HEALTH EVIDENCE REVIEW COMMISSION (HERC)

COVERAGE GUIDANCE: PROTON BEAM THERAPY

Approved January 14, 2016

HERC Coverage Guidance

Proton beam therapy (PBT) is recommended for coverage for malignant ocular tumors (*strong recommendation*).

Proton beam therapy is recommended for coverage *(weak recommendation)* for:

- malignant brain, spinal, skull base, paranasal sinus, and juxtaspinal tumors
- pediatric malignant tumors (incident cancer under age 21)

Proton beam therapy is not recommended for coverage for cancer of the bone, breast, oropharynx, nasopharynx, esophagus, liver, lung, or prostate or for gynecologic or gastrointestinal cancers, lymphoma, sarcoma, thymoma, seminoma, arteriovenous malformation or ocular hemangiomas *(weak recommendation).*

Note: Definitions for strength of recommendation are provided in Appendix A *GRADE Informed Framework Element Description.*

RATIONALE FOR GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT

The HERC selects topics for guideline development or technology assessment based on the following principles:

- Represents a significant burden of disease
- Represents important uncertainty with regard to efficacy or harms
- Represents important variation or controversy in clinical care
- Represents high costs, significant economic impact
- Topic is of high public interest

Coverage guidance development follows to translate the evidence review to a policy decision. Coverage guidance may be based on an evidence-based guideline developed by the Evidence-based Guideline Subcommittee or a health technology assessment developed by the Heath Technology Assessment Subcommittee. In addition, coverage guidance may utilize an existing evidence report produced by one of HERC's trusted sources, generally within the last three years.

EVIDENCE SOURCES

Trusted sources

Washington State Health Care Authority Health Technology Assessment Program. (2014). Proton Beam Therapy. Olympia, WA: Health Technology Assessment Program. Retrieved January 22, 2015 from http://www.hca.wa.gov/hta/Pages/proton.aspx.

The summary of evidence in this document is derived directly from this evidence source, and portions are extracted verbatim.

EVIDENCE OVERVIEW

Clinical background

Protons are positively-charged subatomic particles that have been in clinical use as a form of external beam radiotherapy for over 60 years. Compared to the photon X-ray energy used in conventional radiotherapy, proton beams have physical attributes that are potentially appealing. Specifically, protons deposit radiation energy at or around the target, at the end of the range of beam penetration, a phenomenon known as the Bragg peak. The goal of any external beam radiotherapy is to deliver sufficient radiation to the target tumor while mitigating the effects on adjacent normal tissue. This has been a challenge for conventional photon therapy due to the amount of radiation deposited both before and after the target is reached. While the amount of photon radiation at entry into the body is much higher than at exit, photon beams typically "scatter" to normal tissues after leaving the target. This so-called "exit" dose is absent for protons, as tissue beyond the point of peak energy deposition receives little to no radiation**.**

Initial use of proton beam therapy (PBT) focused on conditions where sparing very sensitive adjacent normal tissues was felt to be of utmost importance, such as cancers or noncancerous malformations of the brain stem, eye, or spinal cord. In addition, proton beam therapy was advocated for many pediatric tumors because even lower-dose irradiation of normal tissue in pediatric patients can result in pronounced acute and long-term toxicity. There are also long-standing concerns regarding radiation's potential to cause secondary malignancy later in life, particularly in those receiving radiation at younger ages. Finally, radiation may produce more nuanced effects in children, such as neurocognitive impairment in pediatric patients treated with radiotherapy for brain cancers.

More recently, however, the use of PBT has been expanded in many settings to treat more common cancers such as those of the prostate, breast, liver, and lung. With the growth in potential patient numbers and reimbursement, the construction of proton centers has grown substantially. There are now 14 operating proton centers in the U.S., including one in Seattle, WA that came online in March 2013. Eleven additional centers are under construction or in the planning stages, and many more are proposed. The construction of cyclotrons at the heart of proton beam facilities is very expensive ($150-$200 million for a multiple gantry facility).

Indications

This appraisal focuses on the use of proton beam therapy (PBT) to treat patients with multiple types of cancer as well as those with selected noncancerous conditions. Within each condition type, two general populations were specified as of interest for this evaluation**:**

- Patients receiving PBT as primary treatment for their condition (i.e., curative intent)
- Patients receiving PBT for recurrent disease or for failure of initial therapy (i.e., salvage)

All forms of PBT were considered for this evaluation, including monotherapy, use of PBT as a "boost" mechanism to conventional radiation therapy, and combination therapy with other modalities such as

chemotherapy and surgery. All PBT studies that met entry criteria for this review were included, regardless of manufacturer, treatment protocol, location, or other such concerns.

Conditions included in the evidence review are as follows:

- Cancers
- Bone tumors
- Brain, spinal, and paraspinal tumors
- Breast cancer
- Esophageal cancer
- Gastrointestinal cancers
- Gynecologic cancers
- Head and neck cancers (including skull base tumors)
- Liver cancer
- Lung cancer
- Lymphomas
- Ocular tumors
- Pediatric cancers (e.g., medulloblastoma, retinoblastoma, Ewing's sarcoma)
- Prostate cancer
- Soft tissue sarcomas
- Seminoma
- Thymoma
- Noncancerous Conditions
- Arteriovenous malformations
- Hemangiomas
- Other benign tumors (e.g., acoustic neuromas, pituitary adenomas)

Evidence review

A summary of the net health benefit of PBT vs. alternative treatments and the strength of available evidence on net health benefit, as well as an evaluation of consistency of these findings with clinical guideline statements and public/private coverage policy, can be found in Table 1. The level of comparative evidence was extremely limited for certain conditions and entirely absent for others. We identified a total of six RCTs and 37 nonrandomized comparative studies across all 19 condition types. Importantly, five of the six RCTs involved different treatment protocols for PBT and had no other comparison groups; while these are included for completeness, primary attention was paid to studies (RCTs and otherwise) that compared PBT to an alternative form of treatment.

Most of the comparative studies identified also had major quality concerns. For example, nearly all non-randomized comparative studies were retrospective in nature, and many involved comparisons of a PBT cohort to a non-contemporaneous group receiving alternative therapy. Major differences in patient demographics and baseline clinical characteristics as well as duration of follow-up were often noted between groups. Of the 6 RCTs identified, 1, 4, and 1 were judged to be of good, fair, and poor quality respectively. Corresponding figures for non-randomized comparative studies were 1, 20, and 16.

As noted on Table 1, PBT was judged to have superior net health benefit for ocular tumors, and incremental net health benefit for adult brain/spinal tumors and pediatric cancers. PBT was comparable to alternative treatment options for patients with liver, lung, and prostate cancer as well as one noncancerous condition (hemangiomas). Importantly, however, the strength of evidence was low for all of these conditions. The evidence base for all other condition types was insufficient to determine net health benefit, including two of the four most prevalent cancers in the U.S.: breast and gastrointestinal (lung and prostate are the other two).

As with information on clinical effectiveness, data on potential harms of PBT come from RCTs, comparative cohort studies, and case series, although comparative harms data are still lacking for many condition types. Across all condition types, a total of 25 studies reported comparative information on treatment-related harms; differences in the types of harms relevant to each condition, as well as variability in harms classification even within conditions, precludes any attempt to summarily present harms data across all 19 condition categories.

