

Catheter Ablation as Treatment for Atrial Fibrillation

Policy Number:

MM.06.011

Line(s) of Business:

HMO; PPO; QUEST Integration

Section:

Surgery

Place(s) of Service:

Outpatient; Inpatient

Original Effective Date:

09/01/2009

Current Effective Date:

08/29/2018

I. Description

Atrial fibrillation (AF) frequently arises from an abnormal focus at or near the junction of the pulmonary veins and the left atrium, thus leading to the feasibility of more focused ablation techniques directed at these structures. Catheter-based ablation, using radiofrequency ablation (RFA) or cryoablation, is being studied as a treatment option for various types of AF.

For individuals who have symptomatic paroxysmal or persistent AF who have failed antiarrhythmic drugs who receive RFA or cryoablation, the evidence includes multiple randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, and quality of life. RCTs comparing RFA with antiarrhythmic medications have reported that freedom from AF is more likely after ablation than after medications. Results of long-term follow-up (5-6 years) after ablation have demonstrated that late recurrences continue in patients who are free of AF at 1 year. However, most patients who are AF-free at 1 year remain AF-free at 5 to 6 years. Multiple RCTs comparing cryoablation and RFA have found that cryoablation is noninferior to RFA for AF control. RFA and cryoablation differ in their adverse effect profiles. For example, cryoablation is associated with higher rates of phrenic nerve paralysis, but may permit a shorter procedure time. Given currently available data, it would be reasonable to consider both RFA and cryoablation effective for catheter ablation of AF foci or pulmonary vein isolation, provided there is a discussion about the risks and benefits of each. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have symptomatic AF and congestive heart failure who have failed rate control and antiarrhythmic drugs who receive RFA or cryoablation, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment, supported by RCTs. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, and quality of life. Based on 1 available multicenter RCT, the TEC Assessment found that the evidence was sufficient to conclude that catheter ablation improves outcomes more than the alternative, atrioventricular (AV) nodal ablation and pacemaker insertion. Findings from this RCT have been supported by other comparative studies, which have reported improvements in AF. It is

reasonable to consider both RFA and cryoablation effective for catheter ablation of AF foci or pulmonary vein isolation, provided that there is a discussion about the risks and benefits of each. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have recurrent symptomatic paroxysmal AF who receive RFA or cryoablation as an initial rhythm-control strategy, the evidence includes RCTs nonrandomized studies and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, and quality of life. Two RCTs with low risk of bias compared catheter ablation for pulmonary vein isolation to antiarrhythmic medications. One RCT demonstrated reduced rates of AF recurrence, while the other reported reduced cumulative overall AF burden. Together, these results suggest that, when a rhythm-control strategy is desired, catheter ablation is a reasonable alternative to antiarrhythmic drug therapy. While the RCTs comparing ablation to medical therapy were conducted using RFA, it is reasonable to consider both RFA and cryoablation effective for catheter ablation of AF foci or pulmonary vein isolation, provided that there is a discussion about the risks and benefits of each. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Background

ATRIAL FIBRILLATION

Atrial Fibrillation (AF) is the most common cardiac arrhythmia, with a prevalence estimated at 0.4% of the population, increasing with age. The underlying mechanism of AF involves interplay between electrical triggering events and the myocardial substrate that permits propagation and maintenance of the aberrant electrical circuit. The most common focal trigger of AF appears to be located within the cardiac muscle that extends into the pulmonary veins.

AF accounts for approximately one-third of hospitalizations for cardiac rhythm disturbances. Symptoms of AF (eg, palpitations, decreased exercise tolerance, dyspnea) are primarily related to poorly controlled or irregular heart rate. The loss of atrioventricular (AV) synchrony results in a decreased cardiac output, which can be significant in patients with compromised cardiac function. In addition, patients with AF are at higher risk for stroke, and anticoagulation is typically recommended. AF is also associated with other cardiac conditions, such as valvular heart disease, heart failure, hypertension, and diabetes. Although episodes of AF can be converted to normal sinus rhythm using pharmacologic or electroshock conversion, the natural history of AF is one of recurrence, thought to be related to fibrillation-induced anatomic and electrical remodeling of the atria.

AF can be subdivided into 3 types:

- paroxysmal (episodes that last <7 days and are self-terminating),
- persistent (episodes that last for >7 days and can be terminated pharmacologically or by electrical cardioversion), or
- permanent

Treatment Strategies

Treatment strategies can be broadly subdivided into rate control, in which only the ventricular rate is controlled and the atria are allowed to fibrillate, or rhythm control, in which there is an attempt

to reestablish and maintain normal sinus rhythm. Rhythm control has long been considered an important treatment goal for management of AF, although its primacy has recently been challenged by the results of several randomized trials reporting that pharmacologically maintained rhythm control offered no improvement in mortality or cardiovascular morbidity compared with rate control.

Currently, the main indications for a rhythm control are for patients with paroxysmal or persistent AF who have hemodynamic compromise associated with episodes of AF or who have bothersome symptoms, despite adequate rate control. A rhythm-control strategy involves initial pharmacologic or electronic cardioversion, followed by pharmacologic treatment to maintain normal sinus rhythm. However, antiarrhythmic medications are often not effective in maintaining sinus rhythm. As a result, episodes of recurrent AF are typical, and patients with persistent AF may require multiple episodes of cardioversion. Implantable atrial defibrillators, which are designed to detect and terminate an episode of AF, are an alternative in patients otherwise requiring serial cardioversions, but they have not yet achieved widespread use. Patients with paroxysmal AF, by definition, do not require cardioversion but may be treated pharmacologically to prevent further arrhythmic episodes.

