to warfarin include dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are rates of ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke, cardiovascular or unexplained death, and systemic embolism, measured between 6 to 12 months of follow-up, although some studies show follow-up of up to 5 years. (13) Additional outcomes of interest include device- or procedure-related events that may occur within 1 week of the procedure. In particular, events requiring open cardiac surgery or major endovascular intervention (e.g., pseudoaneurysm repair, arteriovenous fistula repair, or other major endovascular repair) should be noted.

Study Selection Criteria

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse effects, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

Watchman Device

Systematic Reviews

A number of systematic reviews have pooled evidence from RCTs for the Watchman device. (14-22) Others have included RCTs and observational studies. (17, 23, 24)

Holmes et al. (2015) published an analysis that included patient-level data from the industry-sponsored PROTECT AF and PREVAIL trials (described below), together with both studies' continued access registries. (16) The PROTECT AF and PREVAIL registries were designed to include patients with similar baseline characteristics as their respective RCTs. The meta-analysis included 2406 patients, 1877 treated with the Watchman device and 382 treated with warfarin alone. Mean patient follow-up durations were 0.58 years and 3.7 years, respectively, for the PREVAIL continued access registry and the PROTECT AF continued access registry. In a meta-analysis of 1114 patients treated in the RCTs, compared with warfarin, LAAC met the trial's noninferiority criteria for the primary composite efficacy endpoint of all-cause stroke, systemic embolization, and cardiovascular death (hazard ratio [HR], 0.79, 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.52 to 1.2; p=.22). All-cause stroke rates did not differ significantly between groups (1.75 per 100 patient-years for LAAC vs 1.87 per 100 patient-years for warfarin; HR, 1.02; 95% CI, 0.62 to 1.7; p=.94). LAAC-treated patients had higher rates of ischemic stroke (1.6 events per 100 patient-years vs. 0.9 events per 100 patient-years; HR, 1.95, p=.05) when procedure-related strokes were included but had lower rates of hemorrhagic stroke (0.15 events per 100 patient-years vs 0.96 events per 100 patient-years; HR, 0.22; 95% CI, 0.08 to 0.61; p=.004).

Price et al. (2015) reported on a second patient-level meta-analysis of the 2 RCTs that focused on bleeding outcomes. (19) There were 54 episodes of major bleeding, with the most common types being gastrointestinal bleed (31/54 [57%]) and hemorrhagic stroke (9/54 [17%]). On combined analysis, the rate of major bleeding episodes over the entire study period did not differ between groups. There were 3.5 events per 100 patient-years in the Watchman group compared with 3.6 events per 100 patient-years in the anticoagulation group, for a rate ratio of 0.96 (95% CI, 0.66 to 1.40; p=.84). However, there was a reduction in bleeding risk for the Watchman group past the initial periprocedural period. For bleeding events occurring more than 7 days postprocedure, the event rates were 1.8 per 100 patient-years in the Watchman group compared with 3.6 per 100 patient-years in the anticoagulation group (rate ratio, 0.49; 95% CI, 0.32 to 0.75; p=.01). For bleeding events occurring more than 6 months postprocedure (the time at which antiplatelet therapy is discontinued for patients receiving the Watchman device), the event rates were 1.0 per 100 patient-years in the Watchman group compared with 3.5 per 100 patient-years in the anticoagulation group (rate ratio, 0.28; 95% CI, 0.16 to 0.49; p<.001).

Additional systematic reviews have used network meta-analyses to compare vitamin K antagonists with the Watchman device and with novel oral anticoagulants (6 RCTs, N=59,627), (25) and have compared percutaneous LAA occlusion (5 RCTs, N=1285 subjects) with standard anticoagulant or antiplatelet therapy with device-based surgical or percutaneous LAA exclusion. (26) Bajaj et al. (2016) published a network meta-analysis comparing vitamin K antagonists with novel oral anticoagulants and with the Watchman device. (25) They reported that all the treatment strategies had comparable ischemic stroke rates. However, the cluster analyses showed the novel oral anticoagulants ranked best in safety and efficacy, followed by vitamin K antagonists, and then the Watchman device. Interpretation of these results is limited by the small sample sizes and population heterogeneity in the RCTs comparing the Watchman with vitamin K antagonists. The network meta-analysis comparing LAAC with oral anticoagulants, antiplatelets, and placebo, reported a trend in stroke and mortality favoring LAAC, but the differences were not statistically significant. (26) The authors noted that overall quality of the evidence was low.

Randomized Controlled Trials

PROTECT AF Trial

The first RCT published for the Watchman device was PROTECT AF, an unblinded randomized trial evaluating the noninferiority of an LAAC device compared with warfarin for stroke prevention in AF. (27) The trial randomized 707 patients from 59 centers in the U.S. and Europe to the Watchman device or warfarin treatment in a 2:1 ratio. The mean follow-up was 18 months. The primary efficacy outcome was a composite endpoint of stroke (ischemic or hemorrhagic), cardiovascular or unexplained death, or systemic embolism. There was also a primary safety outcome, a composite endpoint of excessive bleeding (intracranial or gastrointestinal bleeding), and procedure-related complications (pericardial effusion, device embolization, procedure-related stroke).

The primary efficacy composite outcome occurred at a rate of 3.0 per 100 patient-years in the LAAC group compared with 4.9 per 100 patient-years in the warfarin group (rate ratio, 0.62; 95% credible interval [CrI], 0.35 to 1.25). Based on these outcomes, the probability of noninferiority was greater than 99.9%. For the individual components of the primary outcome, hemorrhagic stroke and cardiovascular/unexplained death were higher in the warfarin group; however, ischemic stroke was higher in the LAAC group at 2.2 per 100 patient-years compared with 1.6 per 100 patient-years in the warfarin group (rate ratio, 1.34; 95% CrI, 0.60 to 4.29). The primary safety outcome occurred more commonly in the LAAC group, at a rate of 7.4 per 100 patient-years compared with 4.4 per 100 patient-years in the warfarin group (rate ratio, 1.69; 95% CrI, 1.01 to 3.19). The excess in adverse event rates for the LAAC group was primarily the result of early adverse events associated with device placement. The most frequent type of complication related to LAAC device placement was pericardial effusion requiring intervention, which occurred in 4.8% (22/463) of patients.

Reddy et al. (2013) reported on longer-term follow-up from the PROTECT AF trial. (28) At a mean follow-up of 2.3 years, the results were similar to the initial report. The relative risk for the composite primary outcome in the Watchman group compared with anticoagulation was 0.71, and this met noninferiority criteria with a confidence greater than 99%. Complications were more common in the Watchman group, with an estimated rate of 5.6% per year, compared with 3.6% per year in the warfarin group.

Reddy et al. (2014) also reported outcomes through 4 years of follow-up. (29) Mean follow-up was 3.9 years in the LAAC group and 3.7 years in the warfarin group. In the LAAC group, warfarin was discontinued in 345 (93.2%) of 370 patients by the 12-month follow-up evaluation. During the follow-up period, the relative risk for the composite primary outcome in the Watchman group compared with anticoagulation was 0.60 (8.4% in the device group vs 13.9% in the anticoagulation group; 95% CrI, 0.41 to 1.05), which met the noninferiority criteria with a confidence greater than 99.9%. Fewer hemorrhagic strokes (0.6% vs 4.0%; rate ratio, 0.15; 95% CrI, 0.03 to 0.49) and fewer cardiovascular events (3.7% vs 0.95%; rate ratio, 0.40; 95% CrI, 0.23 to 0.82) occurred in the Watchman group. Rates of ischemic stroke did not differ significantly between groups, but Watchman patients had lower all-cause mortality rates than anticoagulation patients (12.3% vs 18.0%; HR, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.45 to 0.98; p=.04).

Alli et al. (2013) reported on quality-of-life parameters, as measured by the change in the 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey scores from baseline to 12-month follow-up, for a subset of 547 subjects in the PROTECT AF trial. (30) For the subset of PROTECT AF subjects included in the Alli et al. (2013) analysis, at baseline, control group subjects had a higher mean $CHADS_2$ score (2.4 vs 2.2; p=.052) and were more likely to have a history of coronary artery disease (49.5% vs 39.6%; p=.028). For subjects in the Watchman group, the 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey total physical score improved in 34.9% and was unchanged in 29.9%; for those in the warfarin group, the total physical score improved in 24.7% and was unchanged in 31.7% (p=.01).

Reddy et al. (2017) published 5-year follow-up results indicating that the LAAC group had significantly lower rates of the composite efficacy endpoint (stroke, systemic embolism, cardiovascular death) compared with the warfarin-only group (p=.04). (13)

PREVAIL Trial

A second RCT, the PREVAIL trial, was conducted after the 2009 FDA decision on the Watchman device to address some limitations of the PROTECT AF trial, including its inclusion of patients with low stroke risk ($CHADS_2$ scores of 1), high rates of adjunctive antiplatelet therapy use in both groups, and generally poor compliance with warfarin therapy in the control group. Holmes et al. (2014) published results from the PREVAIL trial. (31) In the PREVAIL trial, 461 subjects enrolled at 41 sites were randomized in a 2:1 fashion to the Watchman device or control, which consisted of either initiation or continuation of warfarin therapy with a target international normalized ratio of 2.0 to 3.0. Subjects had nonvalvular AF and required treatment for prevention of thromboembolism based on a $CHADS_2$ score of 2 or higher (or ≥1 with other indications for warfarin therapy based on American College of Cardiology, American Heart Association, and European Society of Cardiology joint guidelines) and were eligible for warfarin therapy. In the device group, warfarin and low-dose aspirin were continued until 45 days postprocedure; if a follow-up echocardiogram at 45 days showed occlusion of the LAA, warfarin therapy could be discontinued. Subjects who discontinued warfarin were treated with aspirin and clopidogrel for 6 months after device implantation and with aspirin 325 mg indefinitely after that.