Observational data on secondary malignancy with PBT are generally lacking. Two studies were identified with comparative information. One was a fair-quality matched retrospective cohort study comparing 1,116 patients in a linked Medicare-SEER database who received either PBT or photon radiation for a variety of cancers and were followed for a median of 6.4 years. On an unadjusted basis, the incidence rates of any secondary malignancy and malignancies occurring in the prior radiation field were numerically lower for PBT, but not statistically-significantly so. After adjustment for age, sex, primary tumor site, duration of follow-up, and year of diagnosis, PBT was associated with a risk of secondary malignancy approximately one-half that of photon therapy (HR=0.52; 95% CI: 0.32, 0.85; p=0.009). There are challenges with these findings, however. First and foremost, the lower rate of secondary malignancy with PBT appeared to be manifested almost entirely in the first five years after radiotherapy, a time period in which a second cancer event is not typically attributed to prior radiation (Bekelman, 2013). In addition, patients were accrued over a very long time period (1973-2001), only the very end of which included highly conformal photon techniques like IMRT.

The second study was a poor-quality retrospective cohort study comparing PBT to photon radiotherapy in 86 infants who were treated for retinoblastoma and followed for a median of 7 years (PBT) or 13 years (photon radiotherapy). Therapy was received at two different US centers (PBT at MGH and photon radiotherapy at Children's Hospital Boston). Kaplan-Meier analyses were conducted to control for differential follow-up but no adjustments were made for other differences between groups. Ten-year estimates of the cumulative incidence of secondary malignancy were numerically lower for PBT, but not statistically significantly so (5% vs. 14% for photon, p=0.12). However, when malignancies were restricted to those occurring in-field or thought to be radiation-induced, a significant difference in favor of PBT was observed (0% vs. 14%, p=0.015). In addition, significant differences in favor of PBT in both cumulative incidence and radiotherapy-related malignancy were observed for the subgroup of patients with hereditary disease.

Other harms are presented in detail for each condition type in the sections that follow.

No comparative studies were identified for curative therapy of: breast, esophageal, gastrointestinal, gynecologic, and pediatric cancers; lymphomas, sarcomas, seminomas, and thymomas; arteriovenous malformations.

No comparative studies were identified for salvage treatment of: brain/spinal/paraspinal, breast, esophageal, gastrointestinal, gynecologic, pediatric, and prostate cancers; lymphomas, sarcomas, seminomas, and thymomas; arteriovenous malformations and hemangiomas.

No comparative studies of harms identified for: gastrointestinal and gynecologic cancers; lymphomas, sarcomas, seminomas, and thymomas; arteriovenous malformations.

Cancers

Bone Cancer

Curative

A single poor-quality retrospective comparative cohort study evaluated PBT for primary and recurrent sacral chordomas in 27 patients. Among these patients 21 were treated with surgery and combination PBT /photon therapy (mean radiation dose: 72.8 Gray Equivalents [GyE]), in comparison to six patients who received PBT/photons alone (mean dose: 70.6 GyE). For patients with primary tumors, Kaplan-Meier estimates of local control, disease-free survival and overall survival exceeded 90% among those treated by surgery and radiation (n=14). Only two of the six patients with primary tumors received radiation alone, one of whom had local failure at four years, distant metastases at five years, and died at 5.5 years.

Salvage

In the same study of 27 patients with sacral chordomas who were treated with PBT/photon radiation alone or in combination with surgery, seven radiation/surgery patients and four radiation-only patients had recurrent disease. Among patients in the radiation/surgery group, four patients died of disease 4-10 years after treatment; the remainder was alive with disease at last follow-up. In the radiation-only group, two of four patients died of disease at 4-5 years of follow-up; the other two were alive with disease at last follow-up.

Harms

In the study described above, multiple descriptive harms were reported. Patients receiving radiation alone reported numerically lower rates of abnormal bowel or bladder function as well as difficulty ambulating in comparison to those receiving combination therapy, but rates were not statistically tested. PBT patients also reported higher rates of return to work, although this was also not tested statistically. Evidence is thus inadequate to compare the potential harms of PBT relative to other radiation modalities in patients with bone cancer.

Brain, Spinal, and Paraspinal Tumors

Curative

Two poor-quality retrospective comparative cohort studies investigated primary PBT for brain, spinal, and paraspinal tumors. One was an evaluation of PBT (mean dose: 54.6 GyE) vs. photon therapy (mean dose: 52.9 Gy) in 40 adults (mean age: 32 years; 65% male) who received surgical and radiation treatment of medulloblastoma at a single US cancer center. PBT patients were followed for a median of 2.2 years, while photon patients were followed for a median of nearly five years. No statistical differences between radiation modalities were seen in Kaplan-Meier assessment of either overall or progression-free survival at two years. A numeric difference was seen in the rate of local or regional failure (5% for PBT vs. 14% for photon), but this was not assessed statistically.

The second study involved 32 patients treated for intramedullary gliomas with either PBT (n=10) or IMRT (n=22). While explicit comparisons were made between groups, the PBT population was primarily pediatric (mean age: 14 years), while the IMRT population was adult (mean age: 44 years). Patients in both groups were followed for a median of 24 months; dose was >50 GyE or Gy in approximately 75% of patients. While the crude mortality rate was lower in the PBT group (20% vs. 32% for IMRT, not tested), in multivariate analyses controlling for age, tumor pathology, and treatment modality, PBT was associated with significantly increased mortality risk (Hazard Ratio [HR]: 40.0, p=0.02). The rate of brain metastasis was numerically higher in the PBT group (10% vs. 5% for IMRT), but this was not statistically tested. Rates of local or regional recurrence did not differ between groups.

Harms

In the first study described above, PBT was associated with statistically-significantly lower rates of weight loss (median % of baseline: -1.2% vs. 5.8% for photon, p=0.004) as well as requirements for medical management of esophagitis (5% vs. 57% respectively, p<0.001). PBT patients also experienced less RTOG grade 2 or greater nausea and vomiting (26% vs. 71%, p=0.004).

In the second study comparing primarily 10 pediatric patients (mean age: 14 years) receiving PBT for spinal cord gliomas to 22 adults receiving IMRT for the same condition (mean age: 44 years) (Kahn, 2011), no cases of long-term toxicity or myelopathy were reported in either group. Minor side-effect rates were reported for the overall cohort only. In summary, limited, low-quality evidence suggests that PBT is associated with reductions in acute radiation-related toxicity relative to photon radiation in patients with brain and spinal tumors.

Table 1: Summary table assessing strength of evidence, direction of benefit, and consistency with relevant guideline statements and coverage policy.

Condition	Incidence (per 100,000)	Net Health Benefit vs. Comparators	Type of Net Health Benefit	Strength of Evidence	Guideline Recommendations	Coverage Policies
Cancer						
Bone	1.3	Insufficient	---	+	M	M
Brain/spinal	9.6	Incremental	B: = H: ↓	+	U	U
Breast	97.7	Insufficient	---	o	NM	NR/NC
Esophageal	7.5	Insufficient	---	o	NM	NR/NC
GI	100.6	Insufficient	---	o	NM	NR/NC
Gynecologic	38.2	Insufficient	---	o	NM	NR/NC
Head/neck	17.2	Insufficient	---	+	NM	M
Liver	12.8	Comparable	B: = H: =	+	NM	M
Lung	95.0	Comparable	B: = H: =	+	M	M
Lymphomas	32.9	Insufficient	---	o	NR/NC	NR/NC
Ocular	1.2	Superior	B: ↑ H: ↓	++	U	U
Pediatric	9.1	Incremental	B: = H: ↓	+	U	U
Prostate	99.4	Comparable	B: = H: =	+	M	M
Sarcomas	4.8	Insufficient	---	o	NM	M
Seminoma	4.0	Insufficient	---	o	NM	NM
Thymoma	0.2	Insufficient	---	o	NM	NM
Noncancerous						
AVMs	1.0	Insufficient	---	o	NM	M
Hemangiomas	2.0	Comparable	B: = H: =	+	NM	NM
Other	2.0	Insufficient	---	o	NM	M