Treatment of permanent AF focuses on rate control, using either pharmacologic therapy or ablation of the AV node, followed by ventricular pacing. Although AV nodal ablation produces symptomatic improvement, it does entail lifelong anticoagulation (due to the ongoing fibrillation of the atria), loss of AV synchrony, and lifelong pacemaker dependency. Implantable defibrillators are contraindicated in patients with permanent AF.

Treatment options are not considered curative. A variety of ablative procedures have been investigated as potentially curative approaches, or perhaps modifying the arrhythmia such that drug therapy becomes more effective. Ablative approaches focus on interruption of the electrical pathways that contribute to AF through modifying the arrhythmia triggers and/or the myocardial substrate that maintains the aberrant rhythm. The maze procedure, an open surgical procedure often combined with other cardiac surgeries (eg, valve repair), is an ablative treatment that involves sequential atriotomy incisions designed to create electrical barriers that prevent the maintenance of AF. Because of the highly invasive nature of this procedure, it is currently mainly reserved for patients who are undergoing open heart surgery for other reasons, (eg, valve repair or coronary artery bypass grafting).

Catheter Ablation for Atrial Fibrillation

Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) using a percutaneous catheter-based approach is a widely used technique for a variety of supraventricular arrhythmias, in which intracardiac mapping identifies a discrete arrhythmogenic focus that is the target of ablation. The situation is more complex for AF because there is no single arrhythmogenic focus. Since the inception of ablation techniques in the early 1990s, there has been a progressive understanding of the underlying electrical pathways in the heart that are associated with AF. In the late 1990s, it was recognized that AF most frequently arose from an abnormal focus at or near the junction of the pulmonary veins and the left atrium, thus leading to the feasibility of more focused, percutaneous ablation techniques. The strategies that have emerged for focal ablation within the pulmonary veins originally involved segmental

ostial ablation guided by pulmonary vein potential (electrical approach) but currently more typically involve circumferential pulmonary vein ablation (anatomic approach).

The individual lesion set (in addition to the pulmonary vein isolation) and the degree to which the pulmonary vein antrum is electrically isolated vary. Research into specific ablation/pulmonary vein isolation techniques is ongoing. Evidence from a randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing pulmonary vein isolation alone with pulmonary vein isolation plus ablation of electrograms showing complex fractionated activity and with pulmonary vein isolation plus additional linear ablation across the left atrial roof and mitral valve isthmus suggests that the more extensive lesion sets do not reduce the AF recurrence rate. Meta-analyses have found that the addition of complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation to pulmonary vein isolation alone did not improve rates of freedom from recurrent AF, although at least 1 RCT has reported that patients with ablation of dormant conduction sources outside the pulmonary veins had fewer arrhythmia recurrences than those treated with pulmonary vein isolation alone.

Circumferential pulmonary vein ablation using radiofrequency energy is the most common approach at the present time. The procedure also can be done using cryoablation technology. Use of currently available radiofrequency catheters for AF has a steep learning curve because they require extensive guiding to multiple ablation points. One of the potential advantages to cryoablation techniques is that cryoablation catheters have a circular or shaped end point, allowing a “one-shot” ablation. Other types of radiofrequency catheters, such as Medtronic’s radiofrequency-based Pulmonary Vein Ablation Catheter®, which incorporate circular or otherwise shaped end points, may also be used.

Repeat procedures following initial RFA are commonly performed if AF recurs or if atrial flutter develops postprocedure. The need for repeat procedures may, in part, depend on clinical characteristics of the patient (eg, age, persistent vs. paroxysmal AF, atrial dilatation), and the type of initial ablation performed. Repeat procedures are generally more limited than the initial procedure. For example, in cases where electrical reconnections occur as a result of incomplete ablation lines, a “touch up” procedure is done to correct gaps in the original ablation. In other cases when atrial flutter develops after ablation, a “flutter ablation” is performed, which is more limited than the original AF procedure. A number of clinical and demographic factors have been associated with the need for a second procedure, including age, length of AF, permanent AF, left atrial size, and left ventricular ejection fraction.

Regulatory Status

In February 2009, the NaviStar® ThermoCool® Irrigated Deflectable Diagnostic/Ablation Catheter and EZ Steer ThermoCool NAV Catheter (Biosense Webster, South Diamond Bar, CA) received expanded approval by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the premarket approval (PMA) process for radiofrequency ablation for treatment of drug-refractory recurrent symptomatic paroxysmal atrial fibrillation.

Devices using laser or cryoablation techniques for substrate ablation have been approved by FDA through the PMA process for atrial fibrillation. These devices include:

- Arctic Front™ Cardiac CryoAblation Catheter and CryoConsole (Medtronic, Minneapolis, MN) in December 2010.

- TactiCath™ Quartz Catheter and TactiSysQuartz® Equipment (St. Jude Medical, St. Paul, MN) in October 2014.
- HeartLight® Endoscopic Ablation System (Cardiofocus, Marlborough, MA) in April 2016.
- The Freezor™ Xtra Catheter (Medtronic) in September 2016.

In addition, numerous catheter ablation systems have been approved by FDA for other ablation therapy for arrhythmias such as supraventricular tachycardia, atrial flutter, and ventricular tachycardia.