Three noninferiority primary efficacy endpoints were specified: 1) occurrence of ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke, cardiovascular or unexplained death, and systemic embolism (18-month rates); 2) occurrence of late ischemic stroke and systemic embolization (beyond 7 days post randomization, 18-month rates); and 3) occurrence of all-cause death, ischemic stroke, systemic embolism, or device- or procedure-related events requiring open cardiac surgery or major endovascular intervention (e.g., pseudoaneurysm repair, arteriovenous fistula repair, or other major endovascular repair) occurring within 7 days of the procedure or by hospital discharge, whichever was later. The 18-month event rates were determined using Bayesian statistical methods to integrate data from the PROTECT AF trial. All patients had a minimum follow-up of 6 months. For randomized subjects, the mean follow-up was 11.8 months, and the median follow-up was 12.0 months (range, 0.03 to 25.9 months).

For the first composite primary endpoint, the 18-month modeled rate ratio between the device and control groups was 1.07 (95% CrI, 0.57 to 1.89). Because the upper bound of the 95% CrI was above the preset noninferiority margin of 1.75, the noninferiority criteria were not met. For the second primary endpoint of late ischemic stroke and systemic embolization, the 18-month relative risk between the device and control groups was 1.6 (95% CrI, 0.5 to 4.2), with an upper bound of the 95% CrI above the preset noninferiority margin of 2.0. The rate difference between the device and control groups was 0.005 (95% CrI, -0.019 to 0.027). The upper bound of the 95% CrI was lower than the noninferiority margin of 0.0275, so the noninferiority criterion was met for the rate difference. For the third primary endpoint (major safety issues), the noninferiority criterion was met.

Reddy et al. (2017), in their-5-year follow-up results, indicated that the Watchman device was noninferior to warfarin alone in the composite efficacy endpoint (stroke, systemic embolism, cardiovascular death) (p=.5). (13)

Reddy et al. (2017), in addition to providing 5-year final results for the individual trials, also conducted a meta-analysis of the 5-year outcomes using data from both trials. (13) Meta-analytic results are summarized in Table 2, showing that the Watchman device is noninferior to warfarin alone in stroke prevention among patients with nonvalvular AF. Also, patients treated with the Watchman device experienced significantly lower bleeding and mortality compared with patients receiving warfarin.

Table 2. Five-Year Meta-Analytics Results for the PROTECT AF and PREVAIL AF Trials

Outcomes	Watchman, n (Rate per 100 PY), %	Warfarin Alone, n (Rate per 100 PY), %	HR (95% CI)	p-value
Composite stroke/SE/CV death	79 (2.8)	50 (3.4)	0.8 (0.6 to 1.2)	.3
All stroke or SE	49 (1.7)	27 (1.8)	1.0 (0.6 to 1.5)	.9
CV/unexplained death	39 (1.3)	33 (2.2)	0.6 (0.4 to 0.9)	.03
All cause death	106 (3.0)	73 (4.9)	0.7 (0.5 to 1.0)	.03
Major bleeding, all	85 (3.1)	50 (3.5)	0.9 (0.6 to 1.3)	.6
Major bleeding, non-LAAC-related	48 (1.7)	51 (3.6)	0.5 (0.3 to 0.7)	<.001

Adapted from Reddy et al. (2017). (13)
CI: confidence interval; CV: cardiovascular; HR: hazard ratio; LAAC: left atrial appendage closure; n: number; PREVAIL: Prospective Randomized Evaluation of the Watchman LAA Closure Device in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation (AF) Versus Long Term Warfarin Therapy; PROTECT AF: Watchman Left Atrial Appendage System for Embolic Protection in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation; PY: patient-years; SE: systemic embolism.

PRAGUE-17 Trial

Osmancik et al. (2020) published the LAAC versus Novel Anticoagulation Agents in AF (PRAGUE-17) study, a multicenter, randomized, noninferiority study that compared the use of LAAC to direct oral anticoagulants in high-risk patients with nonvalvular AF. (32) Patients were included if they had a history of bleeding requiring intervention or hospitalization, a history of cardioembolic event while taking an anticoagulant, or CHA_2DS_2-VASc score ≥3 with a HAS-BLED score ≥2. Patients either received LAAC (n=181) with either the Amplatzer Amulet or Watchman/Watchman FLX devices based on the discretion of the implanting center, or a direct oral anticoagulant (rivaroxaban, apixaban, or dabigatran) (n=201). The primary endpoint was a

composite of ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA), systemic embolism, clinically significant bleeding, cardiovascular death, or significant peri-procedural or device-related complications. At baseline, the mean CHA_2DS_2-VASc score was 4.7 and HAS-BLED score was 3.1. Initial follow-up was 20.8 months. Of the LAAC group, 61.3% received an Amulet, 35.9% received a Watchman device, and 2.8% received a Watchman-FLX device. The primary endpoint occurred in 41 patients (47 events) in the direct oral anticoagulant group (13.42 event rate per year) compared to 35 patients (38 events) in the LAAC group (10.99 event rate per year) (subdistribution HR, 0.84; 95% CI, 0.53 to 1.21; p-value for noninferiority, p=.004). All stroke/TIA events occurred in 9 patients (9 events) in each group, subdistribution HR, 1.0 (95% CI, 0.40 to 2.51). Results were not divided by the type of LAAC device received. Longer-term results were subsequently published by Osmancik et al. (2022). (33) After 3.5 years of follow-up, there was no significant difference in risk of the primary endpoint between the LAAC and direct oral anticoagulant groups (subdistribution HR, 0.81; 95% CI, 0.56 to 1.18). Significant procedure- or device-related complications occurred in 9 patients in the LAAC group. Early complications (≤ 7 days) included device embolization (n=1), procedure-related death (n=1), and vascular complications (n=2), while late complications (>7 days) included pericardial effusion (n=2), device-related death (n=1), and other complications (n=2). The procedure-related death was due to a femoral vascular access bleed and myocardial infarction. The device-related death occurred with the Amulet device due to a pericardial effusion approximately 6 weeks after the procedure.

OPTION Trial

Wazni et al. (2024) published the randomized, open-label OPTION trial comparing LAAC (n=803) with Watchman FLX to physician-choice oral anticoagulation (n=797) in patients with atrial fibrillation who had received catheter ablation. (34) Patients who underwent catheter ablation and had a CHA_2DS_2-VASc score of at least 3 for women or at least 2 for men were eligible if they had received ablation within 90 to 180 days or were scheduled to receive ablation within 10 days. All ablation procedures were performed prior to LAAC placement. After implantation, all patients received 90 days of oral anticoagulant and aspirin followed by aspirin alone until 12 months. At baseline, the mean age in both groups was about 69 years and two-thirds of patients were male. Over 80% of patients in each group were White with an average CHA_2DS_2-VASc score of 3.5. The primary efficacy endpoint of composite of death from any cause, stroke, or systemic embolism at 36 months after randomization occurred in 5.3% of patients treated with LAAC and 5.8% of patients treated with anticoagulation (difference, -0.5%; 95% CI, 0.59 to 1.39; one-sided 97.5% upper confidence limit 1.8; p<.001 for noninferiority). The primary safety endpoint of non–procedure related bleeding or clinically relevant nonmajor bleeding at 36 months occurred in 8.5% of patients treated with LAAC and 18.1% of patients treated with anticoagulation (HR, 0.44; 95% CI, 0.33 to 0.59; p<.001 for superiority). These results demonstrate noninferiority of LAAC compared to anticoagulation for the composite efficacy outcome with lower risk of bleeding.

Nonrandomized Studies

Numerous case series and nonrandomized studies of the Watchman have been published. (35-39) Several are notable in that they were conducted in patients not eligible for anticoagulation,

a population not included in PROTECT AF and PREVAIL. Reddy et al. (2013) conducted a multicenter, prospective, nonrandomized trial to evaluate the safety and efficacy of LAAC with the Watchman device in patients who had nonvalvular AF, with a $CHADS_2$ score 1 or higher, and were considered ineligible for warfarin. (40) Postimplantation, patients received 6 months of clopidogrel or ticlopidine and lifelong aspirin therapy. Thirteen (8.7%) patients had a procedure- or device-related serious adverse event, most commonly pericardial effusion (3 patients). Over a mean follow-up of 14.4 months, all-cause stroke or systemic embolism occurred in 4 patients.

The EWOLUTION Watchman registry tracks procedural success, long-term outcomes, and adverse events in real-world settings. This registry compiles data from patients receiving the Watchman device at 47 centers in 13 countries. Boersma et al. (2016) conducted an analysis of the EWOLUTION registry data reporting 30-day outcomes after device implantation in 1021 patients. (41) The overall population had a risk of bleeding that was substantially higher than that for patients in the RCTs. Over 62% of patients included in the registry were deemed ineligible for anticoagulation by their physicians. Approximately one-third of patients had a history of major bleeding, and 40% had HAS-BLED scores of 3 or greater, indicating moderate- to high-risk of bleeding. Procedural success was achieved in 98.5% of patients, and 99.3% of implants demonstrated no blood flow or minimal residual blood flow postprocedure. Serious adverse events due to the device or procedure occurred at an overall rate of 2.8% (95% CI, 1.9% to 4.0%) at 7 days and 3.6% (95% CI, 2.5% to 4.9%) at 30 days. The most common serious adverse event was major bleeding.

Dukkipati et al. (2018) studied the incidence, predictors, and clinical outcomes of device-related thrombus (DRT) among the following patients receiving the Watchman in the following trials and registries: PROTECT AF, PREVAIL, Continued Access to PROTECT AF registry, and Continued Access to PREVAIL registry. (42) Surveillance transesophageal electrocardiograms were conducted in all patients at 45 days and 12 months. Patients in the RCTs also received electrocardiograms at 6 months. A total of 1739 patients were followed for a total of 7159 patient-years. The mean age of the population was 74 years and 34% were women. DRT was detected in 65 (3.7%) of the patients. Stroke or systemic embolism rates were 7.5 and 1.8 per 100 patient-years for patients with and without DRT, respectively. A multivariable modeling analysis found the following predictors of DRT: history of TIA or stroke, permanent AF, vascular disease, LAA diameter, and left ventricular ejection fraction.