B: Benefits; H: Harms Strength of Evidence: Low=+; Moderate=++; High=+++; No evidence=o

Legend: U = Universally recommended or covered; M=Mixed recommendations or coverage policies; NM=Not mentioned in guidelines or coverage policies; NR/NC=Not recommended or not covered

Esophageal Cancer

Harms

Two studies were identified that examined comparative harms in patients treated with PBT for esophageal cancer. One was a relatively large, fair-quality, retrospective comparative cohort study of 444 patients (median age: 61 years; 91% male) who were treated with chemotherapy and radiation (PBT, IMRT, or 3D-CRT) followed by surgical resection. Patients were followed for up to 60 days after hospital discharge. After adjustment for patient characteristics and clinical variables, 3D-CRT was associated with a significantly greater risk of postoperative pulmonary complications vs. PBT (Odds Ratio [OR]: 9.13, 95% CI: 1.83, 45.42). No significant differences were observed between PBT and IMRT, however. No differences in the rate of gastrointestinal complications were observed for any treatment comparison.

In addition, a fair-quality comparative study was identified that examined early impact on lung inflammation and irritation in 75 patients receiving PBT, IMRT, or 3D-CRT for esophageal cancer; patients were followed for up to 75 days following radiation. Nearly all outcome and toxicity measures were reported for the entire cohort only. However, the rate of pneumonitis was found to be significantly higher among PBT patients (33% vs. 15% for IMRT/3D-CRT, p=0.04). In summary, evidence is inadequate to compare the potential harms of PBT relative to other radiation modalities in patients with esophageal cancer, particularly in comparison to IMRT.

Head and Neck Cancers

Curative

There were two poor-quality retrospective comparative cohorts of primary PBT in head and neck cancer. One was an evaluation of 33 patients treated with either PBT alone or PBT+photon therapy to a target dose of 76 Gy for a variety of head and neck malignancies in Japan. Treatment groups differed substantially in terms of age, gender, and duration of follow-up (mean: 5.9 vs. 3.1 years). Numeric differences in favor of PBT+photon therapy were seen for local control, recurrence, and mortality, but these were not statistically tested, nor were multivariate adjustments made for differences between groups.

The other study was a very small (n=6) comparison of endoscopic resection followed by either PBT or IMRT as well as endoscopy alone in patients with malignant clival tumors. Limited description of the study suggests that PBT was used only in cases of residual disease, while it is unclear whether IMRT was also used in this manner or as an adjuvant modality. One of the IMRT patients died of causes unrelated to disease; no other deaths were reported.

Salvage

In the first study described above, four patients were identified as having recurrent disease, three of whom received PBT alone. Two of the three PBT-only patients were alive with local tumor control at last follow-up (5 and 17 years respectively); one patient had their cancer recur three months after PBT and died in month 7 of follow-up. The one PBT+photon patient died at 2.5 years of follow-up, but was described as having local tumor control.

Harms

In the first study describe above, rates of tongue ulceration, osteonecrosis, and esophageal stenosis differed somewhat between treatment groups, but were not statistically tested. Overall toxicity rates were estimated to be 22.8% at both three and five years, but were not stratified by treatment modality.

In a separate, fair-quality study comparing rates of vision loss from radiation-induced optic neuropathy in 75 patients treated with PBT or carbon-ion therapy for head and neck or skull base tumors, unadjusted rates of vision loss were similar between modalities (8% and 6% for PBT and carbon-ion respectively, not statistically tested). In multivariate analyses controlling for demographic and clinical characteristics, treatment modality had no effect on rates of vision loss (p=0.42). Another comparison of PBT and carbon-ion therapy in 59 patients with head and neck or skull base tumors was of poor quality (due to no control for differences between patient groups) and focused on the incidence of radiation-induced brain changes. The incidence of CTCAE brain injury of any grade was significantly (p=0.002) lower in the PBT group. MRI-based assessment of brain changes showed a lower rate in the PBT group (17% vs. 64% for carbon-ion), although this was not tested statistically. In summary, evidence is inadequate to compare the potential harms of PBT relative to other radiation modalities in patients with head and neck cancer.

Liver Cancer

Curative

Two fair-quality prospective comparative cohort studies provided evidence of the clinical effectiveness of primary use of PBT in liver cancer. One was an evaluation of 35 patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) who were treated with PBT (mean dose: 76.5 GyE) either alone or in combination with chemotherapy and were followed for up to 4 years. While statistical testing was not performed, rates of local tumor control and the proportion of patients experiencing reductions in tumor volume were nearly identical between groups.

The other study was also prospective but compared PBT to another heavy-ion modality not in circulation in the U.S. (carbon ion). In this study, a fair-quality comparison of 350 patients with HCC who received PBT (53-84 GyE) or carbon-ion (53-76 GyE) therapy and were followed for a median of 2.5 years, no statistically-significant differences were observed in 5-year Kaplan-Meier estimates of local control, no biological evidence of disease, or overall survival between treated groups.

Salvage

Two studies were identified with information on recurrent disease. One was a poor-quality comparison of PBT to conventional photon radiation in eight patients with recurrent HCC after hepatectomy. Five patients were treated with PBT (68.8-84.5 GyE), and three with photons (60-70 Gy). Seven of eight patients died of liver failure or lung metastasis a median of 1.5 years after radiation; the one patient alive at the end of follow-up was a photon patient. The rate of local tumor control was 78%, and did not differ between treatment groups.

The other study was a previously-described prospective comparison of PBT to carbon-ion therapy in 350 patients with primary or recurrent HCC. No subgroup analyses were performed, but prior treatment history for HCC was found not to have a statistically-significant impact on local tumor control (p=0.73). Prior treatment was not examined as a risk factor for overall survival, however.

Harms

Two comparative studies were identified with comparative information on radiation-related harms. In a previously-described study of eight patients with recurrent HCC after hepatectomy, there were no instances of bone marrow depression or gastrointestinal complications in either group. Serum aspartate aminotransferase (AST) levels increased in the three photon patients and 4/5 PBT patients, although this was not tested statistically.

In the other study, a previously-described comparison of PBT to carbon-ion therapy in 350 patients with primary or recurrent HCC, rates of toxicities as graded by the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) framework were comparable between groups, including dermatitis, GI ulcer, pneumonitis, and rib fracture. The rate of grade 3 or higher toxicities was similar between groups (3% vs. 4% for PBT and carbon-ion respectively), although this was not statistically tested.

In summary, limited, low-quality evidence suggests that PBT is associated with comparable rates of toxicity to other radiation modalities in patients with liver cancer.

Lung Cancer

Curative

Three fair-quality comparative cohort studies examined the clinical effectiveness of PBT in lung cancer. Two studies retrospectively compared outcomes with PBT to those with IMRT or older three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3D-CRT) at a US cancer center. One study involved 250 patients with non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) who were treated with 66 Gy of photons or 74 GyE of protons and followed for up to one year to assess a key measure of lung function known as diffusing capacity of lung for carbon monoxide (DLCO). While this measure did not differ between PBT and IMRT at 5-8 months after treatment, DLCO declined significantly more in the 3D-CRT group as compared to PBT after adjustment for pretreatment characteristics and other lung function measures (p=0.009).

A second study focused on survival in 202 patients with locally-advanced, unresectable NSCLC who were followed for a median of 1.5 years and treated 74 GyE of PBT or 63 Gy of either IMRT or 3D-CRT. Actuarial estimates of median overall survival were 24.4, 17.6, and 17.7 months for PBT, IMRT, and 3D-CRT respectively, although these differences were not statistically significant (p=0.1061).