II. Criteria/Guidelines

- A. Transcatheter radiofrequency ablation or cryoablation to treat atrial fibrillation is covered (subject to Limitations and Administrative Guidelines) as a treatment for either of the following indications which have failed to respond to adequate trials of antiarrhythmic medications:
 1. Symptomatic paroxysmal or symptomatic persistent atrial fibrillation; or
 2. As an alternative to atrioventricular nodal ablation and pacemaker insertion in patients with class II or III congestive heart failure and symptomatic atrial fibrillation.
- B. Transcatheter radiofrequency ablation or cryoablation to treat atrial fibrillation is covered (subject to Limitations and Administrative Guidelines) as an initial treatment for patients with recurrent symptomatic paroxysmal atrial fibrillation (>1 episode, with 4 or fewer episodes in the previous 6 months) in whom a rhythm-control strategy is desired.
- C. Repeat radiofrequency ablation or cryoablation is covered (subject to Limitations and Administrative Guidelines) in patients with recurrence of atrial fibrillation and/or development of atrial flutter following the initial procedure.

III. Limitations

Transcatheter radiofrequency ablation or cryoablation as a treatment for cases of atrial fibrillation that do not meet the criteria outlined above is not covered as it is not known to improve health outcomes.

IV. Administrative Guidelines

- A. Precertification is not required. HMSA reserves the right to perform retrospective review using the above criteria to validate if services rendered met payment determination criteria.
- B. Transcatheter treatment of atrial fibrillation may include pulmonary vein isolation and/or focal ablation.
- C. There is a CPT code specific to pulmonary vein ablation:
 - 93656: Comprehensive electrophysiologic evaluation including transseptal catheterizations, insertion and repositioning of multiple electrode catheters with induction or attempted induction of an arrhythmia with atrial recording and pacing, when possible, right ventricular pacing and recording, His bundle recording with intracardiac catheter ablation of arrhythmogenic focus, with treatment of atrial fibrillation by ablation by pulmonary vein isolation.
 - This new combination code is not to be used with any of the following CPT codes: 93279-93284, 93286-93289, 93462, 93600, 93602, 93603, 93610, 93612, 93618, 93619, 93620, 93621, 93653, or 93654.

- D. There is also a CPT add-on code for additional AF therapy after the pulmonary vein isolation procedure:
- 93657: Additional linear or focal intracardiac catheter ablation of the left or right atrium for treatment of atrial fibrillation remaining after completion of pulmonary vein isolation (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

CPT Code	Description
93655	Intracardiac catheter ablation of a discrete mechanism of arrhythmia which is distinct from the primary ablated mechanism, including repeat diagnostic maneuvers, to treat a spontaneous or induced arrhythmia (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
93656	Comprehensive electrophysiologic evaluation including transeptal catheterizations, insertion and repositioning of multiple electrode catheters with induction or attempted induction of an arrhythmia with atrial recording and pacing, when possible, right ventricular pacing and recording, His bundle recording with intracardiac catheter ablation of arrhythmogenic focus, with treatment of atrial fibrillation by ablation by pulmonary vein isolation
93657	Additional linear or focal intracardiac catheter ablation of the left or right atrium for treatment of atrial fibrillation remaining after completion of pulmonary vein isolation (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
93799	Unlisted cardiovascular service or procedure

ICD-10-CM Code	Description
I48.0	Atrial fibrillation
I50.20-I50.43	Congestive heart failure code range
I50.9	Heart failure unspecified/Biventricular (heart) failure NOS

ICD-10-PCS Code	Description
025S4ZZ, 025T4ZZ	Destruction, heart and great vessels, pulmonary veins, percutaneous endoscopic, code list

V. Scientific Background

This policy has been updated periodically with literature review of the MEDLINE database. The most recent literature search was performed through April 5, 2018. Broadly defined, health outcomes are length of life, quality of life (QOL), and ability to function—including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and to 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 a technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance and the quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent one 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.

In patients with paroxysmal or persistent atrial fibrillation (AF), catheter ablation may be considered an alternative to drug therapy. In patients with permanent AF, catheter ablation may be considered an alternative to drug therapy or to atrioventricular (AV) nodal ablation and pacing. For all types of AF, it is possible that catheter ablation may not be curative as a sole treatment but might alter the underlying myocardial triggers or substrate in such a way that subsequent pharmacologic therapy may become more effective.

There is ongoing controversy regarding the relative benefits of rhythm versus rate control in AF, which underlies the evaluation of evidence on catheter ablation. Randomized trials of pharmacologic therapies have not demonstrated the superiority of rhythm control versus rate control. However, the apparent equivalency of these 2 strategies with pharmacologic therapy cannot be extrapolated to the rhythm control achieved with ablation. Antiarrhythmic medications used for rhythm control are only partially effective and have serious complications, including proarrhythmic properties, which can be lethal. Therefore, nonpharmacologic strategies for rhythm control have the potential to achieve superior outcomes than have been seen with pharmacologic strategies.

We evaluated the evidence on ablation procedures for AF, with a focus on randomized controlled trials (RCTs) reporting on the AF-related outcomes of interest (see below). In addition, nonrandomized studies and noncomparative studies reporting on longer term outcomes were included to evaluate for durability.