Jazayeri et al. (2018) evaluated the safety profiles of the Watchman and the Lariat devices, using the FDA's Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) database from 2009 to 2016. (43) MAUDE consists of mandatory reports from manufacturers and voluntary reports from healthcare professionals and patients. Outcomes assessed included: a composite of stroke/TIA, pericardiocentesis, cardiac surgery, and death; DRT; cardiac surgery; and myocardial infarction. A total of 5849 Watchman devices were implanted, with 472 events reported during the study period. The most common events in patients receiving the Watchman, were device malfunction (97 [1.7%]), pericardial effusion (84 [1.4%]), need for pericardiocentesis (57 [0.97%]), and intracardiac thrombus (47 [0.84%]). Twenty deaths were reported in the Watchman group, with 1 likely related to DRT. Compared with the Lariat device,

the composite outcome occurred significantly more in the group receiving the Watchman than within the group receiving the Lariat, 1.9% vs. 1.1%, p=.001). Results for the Lariat device are discussed in the "Other Closure Devices" section, below.

Subsection Summary: Watchman Device

The most relevant evidence on the use of the Watchman device for LAAC in patients eligible for anticoagulation derives from 2 industry-sponsored RCTs comparing Watchman and systemic anticoagulants and a patient-level meta-analysis of those studies. After 5 years of follow-up, meta-analytic results showed that the ischemic stroke risk beyond 7 days did not differ between groups and that the hemorrhagic stroke risk remained significantly lower in the LAAC group. The results showed that the Watchman device is noninferior to warfarin alone in stroke prevention among patients with nonvalvular AF. Also, patients treated with the Watchman device experienced significantly lower bleeding and mortality. In patients who have received ablation for atrial fibrillation, an RCT found the Watchman device to be noninferior to oral anticoagulation for the composite of death from any cause, stroke, or systemic embolism. A large study of patients receiving the Watchman device (combining patients from the 2 RCTs and 2 registries) reported that patients who developed DRT were 4 times more likely to experience a stroke or systemic embolism. The authors suggest a surveillance strategy for patients at high risk of DRT following Watchman implantation. One RCT found use of LAAC with either the Watchman device or Amplatzer Amulet device noninferior to direct oral anticoagulants for high-risk patients with AF.

Amplatzer Amulet Device

Randomized Controlled Trials

Two randomized noninferiority trials (SWISS-APERO and Amulet IDE, described below) have been reported comparing the Amplatzer Amulet and Watchman devices, but neither included an anticoagulant group. (44, 45) A third trial (PRAGUE-17) compared either the Amulet or Watchman device with anticoagulants but did not report subgroup analysis according to the device. The ongoing Clinical Trial of Atrial Fibrillation Patients Comparing Left Atrial Appendage Occlusion Therapy to Non-vitamin K Antagonist Oral Anticoagulants (CATALYST; NCT04226547), comparing the Amplatzer Amulet device with non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants, is expected to have primary completion in August 2027.

SWISS-APERO Trial

The Comparison of Amulet Versus Watchman/FLX Device in Patients Undergoing Left Atrial Appendage Closure (SWISS-APERO) trial conducted by Galea et al. (2022) compared the Amulet and Watchman devices in 221 participants with non-valvular AF. (45) The enrolled participants were at high risk for stroke (mean CHA_2DS_2-VASc score 4.3; 39% had a history of prior stroke) and bleeding (mean HAS-BLED score 3.1; 88% had a history of bleeding requiring medical evaluation). Participants were primarily male (70%) and mean age was 77 years. Outcome assessment focused on successful closure, based on a composite outcome of either treatment group crossover during the LAAC procedure or residual LAA patency at 45 days post-intervention, based on computed tomography (CT) angiography. The study found no difference in treatment between groups in the composite outcome (risk ratio [RR], 0.97; 95% CI, 0.80 to

1.16). Major procedure-related complications were more common with the Amulet versus the Watchman device (9.0% vs. 2.7%; p=.047) There were 6 deaths during the trial, including 2 in the Amulet group (1.8%) and 4 in the Watchman group (3.6%; p=.409). Limitations of the study include the lack of an anticoagulant control group. In addition, the actual Watchman device used was changed during the course of the trial due to a new device (Watchman FLX) version becoming available.

One-year outcomes were published in 2024 by Galea and colleagues. (46) At 13 months, 164 patients (74.2%) from the original cohort (75.7% with Amulet and 72.2% with Watchman 2.5/FLX) underwent CT angiography. There was no difference in definite or possible device-related thrombus between Amulet and Watchman groups (2.4% vs. 3.8%; RR, 0.63; 95% CI, 0.11 to 3.70; p=.610). Additionally, the composite of cardiovascular death, ischemic stroke, and systemic embolism (9.5% vs. 10.2%; HR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.39 to 2.14; p=.829), cerebrovascular events (2.7% vs. 3.7%; HR, 0.75; 95% CI, 0.17 to 3.35; p=.706), or bleeding (40.8% vs. 31.4%; HR, 1.46; 95% CI, 0.93 to 2.28; p=.098) was comparable between the 2 groups. The results were consistent when only patients with the Watchman FLX were analyzed and compared to Amulet. Of note, the SWISS-APERO trial was not powered to show differences with regard to clinical endpoints, so all results are hypothesis-generating.

Amulet IDE Trial

Lakkireddy et al. (2021) reported the results of the Amplatzer Amulet Left Atrial Appendage Occluder IDE Trial (Amulet IDE) comparing the Amulet and Watchman devices. (44) The study enrolled 1878 patients with non-valvular AF at high-risk for stroke (mean CHA_2DS_2-VASc score 4.5 and 4.7) and bleeding (mean HAS-BLED score 3.2 and 3.3). The mean age of enrolled patients was 75 years and 59% were male; race and ethnicity were not reported. Twenty-eight percent of enrolled participants had a history of major bleeding and 19 percent had a history of stroke. The primary efficacy endpoint was a composite that included ischemic stroke or systemic embolism, while the safety analysis included a primary composite outcome of all-cause mortality, major bleeding, or procedure-related complications. Duration of follow-up was 18 months for efficacy outcomes and 12 months for safety outcomes. After 18 months, there was no difference in the composite efficacy outcome between the Amulet and Watchman devices (HR, 0.00; 95% CI, -1.55 to 1.55). Results were consistent in showing no difference between groups when considering ischemic stroke and systemic embolism as individual outcomes. There was also no difference between Amulet and Watchman groups for a secondary composite outcome that included any stroke, systemic embolism or sudden cardiac death (HR, -2.12; 95% CI, -4.45 to 0.21), nor were there differences between groups when these outcomes were considered individually. In terms of safety, there was no difference between the Amulet and Watchman groups for the composite safety outcome at 12 months (HR, -0.14; 95% CI, -3.42 to 3.13). When outcomes were considered separately, there was also no difference between the Amulet and Watchman groups for all-cause mortality or major bleeding. Procedure-related complications were more likely to occur with the Amulet versus the Watchman devices (HR, 1.86; 95% CI, 1.11 to 3.12).

Three-year outcomes from the Amulet IDE trial were published by Lakkireddy et al. (2023). (47) At 3 years, patients originally in the Amulet device group had a 92% follow-up rate; patients in the Watchman group had an 86.7% follow-up rate. Of those analyzed at 3 years, a significantly higher percentage of patients were not using oral anticoagulation with Amulet (96.2%) versus Watchman (92.5%; p<.01). Clinical outcomes were comparable between devices. There was no difference in the composite efficacy outcome of ischemic stroke or systemic embolism (5% vs. 4.6%; p=.69), composite of all strokes, embolism, or cardiovascular death (11.1% vs. 12.7%; p=.31), major bleeding (16.1% vs. 14.7%; p=.46), all-cause death (14.6% vs. 17.9%; p=.08), and cardiovascular death (6.6% vs. 8.5%; p=.14) for Amulet and Watchman, respectively. These results demonstrate 3-year clinical safety and efficacy with both devices and less oral anticoagulation use with Amulet, although there were more patients in the Amulet group who were followed through year 3.

Five-year outcomes from the Amulet IDE trial were published by Lakkireddy et al. (2025). (48) At 5 years, patients originally in the Amulet device group had an 89.2% follow-up rate; patients in the Watchman group had an 83.3% follow-up rate. Of those analyzed at 5 years, a significantly higher percentage of patients were not using oral anticoagulation with Amulet (94.0%) versus Watchman (90.9%; p=.009). Clinical outcomes were comparable between devices. There was no difference in the composite efficacy outcome of ischemic stroke or systemic embolism (7.4% vs. 7.1%; HR, 1.04; 95% CI, 0.71 to 1.50; p=.851), composite of all strokes, embolism, or cardiovascular death (20.3% vs. 20.7%; HR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.77 to 1.19; p=.666), major bleeding (20.1% vs. 20.0%; HR, 1.02; 95% CI, 0.82 to 1.26; p=.882), all-cause death (28.7% vs. 31.1%; HR, 0.90; 95% CI, 0.75 to 1.07; p=.217), and cardiovascular death (14.3% vs. 15.4%; HR, 0.90; 95% CI, 0.70 to 1.17; p=.429) for Amulet and Watchman, respectively. These results demonstrate 5-year clinical safety and efficacy with both devices and less oral anticoagulation use with Amulet, although there were more patients in the Amulet group who were followed through year 5.

PRAGUE-17 Trial

As described above, the PRAGUE-17 trial found that the use of either the Watchman device or the Amplatzer Amulet was noninferior to direct oral anticoagulants for the primary composite endpoint that included ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke, TIA, systemic embolism, clinically significant bleeding, significant peri-procedural or device-related complications, or cardiovascular mortality in high-risk patients with AF. (32, 33)

Observational Studies

Observational studies based on registry data provide evidence comparing the Amplatzer Amulet with anticoagulants.