A third study was a prospectively-measured cohort but, as with the study of liver cancer mentioned above, compared PBT to carbon ion therapy, evaluating 111 Japanese NSCLC patients over a median of 3.5 years. No statistically-significant differences between groups were observed in three-year actuarial estimates of local control, progression-free survival, or overall survival.

Salvage

In the second study described above, 22% of the study sample was identified as having a prior malignancy of any type. The effects of prior malignancy on overall survival were not reported, however.

Harms

A total of three comparative studies assessed harms in patients with lung cancer. One was a study of severe radiation-induced esophagitis (within six months of treatment) among 652 patients treated for NSCLC with PBT, IMRT, or 3D-CRT at a US cancer center. Rates of grade 3 or higher esophagitis were 6%, 8%, and 28% for PBT, 3D-CRT, and IMRT respectively (p<.05 for PBT and 3D-CRT vs. IMRT).

In the previously-described noncontemporaneous case series comparison of patients with locally-advanced, unresectable NSCLC who were treated with PBT, IMRT, or 3D-CRT, hematologic toxicity rates did not differ by radiation modality. Significant differences in favor of PBT were seen in rates of grade 3 or higher esophagitis (5%, 39%, and 18% for PBT, IMRT, and 3D-CRT respectively, p<0.001) as well as pneumonitis (2%, 6%, and 30%, p<0.001), while rates of grade 3 or higher dermatitis were significantly greater in the PBT group (24% vs. 17% and 7% for IMRT and 3D-CRT, p<0.001).

Finally, in a previously-described comparison of PBT to carbon-ion therapy in 111 patients in Japan, rates of pneumonitis, dermatitis, and rib fracture did not differ statistically between radiation modalities across all toxicity grades. In summary, moderate evidence suggests that rates of treatment-related toxicities with PBT are comparable to those seen with other radiation modalities in patients with lung cancer.

Ocular Tumors

Curative

In comparison to other cancer types, the evidence base for ocular tumors was relatively substantial. A total of seven comparative studies were identified of the clinical benefits of primary PBT in such cancers—a single RCT, four retrospective cohort studies, a comparison of a recent case series to the treatment groups from the RCT, and a comparison of noncontemporaneous case series. The RCT compared PBT alone to a combination of PBT and transpupillary thermotherapy (TTT) in 151 patients treated for uveal melanoma and followed for a median of 3 years. Combination therapy was associated with a statistically-significantly (p=0.02) reduced likelihood of secondary enucleation; no other outcomes differed significantly between groups. In a separate, poor-quality comparison of these findings to a separate series of patients undergoing PBT with endoresection of the scar, rates of secondary enucleation did not differ between groups, but rates of neovascular glaucoma were significantly lower in the PBT+endoresection group vs. the groups from the RCT (7% vs. 58% and 49% for PBT alone and PBT+TTT respectively, p<0.0001). Of note, however, median follow-up was less than two years in the PBT+endoresection series vs. 9 years in the RCT.

Three of the cohort studies were all fair-quality and involved comparisons to surgical enucleation in patients with uveal melanoma at single centers. PBT was associated with statistically-significant improvements in overall survival rates relative to enucleation at 2-5 years in two of these studies. Rates of metastasis-related and all cancer-related death were statistically-significantly lower among PBT patients through two years of follow-up in one study (n=1,051), but were nonsignificant at later timepoints. The 5-year metastasis-free survival rate in a second study (n=67) was 50% higher among PBT patients in a Cox regression model controlling for baseline characteristics (59.0% vs. 39.4% for enucleation, p=0.02). In the third study, Kaplan-Meier curves for all-cause mortality, melanoma-related mortality and metastasis-free survival did not statistically differ for 132 patients treated with PBT and enucleation. Metastasis-free survival also did not differ in Cox regression adjusting for age, sex, and tumor thickness.

Another fair-quality study assessed the impact of PBT + chemotherapy vs. PBT alone in 88 patients with uveal melanoma who were followed for 5-8 years. Five-year overall survival rates did not statistically differ between groups on either an unadjusted or Cox regression-adjusted basis.

Finally, a poor-quality comparison of noncontemporaneous case series evaluated treatment with PBT + laser photocoagulation or PBT alone in 56 patients with choroidal melanoma. At one year, there were no differences in visual acuity between groups.

Salvage

A single comparative study examined PBT in recurrent ocular cancer. In this fair-quality, comparative cohort study, a total of 73 patients with uveal melanoma had recurrence of disease following an initial course of PBT at a US hospital. Patients (mean age: 58 years) were treated with either a second course of PBT (70 GyE) in five fractions or surgical enucleation and followed for 5-7 years. The likelihood of overall survival at five years was significantly (p=0.04) longer in the PBT group (63% vs. 36% for enucleation), as was the probability of being free of metastasis at this timepoint (66% vs. 31% respectively, p=0.028). Findings were similar after Cox proportional hazards regression adjusting for tumor volume and year of retreatment as well as patient age. The likelihood of local tumor recurrence at five years was 31% in the PBT group. No local recurrences were found in the enucleation group, which is not surprising given the nature of the treatment.

Harms

Two comparative studies assessed the harms of PBT for ocular cancers. In the previously-described RCT comparing PBT with thermotherapy to PBT alone in 151 patients with uveal melanoma, no statistically-significant differences were observed between groups in rates of cataracts, maculopathy, papillopathy, glaucoma, or intraocular pressure. The combination therapy group had a significantly lower rate of secondary enucleation (p=0.02), although actual figures were not reported.

In a previously-described comparison of PBT to enucleation in 132 patients treated for unilateral choroidal tumors, rates of eye loss in the PBT arm were assessed and estimated to be 26% at five years of follow-up. In summary, limited, low-quality evidence suggests comparable rates of harm for PBT relative to treatment alternatives in patients with ocular tumors.

Pediatric Cancers

Harms

PBT's theoretical potential to lower radiation-induced toxicity in children serves as the comparative evidence base. Comparative studies are lacking, most likely due to a lack of clinical equipoise.

Other than the study of secondary malignancy described above, no comparative studies of the potential harms of PBT in patients with pediatric cancers were identified.

Prostate Cancer

Curative

The largest evidence base available was for prostate cancer (10 studies). However, only 6 of these studies reported clinical outcomes *and* compared PBT to alternative treatments. These included an RCT, a prospective comparative cohort, and four comparisons of noncontemporaneous case series.

The included RCT was a fair-quality comparison of 202 patients with advanced (stages T3-T4) prostate cancer who were randomized to receive either photon therapy with a proton boost (total dose: 75.2 GyE) or photons alone (67.2 Gy) and were followed for a median of five years. Kaplan-Meier estimates of local tumor control, disease-specific survival, and overall survival were similar at both 5- and 8-year

timepoints among the entire intent-to-treat population as well as those completing the trial (n=189). However, in patients with poorly-differentiated tumors (Gleason grades 4 or 5), local control at 8 years was significantly better in patients receiving PBT+photons (85% vs. 40% for photons alone, p=0.0014).

The prospective cohort study was a fair-quality comparison of patient-reported health-related QoL at multiple timepoints among 185 men (mean age: 69 years) with localized prostate cancer who were treated with PBT, PBT+photons, photons alone, surgery, or watchful waiting. Overall QoL, general health status, and treatment-related symptom scales were employed. No differences in overall QoL or general health status were observed at 18 months of follow-up, although men treated with PBT monotherapy reported better physical function in comparison to surgery (p=0.01) or photon radiation (p=0.02), and better emotional functioning in relation to photon radiation (p<0.001). Men receiving PBT+photons also reported significantly fewer urinary symptoms at 18 months in comparison to watchful waiting (p<0.01).