OUTCOME ASSESSMENT IN AF

Various outcomes for treatment of AF may be considered. The mortality and morbidity related to AF (eg, cardiovascular mortality, stroke, heart failure) are the most important clinical outcomes. However, these are uncommon events, and currently available trials are not powered to detect differences in these outcomes. Quality of life (QOL) is also an important outcome, because QOL measures reflect important manifestations of AF, such as symptoms and reduced exercise tolerance. AF has been shown to be associated with lower QOL scores, and maintenance of sinus rhythm has been associated with higher QOL scores for patients with paroxysmal AF.

Recurrence of AF is a more problematic outcome measure, because the intermittent and often transient nature of recurrences makes accurate measurement difficult. This outcome measure has been reported in different ways. For example, the proportion of patients in sinus rhythm at the end

of the study, the time to first recurrence, and the number of recurrences within a time period have been reported. A recent publication highlights the difficulties in measuring AF recurrence and recommends a measure of AF “burden,” defined as the percentage of time an individual is in AF, as the optimal measure of treatment efficacy. However, this parameter requires continuous monitoring over a relatively long period of time, which is inconvenient for patients, resource intensive, and usually not pragmatic in patients who do not already have an implanted pacemaker.

Recommendations for outcome assessment in trials of AF treatment were included in the 2006 American College of Cardiology, American Heart Association, and European Society of Cardiology practice guidelines for the treatment of AF. These guidelines pointed out that the appropriate end points for evaluation of treatment efficacy in patients with paroxysmal or persistent AF have little in common. For example, in studies of persistent AF, the proportion of patients in sinus rhythm at the end of follow-up is a useful end point, but this end point is less useful in studies of paroxysmal AF. Given all these variables, ideally, controlled clinical trials would report a range of outcomes (including QOL) and complications in homogeneous patient groups and compare with the most relevant treatment alternatives (eg, pharmacologic therapy, defibrillator therapy, AV nodal ablation), depending on the classification of AF (paroxysmal, persistent, permanent).

RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION FOR AF

Overall Efficacy of Radiofrequency Ablation for Symptomatic Paroxysmal or Persistent AF

Systematic Reviews

The literature review for this evidence review was originally based on a 2008 TEC Assessment. Six randomized controlled trials (RCTs) met the inclusion criteria for this TEC Assessment. The trials differed in their patient populations, the specific catheter ablation techniques used, and comparisons made. The trials addressed 3 distinct indications for catheter ablation: (1) patients with paroxysmal AF, as a first-line treatment option (1 trial); (2) patients with symptomatic paroxysmal or persistent AF who have failed treatment with antiarrhythmic drugs (4 trials); and (3) patients with symptomatic AF and heart failure who have failed treatment with standard medications for rate control and who would otherwise be considered for AV nodal ablation and pacemaker insertion (1 trial).

All 6 trials reported that maintenance of sinus rhythm was improved for the catheter ablation group. Recurrence rates of AF at 1 year ranged from 11% to 44% for the catheter ablation groups, compared with 63% to 96% for the medication groups. Four of the 6 trials reported QOL outcomes. One of these only reported within-group comparisons, as opposed to between-group comparisons. The other 3 trials reported improvements in QOL associated with catheter ablation. None of the available trials reported meaningful data on cardiovascular morbidity and mortality associated with AF. The Assessment concluded that catheter radiofrequency ablation (RFA) is more effective than medications in maintaining sinus rhythm across a wide spectrum of patients with AF and across different variations of catheter ablation. The evidence on QOL is suggestive, but not definitive, of a benefit for patients undergoing catheter ablation. For other outcomes, the evidence did not permit conclusions. Based on these findings, TEC criteria were met for 2 indications: patients with symptomatic paroxysmal or persistent AF who have failed treatment with antiarrhythmic drugs and

patients with symptomatic AF and heart failure who have failed treatment with standard medications for rate control and who would otherwise be considered for AV nodal ablation and pacemaker insertion. For the first indication, the conclusion followed from the premise that reducing episodes of recurrent AF for this population will reduce or eliminate the symptoms associated with episodes of AF. For the other indication, the single multicenter RCT available was judged sufficient to conclude that catheter ablation improved outcomes compared with the alternative, AV nodal ablation and pacemaker insertion. While this trial was relatively small, it was judged to be otherwise of high quality and reported improvements of a relatively large magnitude across a range of clinically important outcome measures, including QOL, exercise tolerance, left-ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), and maintenance of sinus rhythm.

Since the publication of the 2008 TEC Assessment, additional systematic reviews and meta-analyses of catheter ablation for AF have been published.

Nyong et al (2016) reported on a Cochrane review of ablation for individuals with nonparoxysmal AF, which included RCTs comparing radiofrequency catheter or surgical ablation with antiarrhythmic drugs for persistent or long-standing persistent AF. Reviewers selected 3 RCTs (total N=261 subjects; Forleo et al [2009], Stabile et al [2006], and Mont et al [2014] not discussed in detail herein), all comparing catheter RFA (n=159) to antiarrhythmic drugs (n=102) at 12 months. The trials were assessed to have low or unclear risk of bias. Reviewers' primary outcomes are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Efficacy of Catheter Ablation for Nonparoxysmal AF (Nyong et al [2016])

Outcome (Catheter vs Drug Therapy)	No. of Participants (Studies)	Evidence Quality ^a	Relative Effect Size (RR)	95% CI
Freedom from atrial arrhythmias or recurrence of any atrial arrhythmias	261 (3 studies)	Low	1.84	1.17 to 2.88
Need for cardioversion	261 (3 studies)	Moderate	0.62	0.47 to 0.82
Cardiac hospitalization	216 (2 studies)	Low	0.28	0.1 to 0.72

AF: atrial fibrillation; CI: confidence interval; RR: relative risk.