Landmesser et al. (2017) presented periprocedural (within 7 days of procedure) and early clinical outcomes (1 to 3 months postprocedure) from the Amulet Observational Registry of 1088 patients receiving the Amplatzer Amulet between June 2015 and September 2016. (49) Technical success was defined as implantation of the device in the correct position, which was reported for 1078 (99%) of the patients. A composite of ischemic stroke, systemic

embolism, and cardiovascular death occurred in 7 (0.6%) patients during the periprocedural period and in 15 (1.4%) patients between 7 days postprocedure and 3 months follow-up. Landmesser et al. (2018) and Hildick-Smith et al. (2020) provided updated analyses on 950 patients and 864 patients from the registry series described above who had 1-year and 2-year follow-up data. (50, 51) Oral anticoagulants were used by 6% of the patients at 3, 6, and 12 months postprocedure and 6.6% of patients at 2 years. At year 1, there were 29 ischemic strokes (27 patients), 9 patients experiencing a TIA, and no systemic embolisms were reported. At year 2, there were 42 ischemic strokes (39 patients), 20 TIA events (16 patients; 9 events over the first year and 11 over the second year) and no systemic embolism were reported. The annualized bleeding rate was 10.1% per year in year 1 (103 events per 1016 patient-years) and 4.0% per year in year 2 (37 events per 917 patient-years). The proportion of patients experiencing a major bleeding event was 8.0% over the first year (87 of 1088 patients) and 3.2% over the second year (31 of 958 patients). The DRT rate was 1.6% at 2 years, with 19 events in 17 patients. There were 91 and 70 deaths reported in the first and second years, respectively, with 55 deaths considered cardiovascular-related, 71 non-cardiovascular-related, and 35 with unknown causes.

Nielsen-Kudsk et al. (2021) compared Amulet Observational Registry patients with a successful LAAC using the Amulet device (n=1078) with a propensity-matched (based on CHA_2DS_2-VASc and HAS-BLED score) control cohort of patients with AF treated with direct oral anticoagulants (n=1184) identified from the Danish National Patient Registry and the Danish National Prescription Registry. (52) The primary outcome was a composite of ischemic stroke, major bleeding, or all-cause mortality at 2 years. At baseline, the CHA_2DS_2-VASc scores were 4.2 and 4.3 and the HAS-BLED scores were 3.3 and 3.4 in the LAAC and direct oral anticoagulant groups, respectively. At 2 years follow-up, 58% of patients had discontinued the direct oral anticoagulant. The primary outcome of ischemic stroke, major bleeding, and mortality was lower with LAAC (256 events; 14.5 event rate per 100 patient-years) compared with the direct oral anticoagulant group (461 events; 25.7 event rate per 100 patient-years; HR, 0.57; 95% CI, 0.49 to 0.67). Ischemic stroke was not significantly different between groups (HR, 1.11; 95% CI, 0.71 to 1.75). Major bleeding (HR, 0.62; 95% CI, 0.49 to 0.79), all-cause mortality (HR, 0.53; 95% CI, 0.43 to 0.64), and cardiovascular mortality (HR, 0.51; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.70) were reduced with LAAC compared to direct oral anticoagulants.

Section Summary: Amplatzer Amulet

Two RCTs compared the Amulet and Watchman devices, one of which was a short-term trial that assessed periprocedural outcomes at 45 days. The second trial comparing the Amulet and Watchman devices found the Amulet device to be noninferior to the Watchman device after 18-months follow-up for a composite efficacy outcome that included ischemic stroke or systemic embolism and for a composite safety outcome that included all-cause mortality, major bleeding or procedure-related complications. At 3- and 5-year follow-up, clinical outcomes remained similar between patients in the Amulet group and the Watchman group, with a higher percentage of Amulet users not using oral anticoagulation. The primary mechanism of action endpoint of device closure at 45 days was observed in 98.9% of Amulet subjects and 96.8% of Watchman subjects. The 97.5% lower confidence bound was 0.41%, which was

greater than the predefined non-inferiority margin of -3% (p<.0001). Therefore, device closure with the Amulet device was non-inferior to the Watchman device. Thirteen-month follow-up to the SWISS-APERO trial provided additional safety information, showing no differences in device-related thrombus between devices, including when only patients with the Watchman FLX were analyzed and compared to Amulet.

One additional RCT evaluated the use of either the Amplatzer Amulet or Watchman device versus anticoagulants; subgroup analyses according to the device were not performed. After up to 4 years of follow-up, the study found LAA closure with either the Watchman or Amulet was noninferior to anticoagulants for a composite outcome that included stroke, TIA, systemic embolism, clinically significant bleeding, significant periprocedural or device-related complications, or cardiovascular mortality.

The summary of the clinical evidence provides a reasonable assurance that the Amulet device is effective for reducing the risk of thrombus embolization from the LAA in select patients with non-valvular AF.

Other Percutaneous Left Atrial Appendage Closure Devices

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of other percutaneous LAAC devices in individuals who have AF and are at increased risk for embolic stroke is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this policy.

Populations

The relevant population of interest is individuals with AF. Atrial fibrillation causes a low flow state in the left atrium which increases the risk of thromboembolism. Strokes in individuals with AF occur primarily due to thromboembolism from the left atrium. Individuals with AF who are not treated have a 5% estimated incidence of stroke.

Interventions

The interventions of interest are percutaneous LAA occlusion devices other than the Watchman or Amulet devices. By occluding the LAA, thrombus formation is prevented, potentially preventing stroke. Other devices currently being evaluated for the use of LAA occlusion include:

- The Lariat Loop Applicator is a suture delivery device approved by the FDA to facilitate suture placement and knot tying for use in surgical applications where soft tissues are being approximated or ligated with a pretied polyester suture. The approved use does not specify LAA occlusion. While the Watchman and other devices are implanted in the endocardium, the Lariat is a non-implant epicardial device. The Lariat is contraindicated in individuals with active pericarditis; prior sternotomy or other mediastinal surgery or known pericardial adhesions; appendage width >45 mm; superiorly oriented appendage lying near or behind the pulmonary arterial trunk; or appendage thrombus.

- The Amplatzer Cardiac Plug is a transcatheter, self-expanding device constructed from the nitinol mesh and polyester patch. It is a precursor to the FDA-approved Amplatzer Amulet device, discussed above. The Amplatzer Cardiac Plug is not FDA-approved for LAA closure.

Comparators
The current treatment for stroke prevention in individuals with AF is systemic anticoagulation. While anticoagulants are effective in preventing stroke, the increased risk of bleeding is a potential harm. Warfarin, which is the most common anticoagulant in use, requires frequent monitoring and lifestyle changes. Other anticoagulants found to be noninferior to warfarin include dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are rates of ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke, cardiovascular or unexplained death, and systemic embolism, measured between 6 to 12 months of follow-up, although some studies show follow-up of up to 5 years. Additional outcomes of interest include device- or procedure-related events that may occur within 1 week of the procedure, in particular, events requiring open cardiac surgery or major endovascular intervention (e.g., pseudoaneurysm repair, arteriovenous fistula repair, or other major endovascular repair).

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:
- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse effects, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

Lariat Device
Systematic Reviews
Chatterjee et al. (2015) published a systematic review of studies on the Lariat device. (53) No RCTs were identified. Five case series or observational studies were included, with a total of 309 patients (range, 4 to 154 patients). (54-58) The combined estimate of procedural success was 90.3%. One (0.3%) death was reported, and 7 (2.3%) patients required urgent cardiac surgery. Reviewers also searched the MAUDE database for adverse events and found 35 unique reports. Among the 35 reported complications, there were 5 deaths and 23 cases of emergency cardiac surgery.

Randomized Controlled Trial
Lakkireddy et al. (2024) published the aMAZE open-label trial which randomized patients with nonparoxysmal atrial fibrillation to pulmonary vein isolation alone or (n=206) pulmonary vein isolation with left atrial appendage ligation with the Lariat device (n=404). (59) The trial had 2 co-primary endpoints - one for safety and one for efficacy. The primary efficacy endpoint was

freedom from atrial fibrillation episodes at 12 months follow-up and was not significantly different between groups by Bayesian primary analysis with 64.3% effectiveness for those receiving left atrial appendage ligation and 59.9% for those who did not receive the procedure (4.3% difference; 95% Bayesian credible interval, -4.2% to 13.2%; posterior probability, 0.835). The Bayesian probability did not meet the 0.977 criterion for superiority. For the primary safety endpoint of serious adverse events 30 days after the procedure, the Bayesian safety estimate was 3.4% (Bayesian 95% credible interval, 2.0% to 5.0%; posterior probability, 1.0), which met the probability criterion of 0.957 for safety compared with the performance goal of 10% or less.

Observational Studies

Individual observational studies published since the systematic review included a large 2016 observational study of 712 consecutive patients from 18 U.S. hospitals. (60) This study reported a procedural (suture deployment) success rate of 95% and complete closure rate in 98%. The high success rate was attributed to the appropriate selection of patients for the procedure, which was determined by a screening CT scan showing if the LAA anatomy was suitable for Lariat deployment. There was 1 death, and emergent cardiac surgery was required in 1.4%. Cardiac perforations (overall and those needing surgery) and the number of patients needing blood transfusions decreased when providers altered the procedure from using large bore needles to micropuncture needles. Other individual observational studies are smaller, reporting success rates and complication rates in the same range. (61-64)

Litwinowicz et al. (2018) presented an observational study of 139 patients from a single center undergoing LAAC with the Lariat device, with a longer follow-up than the other observational studies. (65) After a follow-up of 5 years (428 patient-years), the thromboembolism rate was 0.8%, with a calculated bleeding risk reduction of 78%. The overall mortality rate was 1.6%. Litwinowicz et al. (2019) reported on the same set of patients, dividing them into 2 groups: patients with prior stroke (n=37) and those without prior stroke (control group; n=102). (66) Results showed that patients in the stroke group had significantly higher $CHADS_2$, CHA_2-DS_2-VASc, and HAS-BLED scores than the control group (all p<.0001). Thromboembolic event rate, bleeding event rate, and mortality rate were not significantly different between groups. The investigators concluded that patients with prior stroke may be preferred for LAAC, regardless of whether a contraindication for anticoagulant therapy exists.

Jazayeri et al. (2018) evaluated the safety profiles of the Watchman and the Lariat devices, using the FDA's MAUDE database from 2009 to 2016, as described in the Watchman section above. (43) A total of 4889 Lariat devices were implanted, with 136 events reported during the study period. The most common events in the Lariat group were pericardial effusion (46 [0.94%]), need for cardiac surgery (38 [0.78%]), and pericardiocentesis (23 [0.47%]). Ten deaths were reported in the Lariat group, with 6 involving the tightening of the suture around the LAA. Compared to the Watchman device, the composite outcome occurred significantly more in the group receiving the Watchman than in the group receiving the Lariat (1.9% vs. 1.1%; p=.001).