Outcomes were also assessed in three comparisons of noncontemporaneous case series. One was a fair-quality evaluation of high-dose PBT+photons (79.2 GyE) in 141 patients enrolled in a clinical trial who were matched on clinical and demographic criteria to 141 patients treated with brachytherapy. Patients were followed for a median of eight years. Eight-year actuarial estimates of overall survival, freedom from metastasis, and biochemical failure did not statistically differ between groups. The proportion of patients achieving a nadir PSA level of ≤0.5 ng/mL as of their final measurement was significantly higher in the brachytherapy group (92% vs. 74% for PBT, p=0.0003).

Two additional studies were deemed to be of poor quality due to a lack of control for confounding between study populations. One was a comparison of a cohort of 206 brachytherapy patients compared with the same PBT+photon group described above. The difference in the percentage of patients achieving nadir PSA after a median of 5.4 years of follow-up was similar to that reported in the study above (91% vs. 59%), although statistical results were not reported. Five-year estimates of disease-free survival (using biochemical failure definitions) did not statistically differ between groups. The other study involved comparisons of bowel- and urinary-related QoL in three distinct cohorts receiving PBT (n=95; 74-82 GyE), IMRT (n=153; 76-79 Gy), or 3D-CRT (n=123; 66-79 Gy). Statistical changes were assessed within (but not between) each cohort immediately following treatment as well as at 12 and 24 months of follow-up, and were also assessed for whether the change was considered “clinically meaningful” (>0.5 SD of baseline values). Some differences in QoL decrements were seen at earlier timepoints. However, at 24 months, all groups experienced statistically and clinically significant decrements in bowel QoL, and none of the groups had significant declines in urinary QoL.

A fourth, poor-quality comparison of case series involved an evaluation of patient-reported outcomes on the Expanded Prostate Cancer Index Composite (EPIC) questionnaire among a cohort of 1,243 patients receiving PBT for prostate cancer and a group of 204 patients receiving IMRT from a previous multicenter study. Statistically-significant differences between treatment groups were observed for many baseline characteristics, only some of which were adjusted for in multivariate analyses. No differences were observed in summary scores for bowel, urinary, and sexual QoL at two years, although more IMRT patients reported specific bowel frequency (10% vs. 4% for PBT, p=0.05) and urgency (15% vs. 7%, p=0.02) problems at two years.

Harms

Four comparative studies examined the harms associated with PBT and alternative treatments in patients with prostate cancer. The previously-described RCT of PBT+photon therapy vs. photons alone examined rates of rectal bleeding, urethral stricture, hematuria, incontinence, and loss of full potency; no patients in either arm had grade 3 or higher toxicity during radiation therapy. Actuarial estimates of rectal bleeding at eight years were significantly higher in the PBT+photon arm (32% vs. 12% for photons alone, p=0.002), although this was primarily grade 2 or lower toxicity. Rates of urethral stricture, hematuria, incontinence, and loss of potency did not differ between groups.

Three additional studies involved retrospective comparisons using available databases. The most recent was a matched comparison of 314 PBT and 628 IMRT patients treated for early-stage prostate cancer using the linked Chronic Condition Warehouse-Medicare database with a focus on complications occurring within 12 months of treatment. At six months, rates of genitourinary toxicity were significantly lower in the PBT arm (5.9% vs. 9.5%, p=0.03). This difference was not apparent after 12 months of follow-up, however (18.8% vs. 17.5%, p=0.66). Rates of gastrointestinal and other (e.g., infection, nerve damage) complications did not statistically differ at either timepoint.

Another recent study compared matched cohorts of men with prostate cancer in the linked Medicare-SEER database who were treated with PBT or IMRT (684 patients in each arm) and followed for a median of four years. IMRT patients had a statistically-significantly lower rate of gastrointestinal morbidity (12.2 vs. 17.8 per 100 person-years, p<0.05). No other statistical differences were noted in genitourinary morbidity, erectile dysfunction, hip fracture, or use of additional cancer therapy.

Finally, there was an analysis of nearly 30,000 men in the Medicare-SEER database who were treated with PBT, IMRT, 3D-CRT, brachytherapy, or conservative management (observation alone) and evaluated for gastrointestinal toxicity. All forms of radiation had higher rates of GI morbidity than conservative management. In pairwise comparisons using Cox proportional hazards regression, PBT was associated with higher rates of GI morbidity than conservative management (HR: 13.7; 95% CI: 9.1, 20.8), 3D-CRT (HR: 2.1; 95% CI: 1.5, 3.1), and IMRT (HR: 3.3; 95% CI: 2.1, 5.2).

In summary, moderate evidence suggests that rates of major harms are comparable between PBT and photon radiation treatments, particularly IMRT.

Noncancerous Conditions

Ocular Hemangiomas

Curative

A single poor-quality retrospective study evaluated PBT's clinical effectiveness in 44 patients with diffuse or circumscribed choroidal hemangiomas who were treated with either PBT (20-23 GyE) or photon therapy (16-20 Gy) and followed for an average of 2.5 years. Unadjusted outcomes were reported for the entire cohort only; reduction in tumor thickness, resolution of retinal detachment, and stabilization of visual acuity were observed in >90% of the overall sample. In Kaplan-Meier analysis of outcomes adjusting for differential follow-up between treatment groups, therapeutic modality had no statistically-significant effects on stabilization of visual acuity (p=0.43).

Harms

A single, previously-described retrospective comparative cohort study assessed outcomes in patients with circumscribed or diffuse hemangiomas treated with PBT or photon radiation. Small differences in unadjusted rates of optic nerve/disc atrophy, lacrimation (formation of tears) and ocular pressure as well as effects on the retina, lens, and iris were observed between groups, but most side effects were grade 1 or 2. The rate of retinopathy was substantially higher in PBT patients (40% vs. 16% for photons). However, in Cox proportional hazards regression adjusting for between-group differences, no effect of radiation modality on outcomes was observed, including retinopathy (p=0.12).

Other Benign Tumors

Curative

Two comparative studies of PBT's clinical effectiveness in other benign tumors were both of poor quality. One was a retrospective cohort of consisting of 20 patients with giant-cell bone tumors who were treated with PBT+photon therapy (mean: 59 GyE) or photons alone (mean: 52 Gy) and followed for median of 9 years. Patients could also have received partial tumor resection. Of note, the PBT population consisted entirely of young adults (mean age: 23 years), while the photon-only population was much older (mean: 46 years); no attempt was made to control for differences between treatment groups. Rates of disease progression, progression-free survival, and distant metastases were numerically similar between groups, although these rates were not statistically tested.

The other study was a small cohort study comparing PBT alone, photon therapy alone, or PBT + photons in 25 patients with optic nerve sheath meningioma. On an overall basis, visual acuity improved in most patients. Rates did not numerically differ between treatment groups, although these were not tested statistically.

Salvage

In the first study described above, five of 20 were identified as having recurrent disease. Two of the five were treated with PBT+photon therapy, one of whom had progression of disease at eight months but no further progression after retreatment at five years of follow-up. The other patient was free of local progression and metastases as of 9 years of follow-up. In the three photon patients, one had local progression at 12 months but no further progression as of year 19 of follow-up, one patient was free of progression and metastases as of five years of follow-up, and one patient had unknown status.

Harms

The previously-described study comparing PBT, PBT+photon, and photon therapy alone in 25 patients treated for optic nerve sheath meningiomas showed numerically lower rates of acute orbital pain and headache for both PBT groups compared to photon therapy, and numerically higher rates of late asymptomatic retinopathy. None of these comparisons were tested statistically, however. Evidence is limited and inadequate to compare the potential harms of PBT relative to other radiation modalities in patients with other benign tumors.