^a Assessed using the GRADE assessment tool.

Overall, reviewers concluded that catheter RFA was superior to antiarrhythmic drugs for patients who have not responded to antiarrhythmic drug therapy, but there was uncertainty related to their findings.

Vaidya et al (2015) reported results of a systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs comparing pulmonary vein isolation, pharmacologic rate control, atrioventricular (AV) junction ablation with pacemaker insertion for AF. Subgroup analyses focused on patients with congestive cardiac failure. The review identified 7 RCTs, 2 comparing AV junction ablation and pacemaker insertion with pharmacologic rate control, 1 comparing AV junction ablation with pacemaker insertion with pharmacologic rate control and pacemaker insertion, 1 comparing pulmonary vein isolation with AV junction ablation and biventricular pacing, and 3 comparing pulmonary vein isolation with pharmacologic rate control. Studies ranged in size from 36 to 99 patients, with 425 patients in total across the 7 studies. When pulmonary vein isolation was compared with pharmacologic rate control, based on 3 RCTs, pulmonary vein isolation-treated patients had higher increases in left

ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF; weighted mean difference [WMD] +6.5; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.6 to 12.5; $p=0.03$). When pulmonary vein isolation was compared with AV junction ablation and pacemaker insertion, based on 1 RCT, pulmonary vein isolation-treated patients had higher increases in LVEF (WMD = +9.0; 95% CI, 6.3 to 11.7; $p<0.01$). Patients treated with pulmonary vein isolation had greater improvements in heart failure symptoms, measured by the Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHFQ) compared with pharmacologic rate control, in 3 RCTs that included only patients with congestive cardiac failure (WMD = -11.0; 95% CI, -19.4 to -2.6; $p=0.01$). MLHFQ score was also improved when pulmonary vein isolation was compared with AV junction ablation with pacemaker insertion.

Shi et al (2015) reported results of a meta-analysis of RCTs comparing catheter ablation with antiarrhythmic drug therapy for AF. The meta-analysis included 11 trials (total $N=1763$ patients), of which 4 included only patients with paroxysmal AF, 2 included only patients with persistent AF, and 5 included patients with paroxysmal or persistent AF. Eight RCTs included only patients who were drug-refractory or drug-intolerant, and the remaining 3 included patients treated with catheter ablation as first-line therapy. Catheter ablation-treated patients had lower rates of AF recurrence than antiarrhythmic drug therapy-treated patients (RR 0.47; 95% CI, 0.38 to 0.58; $p<0.001$; $I^2=62%$, $p=0.003$).

A Cochrane review of catheter ablation for paroxysmal and persistent AF was published in 2012. It included 7 RCTs of catheter ablation versus medical therapy. The review's main conclusions were that catheter ablation was superior at reducing the recurrence of AF (RR=0.27; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.18 to 0.41) but that there were no differences in mortality (RR=0.50; 95% CI, 0.04 to 5.65), embolic complications (RR=1.01; 95% CI, 0.18 to 5.68), or death from thromboembolism (RR=3.04; 95% CI, 0.13 to 73.4).

Ganesan et al (2013) published results from a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies reporting long-term outcomes after percutaneous catheter ablation for paroxysmal and nonparoxysmal AF. The authors included 19 studies (RCTs, case-control and cohort studies, case series) that reported catheter ablation outcomes at 3 years or more after the index ablation procedures. Sample sizes in these studies ranged from 39 to 1404 (total $N=6167$ patients) included overall. For a single procedure, the pooled overall success rate at 12 months postprocedure was 64.2% (95% CI, 57.5% to 70.3%). At late follow-up, the overall single-procedure success, defined as freedom from atrial arrhythmia at latest follow-up, was 53.1% (95% CI, 46.2% to 60.0%). The pooled overall multiple-procedure long-term success rate was 79.8% (95% CI, 75.0% to 83.8%). The analysis was unable to identify any predictors of short- or long-term recurrence. Reporting of periprocedural complications was heterogeneous across the studies, but complication rates were generally low.

Earlier systematic reviews and meta-analyses (2008, 2009) comparing RFA with antiarrhythmic drug therapy for AF have reported improved rates of freedom from arrhythmias with catheter ablation.

Other systematic reviews have assessed the effect of RFA on a variety of AF-related outcomes. Zhuang et al (2014) conducted a meta-analysis to evaluate the effect of RFA on left atrial (LA) volume and function in patients with AF. In a summary of data from 26 studies enrolling 1821 patients, RFA was associated in improvements in LA volume measurements compared with

preablation (eg, for LA diameter); the weighted mean difference was -1.52 mm (95% CI -2.57 to -0.47 mm). There were no significant improvements in LA function.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Since the TEC Assessment, additional RCTs comparing RFA with pharmacologic treatment have been identified. Wilber et al enrolled 167 patients who had failed at least 1 antiarrhythmic medication and had at least 3 AF episodes in the prior 6 months. Patients were randomized to catheter ablation or to continued drug therapy and followed for 9 months. At the end of follow-up, 66% of patients in the ablation group were free of recurrent AF compared with 16% of patients in the medication group. Adverse events related to treatment occurred in 4.9% (5/103) of patients treated with ablation and in 8.8% (5/57) of patients treated with medications.