Nonrandomized Comparative Study

Litwinowicz et al. (2019) compared outcomes of patients undergoing LAAC with the Lariat device (n=57) with patients receiving either warfarin or clopidogrel (n=31). (67) Age, sex, and comorbidities were similar between the 2 groups. Treatment prior to the study differed significantly. The Lariat group received warfarin (93%), aspirin (4%), aspirin plus clopidogrel (2%), and no anticoagulation (1%). The control group received warfarin (87%) or clopidogrel (13%). However, there was no significant difference in CHA_2DS_2-VAS scores between the groups at baseline. The average follow-up in the Lariat group was 59 months and the average follow-up in the control group was 60 months. There were no thromboembolic events in the Lariat group, while 9.6% of the control group experienced thromboembolic events (p=.02). The bleeding risk reduction in the Lariat group was estimated at 53%.

Section Summary: Lariat Device

One RCT of the Lariat device for LAAC found similar atrial fibrillation outcomes when comparing pulmonary vein isolation alone to pulmonary vein isolation plus LAAC. There was 1 nonrandomized study comparing patients undergoing LAAC with the Lariat device with patients receiving either anticoagulant or antiplatelet therapy. Results showed significantly fewer thromboembolic events in the group undergoing LAAC with the Lariat device compared with the group receiving medication alone. The remaining evidence consisted of observational studies. The evidence is insufficient to draw conclusions about treatment efficacy.

Amplatzer Cardiac Plug Device (first generation)

The Amplatzer Cardiac Plus Clinical Trial (NCT01118299) comparing the cardiac plug device with anticoagulant therapy discontinued enrollment after enrolling 97 participants (of a planned minimum of 400 participants) and results are currently unpublished. The available evidence on the use of the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug device for LAAC consists of a number of observational studies. Nietlispach et al. (2013) published the largest cohort, which included 152 patients from a single institution in Europe. (68) Short-term complications occurred in 9.8% (15/152) of patients. The longer-term adverse outcomes occurred in 7% of patients, including 2 strokes, 1 peripheral embolization, and 4 episodes of major bleeding. Device embolization occurred in 4.6% (7/152) of patients. Other reports of patients treated with the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug device include a study of 90 patients from Belgium (2013), (69) 86 patients from Portugal (2012), (70) 37 patients from Italy (2013), (71) 35 patients from Spain (2013), (72) 21 patients from Poland (2013), (73) and 20 patients from China (2012). (35) All studies reported high procedural success rates, as well as complications such as vascular events, air embolism, esophageal injury, cardiac tamponade, and device embolization.

Cruz-Gonzales et al. (2020), in their retrospective registry study, aimed to evaluate the safety and efficacy of LAAC for patients with nonvalvular AF with prior stroke or TIA despite anticoagulant therapy (resistant stroke). (74) They assessed data from the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug multicenter registry on 1047 consecutive patients with nonvalvular AF undergoing LAA occlusion. Of the 1047 patients, 115 had resistant stroke and 932 had other indications. The resistant stroke group had a significantly higher mean CHA_2DS_2-VASc score (5.5±1.5 in the resistant stroke group vs 4.6±1.6 in the non-stroke group; p<.001) and HAS-BLED score (3.9±1.3 vs 3.1±1.2; p<.001). There were no significant differences between groups in procedural success

or periprocedural major safety events (7.8% vs 4.5%; p=.10). All patients completed at least 1 year of follow-up. At follow-up, the observed annual rate of stroke or TIA was 2.6% (65% relative reduction of thromboembolism based on the CHA_2DS_2-VASc score) in the resistant stroke group and 1.2% (78% relative risk reduction) for the non-stroke group. In addition, the observed annual major bleeding rate was 0% (100% relative reduction based on the HAS-BLED score) for resistant stroke patients and 1.2% (79% relative reduction) for those without prior stroke/TIA. Although larger controlled trials are needed, LAAC showed significant benefit to patients who had had a previous stroke or TIA.

Several other observational studies have reported on the use of the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug device in patients with a contraindication to oral anticoagulation therapy. Santoro et al. (2016), in the largest observational study, reported on outcomes up to 4 years postprocedure for 134 patients with nonvalvular AF and a long-term contraindication to oral anticoagulation treated with the Cardiac Plus device. (75) Patients had a median CHA_2DS_2-VASc score of 4 and were generally considered at high risk for bleeding complications. Procedural success occurred in 93.3%, and 3 major procedure-related complications (2 cases of cardiac tamponade, 1 case of pericardial effusion requiring drainage or surgery) occurred. Over a mean follow-up of 680 days, observed annual rates of ischemic strokes and any thromboembolic events were 0.8% and 2.5%, respectively. Other observational studies have been published in this population, evaluating between 37 and 100 patients. (71, 76-79) These studies also reported high success rates and low procedural complications.

Gloekler et al. (2015) reviewed records from 2 university hospitals' occlusion registries and conducted a retrospective analysis comparing the last 50 consecutive patients receiving the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug with the first 50 consecutive patients receiving the Amulet. (79) Follow-up examinations were performed between 4 to 6 months post-procedure. No significant differences between the 2 devices were detected in mortality, neurologic events, late pericardial effusions, major bleeding, device leaks, or device thrombi. Interpretation of these results is limited by the small sample size and short follow-up period.

Sectional Summary: Amplatzer Cardiac Plug Device

There are no RCTs of the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug device for LAAC. Numerous observational studies found high procedural success rates, but complication rates varied according to the AF population.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have atrial fibrillation (AF) who are at increased risk for embolic stroke who receive a U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (LAAC) device (e.g., the Watchman or Amulet device), the evidence includes randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. The most relevant evidence for the Watchman device comes from 2 industry-sponsored RCTs comparing the Watchman device with anticoagulation alone. One trial reported noninferiority on a composite outcome of stroke, cardiovascular/unexplained death, or systemic embolism after 2 years of follow-up, with

continued benefits with the Watchman device after 4 years of follow-up. The second trial did not demonstrate noninferiority for the same composite outcome but did demonstrate noninferiority of the Watchman device to warfarin for late ischemic stroke and systemic embolization. Patient-level meta-analyses at 5-year follow-up for the 2 Watchman trials reported that the Watchman device is noninferior to warfarin on the composite outcome of stroke, systemic embolism, and cardiovascular death. Also, the Watchman was associated with lower rates of major bleeding, particularly hemorrhagic stroke, and mortality over the long term. Evidence for the Amplatzer Amulet device comes from 2 RCTs comparing the Amulet and Watchman devices, one of which was a shorter trial that assessed periprocedural outcomes at 45 days and again at 13 months. The second trial comparing the Amulet and Watchman devices found the Amulet device to be noninferior to the Watchman device after 18 months of follow-up for a composite efficacy outcome that included ischemic stroke or systemic embolism and for a composite safety outcome that included all-cause mortality, major bleeding or procedure-related complications. At 3- and 5-year follow-up, clinical outcomes remained similar between patients in the Amulet group and the Watchman group, with a higher percentage of Amulet users not using oral anticoagulation. One additional RCT evaluated the use of either the Amplatzer Amulet or Watchman device versus anticoagulants; subgroup analyses according to device were not performed. After up to 4 years of follow-up, the study found LAAC with either the Watchman or Amulet was noninferior to anticoagulants for a composite outcome that included stroke, transient ischemic attack (TIA), systemic embolism, clinically significant bleeding, significant periprocedural or device-related complications, or cardiovascular mortality. Among patients in which the long-term risk of systemic anticoagulation exceeds the procedural risk of device implantation, the net health outcome will be improved. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have AF who are at increased risk for embolic stroke who receive a percutaneous LAAC device other than the Watchman device or Amplatzer Amulet device (e.g., Lariat or Amplatzer Cardiac Plug), the evidence includes one RCT, several nonrandomized comparator studies, and uncontrolled observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. One RCT with the Lariat device did not find a reduction in atrial arrhythmias when the device was used in combination with pulmonary vein isolation compared with pulmonary vein isolation alone. One nonrandomized study that compared outcomes among patients undergoing LAAC with the Lariat device with patients receiving anticoagulant or antiplatelet therapy reported fewer thromboembolic events in the group receiving the Lariat device. Evidence from other observational studies of these devices report high procedural success but also numerous complications. In addition, these devices do not have FDA approval for LAAC. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

American College of Chest Physicians

In 2018, the American College of Chest Physicians (CHEST) guideline made the following recommendation regarding left atrial appendage (LAA) occlusion and oral anticoagulation: "In

patients with AF [atrial fibrillation] at high risk of ischemic stroke who have absolute contraindications for OAC [oral anticoagulation], we suggest using LAA occlusion (Weak recommendation, low-quality evidence)." (5)

American Heart Association

In 2019, the American Heart Association (AHA), in collaboration with the American College of Cardiology (ACC) and the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS), published an update of their guideline for the management of patients with AF. (80) A new recommendation in the guideline states: "Percutaneous LAA occlusion may be considered in patients with AF at increased risk of stroke who have contraindications to long-term anticoagulation." The class of recommendation is IIb (weak), and the level of evidence is B_NR (moderate quality of evidence, nonrandomized). No other LAA closure (LAAC) devices are mentioned in the guideline. Another guideline update was published in 2023. (81) Based on additional data on safety and efficacy of LAA occlusion devices, the class of recommendation was updated to IIa (moderate) compared to the 2019 recommendation of IIb.

The AHA also released a scientific statement in 2021 about managing AF in patients with heart failure and reduced ejection fraction. (82) They state that, "It is reasonable to consider LAA closure in patients with AF and heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF) with moderate to high stroke risk and contraindications to long-term oral anticoagulation", however, they also note that the role of LAA therapies in patients with AF with HFrEF needs to be better understood, and this is an opportunity for future research.

Heart Rhythm Society

In collaboration with the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions Foundation, the HRS published an expert consensus statement on transcatheter LAAC in 2023. (83) They state that "LAAC is appropriate for patients with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation with high thromboembolic risk who are not suited for long-term oral anticoagulation and who have adequate life expectancy (minimum >1 year) and quality of life to benefit from LAAC."