Cost & Cost-Effectiveness

Limited data are available about costs of PBT in most types of cancer. One study of breast cancer patients in the US examined reimbursement for treatment with 3D-conformal partial breast irradiation using protons or photons vs. traditional whole breast irradiation. Payments included those of treatment

planning and delivery as well as patient time and transport. Total per-patient costs were substantially higher for PBT vs. photon partial irradiation ($13,200 vs. $5,300) but only modestly increased relative to traditional whole breast irradiation ($10,600), as the latter incurred higher professional service fees and involved a greater amount of patient time. Two additional studies from the same group assessed the cost-effectiveness of PBT vs. photon radiation among women with left-sided breast cancer in Sweden. In the first of these, photon radiation was assumed to increase the risk of ischemic and other cardiovascular disease as well as pneumonitis relative to PBT; clinical effectiveness was assumed to be identical. Reductions in adverse events led to a gain in quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) equivalent to approximately one month (12.35 vs. 12.25 for photon). Costs of PBT were nearly triple those of photon therapy, however ($11,124 vs. $4,950), leading to an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of $65,875 per QALY gained. The other study used essentially the same model but focused attention only on women at high risk of cardiac disease (43% higher than general population). In this instance, a much lower ICER was observed ($33,913 per QALY gained).

One study evaluated the economic impact of PBT in lung cancers among patients in the Netherlands. A Markov model compared PBT to carbon-ion therapy, stereotactic radiation therapy, and conventional radiation in patients with stage 1 non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) over a 5-year time horizon. Effects of therapy included both overall and disease-related mortality as well as adverse events such as pneumonitis and esophagitis. For inoperable NSCLC, PBT was found to be both more expensive and less effective than either carbon-ion or stereotactic radiation and was therefore not included in subsequent analyses focusing on inoperable disease. While not reported in the paper, PBT's derived cost-effectiveness relative to conventional radiation (based on approximately $5,000 in additional costs and 0.35 additional QALYs) was approximately $18,800 per QALY gained.

Three decision analyses were available that focused on pediatric cancers, all of which focused on a lifetime time horizon in children with medulloblastoma who were treated at 5 years of age. In a US-based model that incorporated costs and patient preference (utility) values of treatment and management of adverse events such as growth hormone deficiency, cardiovascular disease, hypothyroidism, and secondary malignancy, PBT was found to generate lower lifetime costs ($80,000 vs. $112,000 per patient for conventional radiation) and a greater number of QALYs (17.37 vs. 13.91). Reduced risks for PBT were estimated based on data from dosimetric and modeling studies. Sensitivity analyses on the risk of certain adverse events changed the magnitude of PBT's cost-effectiveness, but it remained less costly and more effective in all scenarios.

Pediatric medulloblastoma was assessed in two modeling studies. As with the analysis above, PBT was assumed to reduce both mortality and nonfatal adverse events relative to conventional photon therapy. On a per-patient basis, PBT was assumed to reduce lifetime costs by approximately $24,000 per patient and increase quality-adjusted life expectancy by nearly nine months (12.8 vs. 12.1 QALYs). On a population basis, 25 medulloblastoma patients treated by PBT would have lifetime costs reduced by $600,000 and generate an additional 17.1 QALYs relative to conventional photon radiation.

Finally, four studies were identified that examined costs and cost-effectiveness of PBT for prostate cancer. An analysis of the 2008-2009 Chronic Condition Warehouse examined treatment costs for matched Medicare beneficiaries with prostate cancer who received PBT or IMRT. Median Medicare reimbursements were $32,428 and $18,575 for PBT and IMRT respectively (not statistically tested).

A relatively recent Markov decision analysis estimated the lifetime costs and effectiveness of PBT, IMRT, and stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) for localized prostate cancer. Clinical effectiveness and impact on mortality were assumed to be equivalent across all three groups. SBRT was found to have the lowest treatment costs and shortest time in treatment of the three modalities, and produced slightly more QALYs (8.11 vs. 8.05 and 8.06 for IMRT and PBT respectively) based on an expected rate of sexual dysfunction approximately half that of IMRT or PBT. SBRT was cost-saving or cost-effective vs. PBT in 94% of probabilistic simulations.

An earlier decision analysis estimated the potential cost-effectiveness of a hypothetically-escalated PBT dose (91.8 GyE) vs. 81 Gy delivered with IMRT over a 15-year time horizon. The model focused on mortality and disease progression alone (i.e., toxicities were assumed to be similar between groups), and assumed a 10% reduction in disease progression from PBT's higher dose. This translated into QALY increases of 0.42 and 0.46 years in 70- and 60-year-old men with intermediate-risk disease respectively. Costs of PBT were $25,000-$27,000 higher in these men. ICERs for PBT vs. IMRT were $63,578 and $55,726 per QALY for 70- and 60-year-old men respectively.

Finally, the model also evaluated costs and outcomes for a hypothetical cohort of 300 65 year-old men with prostate cancer. PBT was assumed to result in a 20% reduction in cancer recurrence relative to conventional radiation as well as lower rates of urinary and gastrointestinal toxicities. PBT was estimated to be approximately $8,000 more expensive than conventional radiation over a lifetime but result in a QALY gain of nearly 4 months (0.297). The resulting cost-effectiveness ratio was $26,481 per QALY gained.

EVIDENCE SUMMARY

Proton beam therapy (PBT) has been used for clinical purposes for over 50 years and has been delivered to tens of thousands of patients with a variety of cancers and noncancerous conditions. Despite this, evidence of PBT's comparative clinical effectiveness and comparative value is lacking for nearly all conditions under study in this review. As mentioned previously, it is unlikely that significant comparative study will be forthcoming for childhood cancers despite uncertainty over long-term outcomes, as the potential benefits of PBT over alternative forms of radiation appear to be generally accepted in the clinical and payer communities. In addition, patient recruitment for potential studies may be untenable in very rare conditions (e.g., thymoma, arteriovenous malformations). In other areas, however, including common cancers such as breast and prostate, the poor evidence base and residual uncertainty around the effects of PBT is highly problematic.

The net health benefit of PBT relative to alternative treatments is rated "Superior" (moderate-large net health benefit) in ocular tumors and "Incremental" (small net health benefit) in adult brain/spinal and pediatric cancers. The net health benefit is judged "Comparable" (equivalent net health benefit) in several other cancers, including liver, lung, and prostate cancer, as well as ocular hemangiomas. It should be noted, however, that judgments of comparability were made based on a limited evidence base that provides relatively low certainty that PBT is roughly equivalent to alternative therapies. While further study may reduce uncertainty and clarify differences between treatments, it is currently the case that PBT is far more expensive than its major alternatives, and evidence of its short or long-term relative cost-effectiveness is lacking for many of these conditions. It should also be noted that evidence was

examined for 11 cancers and noncancerous conditions not listed above, and it was determined that there was insufficient evidence to obtain even a basic understanding of PBT's comparative clinical effectiveness and comparative value.

GRADE-INFORMED FRAMEWORK

The HERC develops recommendations by using the concepts of the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system. GRADE is a transparent and structured process for developing and presenting evidence and for carrying out the steps involved in developing recommendations. There are four elements that determine the strength of a recommendation, as listed in the table below. The HERC reviews the evidence and makes an assessment of each element, which in turn is used to develop the recommendations presented in the coverage guidance box. Balance between desirable and undesirable effects, and quality of evidence, are derived from the evidence presented in this document, while estimated relative costs, values and preferences are assessments of the HERC members.