Forleo et al randomly assigned 70 patients with type 2 diabetes and paroxysmal or persistent AF to RFA or an antiarrhythmic medication. Follow-up was for 1 year, with the primary outcome being recurrence of AF. At the end of the trial, 42.9% (15/35) of patients in the medication group were free of AF compared with 80% (28/35) of patients in the ablation group. QOL also improved significantly for patients in the ablation group. Adverse events from medications occurred more frequently (17.2% [6/35]) than complications from ablation (2.9% [1/35]).

Mont et al conducted an RCT comparing catheter RFA with antiarrhythmic drug therapy among 146 patients with symptomatic persistent AF. Patients were randomized in a 2:1 fashion to catheter RFA (n=98) or antiarrhythmic drug therapy (n=48). Although the study was terminated before the planned sample size of 208 was enrolled (low enrollment), at 12 months of follow-up, the proportion of patients who were free of sustained AF episodes was higher in the catheter ablation group (70.4%) than in the antiarrhythmic drug therapy group (43.7%; $p=0.002$). QOL scores did not significantly differ between the groups. Longer term outcomes were not reported.

Marrouche et al (2018) conducted an RCT comparing catheter ablation with medical therapy in 363 patients with systematic paroxysmal or persistent AF who had no response to, were unwilling to take, or had unacceptable side effects to antiarrhythmic drugs. 33 Patients were randomized to catheter ablation (n=179) or medical therapy (n=184), with a median follow-up of 38 months. For patients treated with catheter ablation, there was a significantly lower rate of death from cardiac causes (20 [11.2%] vs 41 [22.3%]; hazard ratio [HR], 0.49; 95% CI, 0.29 to 0.84; $p=0.009$) or hospitalization for worsening heart failure (37 [20.7%] vs 66 [35.9%]; HR=0.56; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.83; $p=0.004$) than found in patients treated with medical therapy alone.

Radiofrequency Ablation as First-Line Therapy for AF

Since the 2008 TEC Assessment which found that the evidence was insufficient to support the use of catheter ablation as first-line therapy for individuals with paroxysmal AF, the evidence has continued to evolve.

Systematic Reviews

Hakalathi et al (2015) reported on a systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs comparing RFA with antiarrhythmic drug therapy as first-line therapy for symptomatic AF which included 3 trials (total N=491 patients). Included were the RAAFT-234 and MANTRA-PAF35 trials (described below) and the earlier RAAFT-1 trial. RAAFT-2 and MANTRA-PAF were considered to be at low risk of bias.

RFA was associated with lower risk of recurrence of AF (risk ratio, 0.63; 95% CI, 0.44 to 0.92; $p=0.02$; $I^2=38\%$).

Randomized Controlled Trials

RAAFT-2

In 2014, Morillo et al (2014) published results of the RAAFT-2 trial, an RCT comparing RFA to antiarrhythmic drug therapy as first-line therapy for paroxysmal AF. Eligible patients had symptomatic recurrent paroxysmal AF lasting more than 30 seconds, with 4 or fewer episodes in the prior 6 months, and had no previous antiarrhythmic drug treatment. The trial enrolled 127 patients at 16 centers; 66 were randomized to RFA and 61 to antiarrhythmic drug therapy, at the discretion of the treating physician. In the RFA group, 63 underwent ablation; during follow up, 9 underwent reablation and 6 crossed over to receive antiarrhythmic drug therapy. In the drug therapy group, 26 crossed over to undergo ablation and 24 discontinued antiarrhythmic drug therapy but continued in the trial. Analysis was intention-to-treat. Patients were followed with biweekly scheduled transtelephonic monitor recordings and symptomatic recordings through the 24-month follow-up period. The study's primary outcome (recurrence of any atrial tachyarrhythmia lasting longer than 30 seconds) occurred in 72.1% ($n=44$) in the antiarrhythmic drug group, compared with 54.5% ($n=36$) in the ablation group (hazard ratio [HR], 0.56; 95% CI, 0.35 to 0.90; $p=0.02$). Fewer patients in the RFA group had recurrence of symptomatic AF, atrial flutter, or atrial tachycardia (47% vs 59%; $HR=0.56$, 95% CI, 0.33 to 0.95; $p=0.03$) or recurrence of symptomatic AF (41% vs 57%; $HR=0.52$, 95% CI, 0.3 to 0.89; $p=0.02$). QOL measures did not differ significantly between groups.

MANTRA-PAF

An earlier RCT of RFA as the initial therapy for paroxysmal AF was published in 2012. A total of 294 patients were randomized to initial treatment with catheter ablation or pharmacologic therapy. Patients were followed for up to 24 months for the primary outcomes of burden of AF (percentage of time in AF on Holter monitor) at each time point and cumulative burden of AF over all time points. For the individual time points, the burden of AF was lower in the catheter RFA group at 24 months (9% vs 18%, $p=0.007$), but not at other time points. The 90th percentile cumulative burden did not differ significantly between groups (13% vs 19%; $p=0.10$). The secondary outcome of percent of patients free from AF at 24 months was greater for the catheter ablation group (85% vs 71%, $p=0.004$), as was the secondary outcome of freedom from symptomatic AF (93% vs 84%, $p=0.01$). There was 1 death in the ablation group due to a procedural-related stroke, and 3 patients in the ablation group developed cardiac tamponade following the procedure.