Medicare National Coverage

Since 2016, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has a national coverage determination under coverage with evidence development for percutaneous LAAC in AF, as follows (84):

"LAAC devices are covered when the device has received Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Premarket Approval (PMA) for that device's FDA-approved indication and meet all of the conditions specified below:

The patient must have:

- A $CHADS_2$ score ≥2 (Congestive heart failure, Hypertension, Age > 75, Diabetes, Stroke/transient ischemia attack/thromboembolism) or CHA_2DS_2-VASc score ≥ 3 (Congestive heart failure, Hypertension, Age ≥ 65, Diabetes, Stroke/transient ischemia attack/ thromboembolism, Vascular disease, Sex category).

- A formal shared decision-making interaction with an independent non-interventional physician using an evidence-based decision tool on oral anticoagulation in patients with NVAF [nonvalvular atrial fibrillation] prior to LAAC. Additionally, the shared decision-making interaction must be documented in the medical record.
- A suitability for short-term warfarin but deemed unable to take long-term oral anticoagulation following the conclusion of shared decision making, as LAAC is only covered as a second line therapy to oral anticoagulants. The patient (preoperatively and postoperatively) is under the care of a cohesive, multidisciplinary team (MDT) of medical professionals. The procedure must be furnished in a hospital with an established structural heart disease (SHD) and/or electrophysiology (EP) program.

The procedure must be performed by an interventional cardiologist(s), electrophysiologist(s), or cardiovascular surgeon(s) that meet the following criteria:
- Has received training prescribed by the manufacturer on the safe and effective use of the device prior to performing LAAC; and,
- Has performed ≥ 25 interventional cardiac procedures that involve transseptal puncture through an intact septum; and,
- Continues to perform ≥ 25 interventional cardiac procedures that involve transseptal puncture through an intact septum, of which at least 12 are LAAC, over a 2-year period."

Patients must be enrolled in approved registries that track outcomes for procedures and devices.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
Some currently ongoing and unpublished trials that might influence this policy are listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of Key Trials

NCT Number	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
NCT06686485	COncomitant Left Atrial APpendage Closure and Pulsed Field AblaTION-Asia	733	Oct 2029
NCT06465706	A Prospective, Multicenter, Randomized Controlled Trial Assessing the Safety and Efficacy of the LAmbre™ Plus Left Atrial Appendage Closure System to REDUCE the Risk of Thromboembolism in Patients With Non-Valvular Atrial Fibrillation	1826	Jan 2030
NCT06861673	COnCOmitaNt Pulse Field Ablation Based pUlmonary Vein Isolation and lefT Atrial Appendage Closure - The COCONUT Study	60	Dec 2026

NCT03309332[a]	OSB Lead-AMPLATZER PFO Occluder New Enrollment PAS	1214	Feb 2030
NCT04394546[a]	WATCHMAN FLX Versus NOAC for Embolic ProtectION in in the Management of Patients With Non-Valvular Atrial Fibrillation	3000	Dec 2027
NCT04226547[a]	Clinical Trial of Atrial Fibrillation Patient Comparing Left Atrial Appendage Occlusion Therapy to Non-vitamin K Antagonist Oral Anticoagulants	2650	Apr 2030
Unpublished			
NCT03463317	Left Atrial Appendage CLOSURE in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation at High Risk of Stroke and Bleeding Compared to Medical Therapy: a Prospective Randomized Clinical Trial	912	Nov 2024
NCT03276169	Left Atrial Function Changes after Left Atrial Appendage Closure in Patients with Persistent Atrial Fibrillation	105	Nov 2020 (updated Mar 2021)
NCT01118299[a]	AMPLATZER Cardiac Plug Clinical Trial	97 (actual; study terminated)	Dec 2018 (updated Apr 2020)
NCT02681042	Left Atrial Appendage Closure with SentreHeart Lariat Device	9	May 2018 (updated Feb 2021)

NCT: national clinical trial.
[a] indicates industry-sponsored study.

Coding

Procedure codes on Medical Policy documents are included **only** as a general reference tool for each policy. **They may not be all-inclusive.**

The presence or absence of procedure, service, supply, or device codes in a Medical Policy document has no relevance for determination of benefit coverage for members or reimbursement for providers. **Only the written coverage position in a Medical Policy should be used for such determinations.**

Benefit coverage determinations based on written Medical Policy coverage positions must include review of the member's benefit contract or Summary Plan Description (SPD) for defined coverage vs. non-coverage, benefit exclusions, and benefit limitations such as dollar or duration caps.

CPT Codes	33340, 33999
HCPCS Codes	None

*Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®) ©2024 American Medical Association: Chicago, IL.

References

1. Mou L, Norby FL, Chen LY, et al. Lifetime Risk of Atrial Fibrillation by Race and Socioeconomic Status: ARIC Study (Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities). Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol. Jul 2018; 11(7):e006350. PMID 30002066
2. Dewland TA, Olgin JE, Vittinghoff E, et al. Incident atrial fibrillation among Asians, Hispanics, blacks, and whites. Circulation. Dec 03 2013; 128(23):2470-2477. PMID 24103419
3. Gardener H, Sacco RL, Rundek T, et al. Race and Ethnic Disparities in Stroke Incidence in the Northern Manhattan Study. Stroke. Apr 2020; 51(4):1064-1069. PMID 32078475
4. Guo J, Gabriel N, Magnani JW, et al. Racial and Urban-Rural Difference in the Frequency of Ischemic Stroke as Initial Manifestation of Atrial Fibrillation. Front Public Health. 2021; 9:780185. PMID 34805085
5. Lip GYH, Banerjee A, Boriani G, et al. Antithrombotic Therapy for Atrial Fibrillation: CHEST Guideline and Expert Panel Report. Chest. Nov 2018; 154(5):1121-1201. PMID 30144419
6. January CT, Wann LS, Alpert JS, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS guideline for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. J Am Coll Cardiol. Dec 02 2014; 64(21):e1-e76. PMID 24685669
7. Lip GY, Frison L, Halperin JL, et al. Comparative validation of a novel risk score for predicting bleeding risk in anticoagulated patients with atrial fibrillation: the HAS-BLED (Hypertension, Abnormal Renal/Liver Function, Stroke, Bleeding History or Predisposition, Labile INR, Elderly, Drugs/Alcohol Concomitantly) score. J Am Coll Cardiol. Jan 11 2011; 57(2):173-180. PMID 21111555
8. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data. WATCHMAN Left Atrial Appendage Closure Device with Delivery System and WATCHMAN FLX Left Atrial Appendage Closure Device with Delivery System. Available at <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov> (accessed March 19, 2025).
9. Food and Drug Administration. Approval Letter: Amplatzer Amulet Left Atrial Appendage Occluder; 2021. Available at <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov> (accessed March 21, 2025).
10. Food and Drug Administration. Left Atrial Appendage Occlusion (LAAO) Devices Potentially Associated with Procedural Outcome Differences Between Women and Men: Letter to Health Care Providers. Available at <https://public4.pagefreezer.com> (accessed March 20, 2025).
11. Darden D, Duong T, Du C, et al. Sex Differences in Procedural Outcomes Among Patients Undergoing Left Atrial Appendage Occlusion: Insights From the NCDR LAAO Registry. JAMA Cardiol. Nov 01 2021; 6(11):1275-1284. PMID 34379072
12. Food and Drug Administration. Approval Letter: WATCHMAN LAA Closure Technology. 2015. Available at <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov> (accessed March 24, 2025).
13. Reddy VY, Doshi SK, Kar S, et al. 5-Year Outcomes After Left Atrial Appendage Closure: From the PREVAIL and PROTECT AF Trials. J Am Coll Cardiol. Dec 19 2017; 70(24):2964-2975. PMID 29103847
14. Bode WD, Patel N, Gehi AK. Left atrial appendage occlusion for prevention of stroke in nonvalvular atrial fibrillation: a meta-analysis. J Interv Card Electrophysiol. Jun 2015; 43(1):79-89. PMID 25711953
15. Briceno DF, Villablanca P, Cyrille N, et al. Left Atrial Appendage Occlusion Device and Novel Oral Anticoagulants Versus Warfarin for Stroke Prevention in Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation:

Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol. Oct 2015; 8(5):1057-1064. PMID 26226997
16. Holmes DR, Doshi SK, Kar S, et al. Left Atrial Appendage Closure as an Alternative to Warfarin for Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation: A Patient-Level Meta-Analysis. J Am Coll Cardiol. Jun 23 2015; 65(24):2614-2623. PMID 26088300
17. Li X, Wen SN, Li SN, et al. Over 1-year efficacy and safety of left atrial appendage occlusion versus novel oral anticoagulants for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and observational studies. Heart Rhythm. Jun 2016; 13(6):1203-1214. PMID 26724488
18. Lip GY, Lane DA. Stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation: a systematic review. JAMA. May 19 2015; 313(19):1950-1962. PMID 25988464
19. Price MJ, Reddy VY, Valderrábano M, et al. Bleeding Outcomes After Left Atrial Appendage Closure Compared With Long-Term Warfarin: A Pooled, Patient-Level Analysis of the WATCHMAN Randomized Trial Experience. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. Dec 28 2015; 8(15):1925-1932. PMID 26627989
20. Noelck N, Papak J, Freeman M, et al. Effectiveness of Left Atrial Appendage Exclusion Procedures to Reduce the Risk of Stroke: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. Jul 2016; 9(4):395-405. PMID 27407055
21. Sahay S, Nombela-Franco L, Rodes-Cabau J, et al. Efficacy and safety of left atrial appendage closure versus medical treatment in atrial fibrillation: a network meta-analysis from randomised trials. Heart. Jan 15 2017; 103(2):139-147. PMID 27587437
22. Oliva A, Ioppolo AM, Chiarito M, et al. Left Atrial Appendage Closure Compared With Oral Anticoagulants for Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. J Am Heart Assoc. Aug 20 2024; 13(16):e034815. PMID 39119987
23. Wei Z, Zhang X, Wu H, et al. A meta-analysis for efficacy and safety evaluation of transcatheter left atrial appendage occlusion in patients with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation. Medicine (Baltimore). Aug 2016; 95(31):e4382. PMID 27495048
24. Tereshchenko LG, Henrikson CA, Cigarroa J, et al. Comparative Effectiveness of Interventions for Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation: A Network Meta-Analysis. J Am Heart Assoc. May 20 2016; 5(5):e003206. PMID 27207998
25. Bajaj NS, Kalra R, Patel N, et al. Comparison of Approaches for Stroke Prophylaxis in Patients with Non-Valvular Atrial Fibrillation: Network Meta-Analyses of Randomized Controlled Trials. PLoS One. 2016; 11(10):e0163608. PMID 27706224
26. Hanif H, Belley-Cote EP, Alotaibi A, et al. Left atrial appendage occlusion for stroke prevention in patients with atrial fibrillation: a systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino). Feb 2018; 59(1):128-139. PMID 28215062
27. Holmes DR, Reddy VY, Turi ZG, et al. Percutaneous closure of the left atrial appendage versus warfarin therapy for prevention of stroke in patients with atrial fibrillation: a randomised non-inferiority trial. Lancet. Aug 15 2009; 374(9689):534-542. PMID 19683639
28. Reddy VY, Doshi SK, Sievert H, et al. Percutaneous left atrial appendage closure for stroke prophylaxis in patients with atrial fibrillation: 2.3-Year Follow-up of the PROTECT AF (Watchman Left Atrial Appendage System for Embolic Protection in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation) Trial. Circulation. Feb 12 2013; 127(6):720-729. PMID 23325525