Indication/ Intervention	Balance between desirable and undesirable effects	Quality of evidence*	Resource allocation	Variability in values and preferences	Coverage recommendation	Rationale
PBT for ocular tumors (excluding hemangiomas)	Superior benefit, fewer harms	Moderate	Moderate; expensive, but lowered projected costs due to greater benefit and fewer harms	Low variability (preference for PBT)	Recommended for coverage (*strong recommendation)*	Moderate quality evidence demonstrates PBT is superior to other therapies with fewer harms, although at a greater cost, and many patients would choose this.
PBT for adult malignant brain/spinal tumors	Comparable benefit but fewer harms.	Very Low**	Moderate; expensive, but lowered projected costs due to fewer harms	Low variability (preference for PBT)	Recommended for coverage (*weak recommendation*)	There is very low quality evidence of incremental benefit compared to alternatives, but also with higher costs. People would likely choose what is thought to have fewer harms and greater benefit.

Indication/ Intervention	Balance between desirable and undesirable effects	Quality of evidence*	Resource allocation	Variability in values and preferences	Coverage recommendation	Rationale
PBT for skull base, paranasal sinus, and juxtaspinal tumors	Comparable benefit but fewer harms.	Very Low**	Moderate, expensive, but lowered projected costs due to fewer harms	Low (preference for PBT)	Recommended for coverage *(weak recommendation)*	The subcommittee heard expert testimony that skull-base tumors were one of the first uses of proton beam therapy in the 1960s and that reduction in harms to surrounding structures while delivering adequate dosimetry to tumor tissue is the primary consideration in treatment planning. Based on comparable benefit and fewer harms, allowing for higher costs but patient preference, weak recommendation for coverage.

Indication/ Intervention	Balance between desirable and undesirable effects	Quality of evidence*	Resource allocation	Variability in values and preferences	Coverage recommendation	Rationale
PBT for malignant pediatric tumors	Comparable benefit but fewer harms.	Very Low**	Moderate, expensive, but lowered projected costs due to fewer harms	Moderate (significant concerns regarding radiation therapy, given variety of tumors may have options for alternative therapies)	Recommended for coverage *(weak recommendation)*	Very low quality evidence suggests comparable benefit, and fewer harms, with a potential health impact over decades. There is a strong theoretical benefit for reducing secondary tumors although there is not good evidence to support this. Cost-effectiveness analyses suggest long term cost savings with PBT for pediatric tumors. There is a lack of clinical equipoise and therefore future studies on this are unlikely.
PBT for liver cancer	Comparable benefit, comparable harms	Low	High	Moderate	Do not recommend (*weak recommendation*)	There is low quality evidence that PBT has comparable benefits and harms to alternatives, but is more expensive,

Indication/ Intervention	Balance between desirable and undesirable effects	Quality of evidence*	Resource allocation	Variability in values and preferences	Coverage recommendation	Rationale
PBT for lung cancer	Comparable benefit, comparable harms	Low	High	Moderate	Do not recommend (*weak recommendation*)	Low quality evidence of similar effectiveness, similar risk, and more cost.
PBT for prostate cancer	Comparable benefit, comparable harms	Low	High	Moderate	Do not recommend (*weak recommendation*)	There is low quality evidence of similar effectiveness, similar risk, and more cost. There may be improved local control in poorly differentiated prostate cancer (Glisan 4-5) but no demonstrated impact on survival.
PBT for ocular hemangiomas	Comparable benefit, comparable harms	Very Low	High	Moderate to high, due to uncertainty of benefit	Do not recommend *(weak recommendation)*	Very low quality evidence exists, but it is suggesting comparable benefit. Given that there are alternatives available with similar risk and less expensive, recommendation against coverage.

Indication/ Intervention	Balance between desirable and undesirable effects	Quality of evidence*	Resource allocation	Variability in values and preferences	Coverage recommendation	Rationale
PBT for bone, breast, oropharyngeal, nasopharyngeal, esophageal, GI, gynecologic, lymphomas, sarcomas, seminomas, thymomas, AVMs, and other noncancerous conditions	Unknown	Bone: Low All others: No evidence	High	Moderate (many would not choose PBT due to cost, need to travel, uncertain benefit)	Do not recommend (weak recommendation)	, Unknown benefit and unknown risk compared to alternative, and increased cost.

*The Quality of Evidence rating was assigned by the primary evidence source, not the HERC Subcommittee, except as specified.

** The Quality of Evidence rating was assigned by the HERC Subcommittee.

Note: GRADE framework elements are described in Appendix A

POLICY LANDSCAPE

Quality measures

No quality measures were identified when searching the National Quality Measures Clearinghouse.

Professional society guidelines

Guidelines on the use of proton beam therapy are available from the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN, 2013-2014), American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO, 2013), American College of Radiology (ACR, 2011-2013), American Cancer Society (ACS), and the Alberta Health Services in Canada (2013).

Bone Cancer

NCCN guidelines state that for unresectable high- and low-grade chondrosarcomas of the skull base and axial skeleton, PBT may be indicated to allow for high-dose treatment. Alberta guidelines recommend PBT for sarcomas, including chordoma and chondrosarcoma. According to the ACR, PBT-based treatment plans are considered inappropriate (rated 1-2) in spinal and non-spinal bone metastases.

Brain, Spinal, and Paraspinal Tumors

Alberta guidelines recommend PBT as an option for CNS lesions including craniopharyngioma, germ cell tumors and low-grade gliomas.

Head and Neck Cancers

For ethmoid and maxillary sinus tumors, NCCN considers PBT an investigative therapeutic technique only. Alberta guidelines state that treatment with PBT for adults with acoustic neuromas, and paranasal sinus and nasal cavity tumors is recommended.

Lung Cancer

NCCN considers PBT appropriate for non-small-cell lung cancer. ACR recommends against use of PBT for NSCLC patients with poor performance status or requirements for palliative treatment, while Alberta guidelines do not recommend PBT for NSCLC.

Lymphomas

NCCN states that PBT may be appropriate for patients with Hodgkin and Non-Hodgkin lymphoma as well as soft tissue sarcomas; however, long-term studies are necessary to confirm benefits and harms. Alberta guidelines do recommend PBT for lymphomas only in patients less than 30 years of age.

Ocular Tumors

NCCN guidelines for treatment options in ocular tumors are under development. Alberta guidelines recommend PBT for ocular melanoma.

Pediatric Tumors

Guidelines from Alberta recommend consideration of PBT for pediatric tumors including ependymomas, rhabdomyosarcoma, Ewing's sarcoma, pineal tumors, and patients requiring craniospinal irradiation.

Prostate Cancer

NCCN and Alberta guidelines do not recommend PBT for use in prostate cancer, as superior or equivalent effects have not been demonstrated in comparison to conventional external-beam therapy. In a position statement, ASTRO concluded that the evidence supporting the use of PBT in prostate cancer continues to develop and define its role among current alternate treatment modalities. ASTRO strongly supports the provision of coverage with evidence development to evaluate the comparative effectiveness of PBT relative to other options including IMRT and brachytherapy. The ACR Appropriateness Criteria® consider PBT for treatment planning in T1 and T2 prostate cancer to be appropriate but with lower ratings than for IMRT (6-7 versus 8-9, based on a 1-9 scale).

Non-cancerous conditions

Alberta Health Services guidelines recommend PBT for benign conditions such as AVMs and meningiomas.