Five-year follow-up from MANTRA-PAF was reported by Nielsen et al in 2017. Follow-up was available for 245 (83%) of 294 patients, of whom 227 had Holter recordings. The randomized groups did not differ significantly in terms their availability for follow-up. On ITT analysis, significantly more patients in the RFA group were free from any AF (126/146 [86%]) than those in the pharmacologic therapy group (105/148 [71%]; $RR=0.82$; 95% CI, 0.73 to 0.93; $p=0.001$). Symptomatic AF burden was also significantly lower in the RFA group, although QOL was not.

Section Summary: RFA as First-Line Therapy for AF

Two RCTs have demonstrated lower rates of AF burden in patients with symptomatic paroxysmal AF who underwent catheter ablation as an initial treatment strategy. Rates of adverse events were relatively low.

RFA for AF in the Setting of Heart Failure

Based on one available multicenter RCT, the TEC Assessment concluded that the evidence was sufficient to conclude that catheter ablation improves outcomes compared with the alternative, atrioventricular (AV) nodal ablation and pacemaker insertion. RCTs and multiple observational studies have compared catheter ablation to medical therapy for AF in the setting of heart failure.

Systematic Reviews

Zhu et al (2016) reported on a systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs comparing catheter ablation to medical rate control in patients with persistent AF and heart failure.³⁷ Three trials (total N=143 subjects; range, 41-52 subjects) met reviewers' inclusion criteria, all of which used blinded outcome assessment and were considered to have low risk of bias. For the meta-analysis's primary end point, compared with medical rate control, catheter ablation was associated with larger improvements in left ventricular end diastolic fraction (mean difference, 6.22%; 95% CI, 0.7% to 11.74%; I²=63%). Measures of peak oxygen capacity, New York Heart Association functional class, and QOL scores were also significantly improved in the catheter RFA-treated groups.

In the same year that the Zhu paper was published, Anselmino et al (2016) reported on a systematic review of available observational studies and RCTs evaluating catheter ablation for AF in patients with chronic heart failure or structural cardiomyopathies. For the population of patients with chronic heart failure, the authors identified 17 observational studies, 4 RCTs, and 4 meta-analyses. In the 4 RCTs, 1 compared catheter ablation with AV node ablation and biventricular pacemaker insertion and 3 compared catheter ablation with optimal medical therapy and rate control. In pooled analysis, the mean efficacy of catheter ablation in maintaining sinus rhythm was 59% after a single procedure, increasing to 77% after patients who underwent a repeat procedure.

Randomized Controlled Trials

The 2 most recent RCTs comparing RFA to medical rate control are described next. While these studies do not directly provide evidence on use of catheter ablation as an alternative to AV nodal ablation in patients who have failed rate control, they support use of catheter ablation to treat AF in this population.

Hunter et al (2014) conducted an RCT comparing catheter RFA to medical rate control for patients with persistent AF and symptomatic heart failure, with adequate rate control at the time of enrollment. There was no requirement for patients to have failed antiarrhythmic drug therapy. The study's primary end point was difference between groups in LVEF at 6 months postprocedure. Fifty patients were randomized, 26 to catheter ablation and 24 to medical management. At 6 months, 81% of the catheter ablation group was free from recurrent AF and antiarrhythmic drugs. LVEF at 6 months after procedure was 40% ($\pm 12\%$) in the catheter ablation group, compared with 31% ($\pm 13\%$, $p=0.015$) in the medical management group. Catheter ablation was also associated with improvements in health-related QOL.

Jones et al reported results from an RCT comparing catheter ablation to medical rate control for patients with symptomatic heart failure, LVEF 35% or less, and persistent AF. Fifty-two patients were randomized, 26 each to catheter ablation or medical rate control. At 12 months after procedure, sinus rhythm was maintained in 88% of the catheter ablation group, with a single-procedure success rate of 68%. For the study's primary outcome (peak oxygen consumption at 12 months postprocedure) there was a significant increase in peak consumption in the catheter ablation group (+3.07 mL/kg/min) compared with the medical management group (95% CI, 0.56 to 5.59 mL/kg/min; $p=0.018$).

Observational Studies

Geng et al (2017) performed a retrospective cohort study on patients with AF, and heart failure.⁴² Patients treated with catheter ablation ($n = 90$) were compared with those treated with rate control therapy ($n=304$), with a mean follow-up of 13.5 months. Patients treated with catheter ablation had improvement in AF freedom (82.2% vs 0%). They also had a significantly lowered risk of major adverse cardiac events (13.3% vs 29.3%; HR=0.51; 95% CI, 0.26 to 0.98; $p=0.044$), defined as a composite score of all-cause mortality, stroke, and unplanned hospitalization. Study limitations included lack of details on selection criteria and differences in baseline criteria between groups (ie, age, symptoms).

Joy et al (2017) retrospectively reviewed the 2013 Nationwide Readmissions Database to examine readmissions for heart failure exacerbations.⁴³ Based on the 885,270 admissions for heart failure exacerbation, 90-day readmission rates were significantly higher in the 364,337 patients with heart failure with coexisting AF (41.4%) than in those without AF (37.6%; $p<0.001$). Treatment by catheter ablation was associated with a lower rate and length of stay for readmission due to heart failure exacerbation, compared with those without discharged without ablation (27.5% vs 41.4%, $p<0.001$; 5.58 days vs 6.60 days, $p=0.031$, respectively). The study was limited to information collected in the database, which focused on hospital data, and did not capture outcomes after discharge; also, it was not possible to compare baseline characteristics between patients who did or did not receive catheter ablation.