29. Reddy VY, Sievert H, Halperin J, et al. Percutaneous left atrial appendage closure vs warfarin for atrial fibrillation: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA. Nov 19 2014; 312(19):1988-1998. PMID 25399274
30. Alli O, Doshi S, Kar S, et al. Quality of life assessment in the randomized PROTECT AF (Percutaneous Closure of the Left Atrial Appendage Versus Warfarin Therapy for Prevention of Stroke in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation) trial of patients at risk for stroke with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation. J Am Coll Cardiol. Apr 30 2013; 61(17):1790-1798. PMID 23500276
31. Holmes DR, Kar S, Price MJ, et al. Prospective randomized evaluation of the Watchman Left Atrial Appendage Closure device in patients with atrial fibrillation versus long-term warfarin therapy: the PREVAIL trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. Jul 08 2014; 64(1):1-12. PMID 24998121
32. Osmancik P, Herman D, Neuzil P, et al. Left Atrial Appendage Closure Versus Direct Oral Anticoagulants in High-Risk Patients With Atrial Fibrillation. J Am Coll Cardiol. Jun 30 2020; 75(25):3122-3135. PMID 32586585
33. Osmancik P, Herman D, Neuzil P, et al. 4-Year Outcomes After Left Atrial Appendage Closure Versus Nonwarfarin Oral Anticoagulation for Atrial Fibrillation. J Am Coll Cardiol. Jan 04 2022; 79(1):1-14. PMID 34748929
34. Wazni OM, Saliba WI, Nair DG, et al. Left Atrial Appendage Closure after Ablation for Atrial Fibrillation. N Engl J Med. Apr 03 2025; 392(13):1277-1287. PMID 39555822
35. Lam YY, Yip GW, Yu CM, et al. Left atrial appendage closure with AMPLATZER cardiac plug for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation: initial Asia-Pacific experience. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. Apr 01 2012; 79(5):794-800. PMID 21542102
36. Montenegro MJ, Quintella EF, Damonte A, et al. Percutaneous occlusion of left atrial appendage with the Amplatzer Cardiac PlugTM in atrial fibrillation. Arq Bras Cardiol. Feb 2012; 98(2):143-50. PMID 22286325
37. Park JW, Bethencourt A, Sievert H, et al. Left atrial appendage closure with Amplatzer cardiac plug in atrial fibrillation: initial European experience. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. Apr 01 2011; 77(5):700-706. PMID 20824765
38. Reddy VY, Holmes D, Doshi SK, et al. Safety of percutaneous left atrial appendage closure: results from the Watchman Left Atrial Appendage System for Embolic Protection in Patients with AF (PROTECT AF) clinical trial and the Continued Access Registry. Circulation. Feb 01 2011; 123(4):417-424. PMID 21242484
39. Swaans MJ, Post MC, Rensing BJ, et al. Percutaneous left atrial appendage closure for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation. Neth Heart J. Apr 2012; 20(4):161-166. PMID 22231152
40. Reddy VY, Möbius-Winkler S, Miller MA, et al. Left atrial appendage closure with the Watchman device in patients with a contraindication for oral anticoagulation: the ASAP study (ASA Plavix Feasibility Study With Watchman Left Atrial Appendage Closure Technology). J Am Coll Cardiol. Jun 25 2013; 61(25):2551-2556. PMID 23583249
41. Boersma LV, Schmidt B, Betts TR, et al. Implant success and safety of left atrial appendage closure with the WATCHMAN device: peri-procedural outcomes from the EWOLUTION registry. Eur Heart J. Aug 2016; 37(31):2465-2474. PMID 26822918
42. Dukkipati SR, Kar S, Holmes DR, et al. Device-Related Thrombus After Left Atrial Appendage Closure: Incidence, Predictors, and Outcomes. Circulation. Aug 28 2018; 138(9):874-885. PMID 29752398

43. Jazayeri MA, Vuddanda V, Turagam MK, et al. Safety profiles of percutaneous left atrial appendage closure devices: An analysis of the Food and Drug Administration Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) database from 2009 to 2016. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. Jan 2018; 29(1):5-13. PMID 28988455
44. Lakkireddy D, Thaler D, Ellis CR, et al. Amplatzer Amulet Left Atrial Appendage Occluder Versus Watchman Device for Stroke Prophylaxis (Amulet IDE): A Randomized, Controlled Trial. Circulation. Nov 09 2021; 144(19):1543-1552. PMID 34459659
45. Galea R, De Marco F, Meneveau N, et al. Amulet or Watchman Device for Percutaneous Left Atrial Appendage Closure: Primary Results of the SWISS-APERO Randomized Clinical Trial. Circulation. Mar 08 2022; 145(10):724-738. PMID 34747186
46. Galea R, Meneveau N, De Marco F, et al. One-Year Outcomes After Amulet or Watchman Device for Percutaneous Left Atrial Appendage Closure: A Prespecified Analysis of the SWISS-APERO Randomized Clinical Trial. Circulation. Feb 06 2024; 149(6):484-486. PMID 37875064
47. Lakkireddy D, Thaler D, Ellis CR, et al. 3-Year Outcomes From the Amplatzer Amulet Left Atrial Appendage Occluder Randomized Controlled Trial (Amulet IDE). JACC Cardiovasc Interv. Aug 14 2023; 16(15):1902-1913. PMID 37587599
48. Lakkireddy D, Ellis CR, Thaler D, et al. 5-Year Results From the AMPLATZER Amulet Left Atrial Appendage Occluder Randomized Controlled Trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. Mar 25 2025; 85(11):1141-1153. PMID 39570242
49. Landmesser U, Schmidt B, Nielsen-Kudsk JE, et al. Left atrial appendage occlusion with the AMPLATZER Amulet device: periprocedural and early clinical/echocardiographic data from a global prospective observational study. EuroIntervention. Sep 20 2017; 13(7):867-876. PMID 28649053
50. Landmesser U, Tondo C, Camm J, et al. Left atrial appendage occlusion with the AMPLATZER Amulet device: one-year follow-up from the prospective global Amulet observational registry. EuroIntervention. Aug 03 2018; 14(5):e590-e597. PMID 29806820
51. Hildick-Smith D, Landmesser U, Camm AJ, et al. Left atrial appendage occlusion with the Amplatzer™ Amulet™ device: full results of the prospective global observational study. Eur Heart J. Aug 07 2020; 41(30):2894-2901. PMID 32243499
52. Nielsen-Kudsk JE, Korsholm K, Damgaard D, et al. Clinical Outcomes Associated With Left Atrial Appendage Occlusion Versus Direct Oral Anticoagulation in Atrial Fibrillation. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. Jan 11 2021; 14(1):69-78. PMID 33413867
53. Chatterjee S, Herrmann HC, Wilensky RL, et al. Safety and Procedural Success of Left Atrial Appendage Exclusion With the Lariat Device: A Systematic Review of Published Reports and Analytic Review of the FDA MAUDE Database. JAMA Intern Med. Jul 2015; 175(7):1104-1109. PMID 25938303
54. Price MJ, Gibson DN, Yakubov SJ, et al. Early safety and efficacy of percutaneous left atrial appendage suture ligation: results from the U.S. transcatheter LAA ligation consortium. J Am Coll Cardiol. Aug 12 2014; 64(6):565-572. PMID 25104525
55. Bartus K, Han FT, Bednarek J, et al. Percutaneous left atrial appendage suture ligation using the LARIAT device in patients with atrial fibrillation: initial clinical experience. J Am Coll Cardiol. Jul 09 2013; 62(2):108-118. PMID 23062528