APPENDIX A. GRADE INFORMED FRAMEWORK – ELEMENT DESCRIPTIONS

Element	Description
Balance between desirable and undesirable effects	The larger the difference between the desirable and undesirable effects, the higher the likelihood that a strong recommendation is warranted. The narrower the gradient, the higher the likelihood that a weak recommendation is warranted
Quality of evidence	The higher the quality of evidence, the higher the likelihood that a strong recommendation is warranted
Resource allocation	The higher the costs of an intervention—that is, the greater the resources consumed—the lower the likelihood that a strong recommendation is warranted
Values and preferences	The more values and preferences vary, or the greater the uncertainty in values and preferences, the higher the likelihood that a weak recommendation is warranted

Strong recommendation

In Favor: The subcommittee is confident that the desirable effects of adherence to a recommendation outweigh the undesirable effects, considering the quality of evidence, cost and resource allocation, and values and preferences.

Against: The subcommittee is confident that the undesirable effects of adherence to a recommendation outweigh the desirable effects, considering the quality of evidence, cost and resource allocation, and values and preferences.

Weak recommendation

In Favor: The subcommittee concludes that the desirable effects of adherence to a recommendation probably outweigh the undesirable effects, considering the quality of evidence, cost and resource allocation, and values and preferences, but is not confident.

Against: The subcommittee concludes that the undesirable effects of adherence to a recommendation probably outweigh the desirable effects, considering the quality of evidence, cost and resource allocation, and values and preferences, but is not confident.

Quality or strength of evidence rating across studies for the treatment/outcome[1]

High: The subcommittee is very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect. Typical sets of studies are RCTs with few or no limitations and the estimate of effect is likely stable.

Moderate: The subcommittee is moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different. Typical sets of studies are RCTs with some limitations or well-performed nonrandomized studies with additional strengths that guard against potential bias and have large estimates of effects.

***Low*:** The subcommittee's confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect. Typical sets of studies are RCTs with serious limitations or nonrandomized studies without special strengths.

***Very low*:** The subcommittee has very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect. Typical sets of studies are nonrandomized studies with serious limitations or inconsistent results across studies.

---

[1] Includes risk of bias, precision, directness, consistency and publication bias

APPENDIX B. APPLICABLE CODES

CODES	DESCRIPTION
ICD-9 Diagnosis Codes	
170.0-170.9	Malignant neoplasm of bone and articular cartilage
171.0-171.9	Malignant neoplasm of connective and other soft tissue
189.0	Malignant neoplasm of kidney, except pelvis
190.0	Malignant neoplasm eyeball, except conjunctive, cornea, retina, choroids
190.5	Malignant neoplasm of retina
190.6	Malignant neoplasm of eye, choroid
191.0-191.9	Malignant neoplasm of brain
192.1-192.3	Malignant neoplasm of cerebral meninges, spinal cord, spinal meninges
194.0	Malignant neoplasm of adrenal gland
194.3	Malignant neoplasm of pituitary gland and craniopharyngeal duct
194.4	Malignant neoplasm of pineal gland
198.3	Secondary malignant neoplasm, brain and spinal cord
209.29	Malignant carcinoid tumors of other sites
225.0-225.9	Benign neoplasm of brain and other parts of nervous system
227.3	Benign neoplasm of pituitary gland
234.8	Carcinoma in situ of other specified sites (pituitary)
237.0	Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of pituitary gland
239.7	Neoplasm of unspecified nature, endocrine gland (pituitary)
437.3	Cerebral aneurysm, non-ruptured
437.8-437.9	Other and unspecified cerebrovascular disease
747.81	Anomalies of the cerebrovascular system (AVM)
185	Malignant neoplasm of prostate
198.82	Secondary malignant neoplasm, genital organs
233.4	Carcinoma in situ, prostate
ICD-10 Diagnosis Codes	
C40.00-C41.9	Malignant neoplasm of bone and articular cartilage
C47.0-C47.9	Malignant neoplasm of peripheral nerves and autonomic nerves
C49.0-C49.9	Malignant neoplasm of other connective and soft tissue
C64.1-C64.9	Malignant neoplasm of kidney, except renal pelvis
C69.20-C69.22	Malignant neoplasm of retina
C69.30-C69.32	Malignant neoplasm of choroid
C69.40-C69.42	Malignant neoplasm of ciliary body
C70.0-C70.9	Malignant neoplasm of meninges
C71.0-C71.9	Malignant neoplasm of brain
C72.0-C72.9	Malignant neoplasm of spinal cord, cranial nerves and other parts of central nervous system
C74.00-C74.92	Malignant neoplasm of adrenal gland
C75.1-C75.3	Malignant neoplasm of pituitary gland, craniopharyngeal duct, pineal gland
C7A.8	Other malignant neuroendocrine tumors
C79.31	Secondary malignant neoplasm of brain
C79.40-C79.49	Secondary malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified parts of nervous system
D09.3	Carcinoma in situ of thyroid and other endocrine glands [pituitary]

D32.0-D32.9	Benign neoplasm of meninges
D33.0-D33.9	Benign neoplasm of brain and other parts of central nervous system
D35.2	Benign neoplasm of pituitary gland
D44.3-D44.4	Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of pituitary gland, craniopharyngeal duct
D49.7	Neoplasm of unspecified behavior of endocrine glands and other parts of nervous system [pituitary]
I67.1	Cerebral aneurysm, nonruptured
I67.89-I67.9	Other and unspecified cerebrovascular disease
Q28.2	Arteriovenous malformation of cerebral vessels
C61	Malignant neoplasm of prostate
C79.82	Secondary malignant neoplasm of genital organs
D07.5	Carcinoma in situ of prostate
ICD-10 Procedure Codes	
D0004ZZ	Beam radiation of brain using heavy particles (protons, ions)
D0014ZZ	Beam radiation of brain stem using heavy particles (protons, ions)
D0064ZZ	Beam radiation of spinal cord using heavy particles (protons, ions)
D0074ZZ	Beam radiation of peripheral nerve using heavy particles (protons, ions)
D8004ZZ	Beam radiation of eye using heavy particles (protons, ions)
DP004ZZ-DP0C4ZZ	Beam radiation of bone using heavy particles (protons, ions) [by site; includes codes DP004ZZ, DP024ZZ, DP034ZZ, DP044ZZ, DP054ZZ, DP064ZZ, DP074ZZ, DP084ZZ, DP094ZZ, DP0B4ZZ, DP0C4ZZ]
DT004ZZ	Beam radiation of kidney using heavy particles (protons, ions)
DW014ZZ	Beam radiation of head and neck using heavy particles (protons, ions)
DW024ZZ	Beam radiation of chest using heavy particles (protons, ions)
DW034ZZ	Beam radiation of abdomen using heavy particles (protons, ions)
DW064ZZ	Beam radiation of pelvic region using heavy particles (protons, ions)
CPT Codes	
32701	Thoracic target(s) delineation for stereotactic body radiation therapy (SRS/SBRT), (proton or particle beam), entire course of treatment
77373	Stereotactic body radiation therapy, treatment delivery, per fraction to 1 or more lesions, including image guidance, entire course not to exceed 5 fractions
77421	Stereoscopic X-ray guidance for localized of target volume for the delivery of radiation therapy
77432	Stereotactic radiation treatment management of cranial lesion(s) (complete course of treatment consisting of 1 session)
77435	Stereotactic body radiation therapy, treatment management, per treatment course, 1 or more lesions, including image guidance, entire course not to exceed 5 fractions
77520	Proton treatment delivery; simple, without compensation
77522	Proton treatment delivery; simple, with compensation
77523	Proton treatment delivery; intermediate
77525	Proton treatment delivery; complex
HCPCS Level II Codes	
S8030	Scleral application of tantalum ring(s) for localization of lesions for proton beam therapy

Note: Inclusion on this list does not guarantee coverage