56. Massumi A, Chelu MG, Nazeri A, et al. Initial experience with a novel percutaneous left atrial appendage exclusion device in patients with atrial fibrillation, increased stroke risk, and contraindications to anticoagulation. Am J Cardiol. Mar 15 2013; 111(6):869-873. PMID 23312129
57. Miller MA, Gangireddy SR, Doshi SK, et al. Multicenter study on acute and long-term safety and efficacy of percutaneous left atrial appendage closure using an epicardial suture snaring device. Heart Rhythm. Nov 2014; 11(11):1853-1859. PMID 25068574
58. Gafoor S, Franke J, Bertog S, et al. Left atrial appendage occlusion in octogenarians: short-term and 1-year follow-up. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. Apr 01 2014; 83(5):805-810. PMID 24259397
59. Lakkireddy DR, Wilber DJ, Mittal S, et al. Pulmonary Vein Isolation With or Without Left Atrial Appendage Ligation in Atrial Fibrillation: The aMAZE Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. Apr 02 2024; 331(13):1099-1108. PMID 38563835
60. Lakkireddy D, Afzal MR, Lee RJ, et al. Short and long-term outcomes of percutaneous left atrial appendage suture ligation: Results from a US multicenter evaluation. Heart Rhythm. May 2016; 13(5):1030-1036. PMID 26872554
61. Bartus K, Bednarek J, Myc J, et al. Feasibility of closed-chest ligation of the left atrial appendage in humans. Heart Rhythm. Feb 2011; 8(2):188-193. PMID 21050893
62. Stone D, Byrne T, Pershad A. Early results with the LARIAT device for left atrial appendage exclusion in patients with atrial fibrillation at high risk for stroke and anticoagulation. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. Jul 2015; 86(1):121-127. PMID 23765504
63. Fink T, Schlüter M, Tilz RR, et al. Acute and long-term outcomes of epicardial left atrial appendage ligation with the second-generation LARIAT device: a high-volume electrophysiology center experience. Clin Res Cardiol. Dec 2018; 107(12):1139-1147. PMID 29881879
64. Dar T, Afzal MR, Yarlagadda B, et al. Mechanical function of the left atrium is improved with epicardial ligation of the left atrial appendage: Insights from the LAFIT-LARIAT Registry. Heart Rhythm. Jul 2018; 15(7):955-959. PMID 29477973
65. Litwinowicz R, Bartus M, Burysz M, et al. Long term outcomes after left atrial appendage closure with the LARIAT device-Stroke risk reduction over five years follow-up. PLoS One. 2018; 13(12):e0208710. PMID 30566961
66. Litwinowicz R, Bartus M, Malec-Litwinowicz M, et al. Left Atrial Appendage Occlusion for Secondary Stroke Prevention in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation: Long-Term Results. Cerebrovasc Dis. 2019; 47(3-4):188-195. PMID 31121584
67. Litwinowicz R, Bartus M, Kapelak B, et al. Reduction in risk of stroke and bleeding after left atrial appendage closure with LARIAT device in patients with increased risk of stroke and bleeding: Long term results. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. Nov 15 2019; 94(6):837-842. PMID 30884101
68. Nietlispach F, Gloekler S, Krause R, et al. Amplatzer left atrial appendage occlusion: single center 10-year experience. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. Aug 01 2013; 82(2):283-289. PMID 23412815
69. Kefer J, Vermeersch P, Budts W, et al. Transcatheter left atrial appendage closure for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation with Amplatzer cardiac plug: the Belgian Registry. Acta Cardiol. Dec 2013; 68(6):551-558. PMID 24579432

70. Guérios EE, Schmid M, Gloekler S, et al. Left atrial appendage closure with the Amplatzer cardiac plug in patients with atrial fibrillation. Arq Bras Cardiol. Jun 2012; 98(6):528-536. PMID 22584492
71. Danna P, Proietti R, Sagone A, et al. Does left atrial appendage closure with a cardiac plug system reduce the stroke risk in nonvalvular atrial fibrillation patients? A single-center case series. Pacing Clin Electrophysiol. Mar 2013; 36(3):347-353. PMID 23252940
72. Lopez-Minguez JR, Eldoayen-Gragera J, Gonzalez-Fernandez R, et al. Immediate and one-year results in 35 consecutive patients after closure of left atrial appendage with the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug. Rev Esp Cardiol. Feb 2013; 66(2):90-97. PMID 22939161
73. Streb W, Szymała M, Kukulski T, et al. Percutaneous closure of the left atrial appendage using the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug in patients with atrial fibrillation: evaluation of safety and feasibility. Kardiol Pol. 2013; 71(1):8-16. PMID 23348528
74. Cruz-González I, González-Ferreiro R, Freixa X, et al. Left atrial appendage occlusion for stroke despite oral anticoagulation (resistant stroke). Results from the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug registry. Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed). Jan 2020; 73(1):28-34. PMID 31036510
75. Santoro G, Meucci F, Stolcova M, et al. Percutaneous left atrial appendage occlusion in patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation: implantation and up to four years follow-up of the AMPLATZER Cardiac Plug. EuroIntervention. Feb 2016; 11(10):1188-1194. PMID 25354761
76. Meerkin D, Butnaru A, Dratva D, et al. Early safety of the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug™ for left atrial appendage occlusion. Int J Cardiol. Oct 09 2013; 168(4):3920-3925. PMID 23890886
77. Wiebe J, Bertog S, Franke J, et al. Safety of percutaneous left atrial appendage closure with the Amplatzer cardiac plug in patients with atrial fibrillation and contraindications to anticoagulation. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. Apr 01 2014; 83(5):796-802. PMID 24327462
78. Urena M, Rodés-Cabau J, Freixa X, et al. Percutaneous left atrial appendage closure with the AMPLATZER cardiac plug device in patients with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation and contraindications to anticoagulation therapy. J Am Coll Cardiol. Jul 09 2013; 62(2):96-102. PMID 23665098
79. Gloekler S, Shakir S, Doblies J, et al. Early results of first versus second generation Amplatzer occluders for left atrial appendage closure in patients with atrial fibrillation. Clin Res Cardiol. Aug 2015; 104(8):656-665. PMID 25736061
80. January CT, Wann LS, Calkins H, et al. 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS focused update of the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS guideline for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. Heart Rhythm. Aug 2019; 16(8):e66-e93. PMID 30703530
81. Joglar JA, Chung MK, Armbruster AL, et al. 2023 ACC/AHA/ACCP/HRS Guideline for the Diagnosis and Management of Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. Circulation. Jan 02 2024; 149(1):e1-e156. PMID 38033089
82. Gopinathannair R, Chen LY, Chung MK, et al. Managing Atrial Fibrillation in Patients With Heart Failure and Reduced Ejection Fraction: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol. Jun 2021; 14(6):HAE0000000000000078. PMID 34129347

83. Saw J, Holmes DR, Cavalcante JL, et al. SCAI/HRS expert consensus statement on transcatheter left atrial appendage closure. Heart Rhythm. May 2023; 20(5):e1-e16. PMID 36990925
84. Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Percutaneous Left Atrial Appendage Closure (LAAC) (20.34). 2016. Available at <https://www.cms.gov> (accessed March 24, 2025).

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)

The information contained in this section is for informational purposes only. HCSC makes no representation as to the accuracy of this information. It is not to be used for claims adjudication for HCSC Plans.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) does have a national Medicare coverage position. Coverage may be subject to local carrier discretion.

A national coverage position for Medicare may have been changed since this medical policy document was written. See Medicare's National Coverage at <https://www.cms.hhs.gov>.

Policy History/Revision

Date	Description of Change
07/15/2025	Document updated with literature review. Coverage unchanged. Added references 22, 34, 46-48, 59, 81, and 83.
10/15/2024	Reviewed. No changes.
06/01/2024	Document updated with literature review. The following change was made to Coverage: Amplatzer Cardiac Plug devices added to the list of other percutaneous left atrial appendage closure devices that are considered experimental, investigational and/or unproven. References 1-4, 9-11, 27, 34, 44-45, and 78 added; others removed. Title changed from Percutaneous and Surgical Closure of the Left Atrial Appendage for Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation. Surgical management of Left Atrial Appendage Occlusion Devices for Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation are now covered on SUR707.033.
08/15/2022	Reviewed. No changes.
02/01/2022	Document updated with literature review. The following change was made to Coverage: Statement on the Amplatzer™ Amulet™ device changed from experimental, investigational and/or unproven to conditionally medically necessary. References 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 29, 52, 60, 68 and 69 added.
07/01/2020	Document updated with literature review. The following changes were made to Coverage: 1) Separated percutaneous transcatheter closure and surgical closure into two sections, and 2) Modified the statement on surgical closure to clarify that both excision or epicardial clipping of the left atrial appendage is considered not medically necessary unless performed in conjunction with a Maze procedure to reduce future stroke risk for atrial fibrillation.

	Added/updated the following references: 6-7, 9-18, 23, 32-35, 39-41, 44-47, 59-61, 63-64, and 66-73. Title changed from: Occlusion, Ablation or Surgical Removal of the Left Atrial Appendage.
09/01/2017	Reviewed. No changes.
03/01/2017	Document updated with literature review. Coverage was changed to include CHADS2 or CHA2DS2-VASc score of ≥ 2 to the following criteria: The use of a device with U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval for percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (e.g., the Watchman) may be considered medically necessary for the prevention of stroke in patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) when there is an increased risk of stroke and systemic embolism based on CHADS2 or CHA2DS2-VASc score of ≥ 2 (S**ee NOTE)** and systemic anticoagulation therapy is recommended. The following Note was added to the coverage section for clarification: **NOTE**: Refer to the Description section for CHADS2 and CHA2DS2-VASc tables. Guidelines from the American College of Chest Physicians recommend the use of oral anticoagulation for patients with AF who are at high risk of stroke (i.e., CHADS2 score ≥2), with more individualized choice of antithrombotic therapy in patients with lower stroke risk. (1) Coverage was changed to add "including but not limited to AtriClip", to the following statement: Prophylactic occlusion, ablation or surgical removal of the left atrial appendage (LAA), including but not limited to AtriClip, is considered not medically necessary during open heart surgery to reduce future stroke risk except when performed in conjunction with a Maze procedure for atrial fibrillation (AF).
04/15/2016	Document updated with literature review. Coverage for percutaneous left atrial appendage closure (i.e., the Watchman) has changed to may be considered medically necessary for the prevention of stroke in patients with atrial fibrillation when criteria are met. The use of other percutaneous left atrial appendage closure devices, including but not limited to the Lariat, PLAATO, and Amplatzer devices, for stroke prevention in patients with atrial fibrillation is considered experimental, investigational and/or unproven.
11/01/2015	Document updated with literature review. Coverage unchanged.
01/01/2014	Policy updated with literature review. The following was added to the coverage section: The use of percutaneous left-atrial appendage closure devices for the prevention of stroke in atrial fibrillation is considered experimental, investigational and unproven. CPT/HCPCS code(s) updated.
07/01/2009	Policy updated with literature review. No change in coverage. This policy is no longer scheduled for routine literature review and update.
05/15/2007	Revised/updated entire document
01/01/2005	New medical document