Section Summary: RFA for AF in the Setting of Heart Failure

Evidence from systematic reviews, RCTs, and an observational study have suggested that catheter ablation improves heart failure outcomes for patients with heart failure and coexisting AF.

Comparisons of RFA Techniques

Techniques for RFA for pulmonary vein isolation or substrate ablation have evolved over time. Specifying RFA techniques is not the focus of the present review, but recent large studies are described briefly.

Reddy et al (2015) reported results of a noninferiority RCT comparing a contact force-sensing RFA catheter with a standard (noncontact force-sensing) catheter in 300 patients with treatment-refractory paroxysmal AF. The study's primary effectiveness end point was a composite end point of acute ablation success and long term ablation success (freedom from symptomatic AF, atrial tachycardia, or atrial flutter at 12 months off antiarrhythmic drugs, after a 3-month blanking period). In the modified intention-to-treat population, patients in the contact force-sensing catheter group ($n=149$) were noninferior to control catheter group patients ($n=141$; 67.8% vs

69.4%, respectively; absolute difference, -1.6%; lower limit of 1-sided 95% CI; -10.7; $p=0.007$ for noninferiority.)

A second, smaller RCT published by Nakamura et al (2015) compared a contact force-sensing RFA catheter with a standard catheter (total $N=120$) and reported lower rates of pulmonary vein reconnections in those treated with a contact force-sensing catheter.

Afzal et al (2015) performed a systematic review and meta-analysis, which included 9 studies (1 RCT) but not the Reddy RCT), comparing RFA with contact force-sensing or noncontact force-sensing catheters. At 12-month follow-up, contact force-sensing catheter-treated patients had lower AF recurrence at 12 months compared with standard catheter-treated patients (relative risk, [RR] 0.63; 95% CI, 0.44 to 0.91; $p=0.01$).

Longer Term Outcomes

The available RCTs mainly report on short-term outcomes (<1 year) and, therefore, do not evaluate the rate of late recurrences after 1 year. Longer term outcomes have been reported and have generally found rates of early recurrence in the range of 20 to 30%, requiring repeat ablations. Rates of longer term recurrence are lower if early recurrence does not occur, in the range of 1 to 2% per year.

Hussein et al reported on 831 patients treated in 2005 (median follow-up, 55 months). During the first year following ablation, 23.8% had a recurrence of AF. During the remaining follow-up, recurrences occurred in 8.9% additional patients. The overall rate free of arrhythmia and medications was 79.4% at 55 months. An additional 10.5% of patients were arrhythmia-free on drugs, for a total clinical improvement rate of 89.9%. In a smaller study ($N=509$) with follow-up to 5 years after initial ablation, Teunissen et al reported that after a single procedure 41.3% of patients had long-term maintenance of sinus rhythm.

Bunch et al (2013) reported results from a prospective cohort study comparing risk of stroke between patients with AF who had undergone catheter ablation, patients with AF who did not undergo ablation, and patients without a history of AF. A total of 4212 patients with AF who had undergone catheter ablation were age- and sex-matched in a 1:4 ratio to 16,848 subjects in each of the other groups. Mean follow up time was 3.9 years. At 1 year postprocedure, significantly more patients with AF who had not undergone ablation had a stroke (3.5%) than those with AF who had had ablation (1.4%) or had no history of AF (1.4%; $p<0.001$ for trend). During the follow-up period, for all ages and CHADS₂ profiles, patients with AF who had ablation had a lower stroke risk than those with AF who had not.

Several smaller studies have also reported longer term follow-up after catheter RFA. Weerasooriya et al reported 5-year follow-up in 100 patients treated with catheter ablation. Recurrences were most common within the first 6 months, with repeat procedures being common during that period. At 1, 2, and 5 years after ablation, arrhythmia-free survival was 87%, 81%, and 63%, respectively. Tzou et al reported long-term follow-up for 123 patients who had a previous successful ablation, defined as free of AF at 1 year. At 3-year follow-up, 85% of patients were still free of AF and off of all medications; at 5 years, 71% remained free of AF. The authors estimated a late recurrence rate of 7% per year for patients with an initially successful procedure. In a similar study, Bertaglia et al reported outcomes after 6 years of follow-up for 229 patients who had a single, successful ablation.

At 1-year follow-up, 77% (177/229) of patients were free of AF and off of all medications. After a mean additional follow-up of 49.7 ± 13.3 months for these 177 patients, 58% remained free of AF. Sawhney et al reported 5-year success rates in 71 patients who underwent ablation in 2002 or 2003. Freedom from symptomatic AF while off medications was achieved in 86% of patients at 1 year, 79% at 2 years, and 56% at 5 years. A substantial minority of patients (22.5%) had recurrence at points more than 2 years after ablation. A 2013 study by Anselmino et al followed 196 patients who underwent catheter RFA for paroxysmal or persistent AF and had LVEF of 50% or less for a mean of 46.2 months. During follow-up, 29.6% of patients required repeat ablation procedures. At the end of follow up, 37.8% had at least 1 episode of AF, atrial flutter, or ectopic atrial tachycardia. Takigawa et al reported long-term follow up for 1220 patients who underwent RFA for symptomatic paroxysmal AF. AF recurrence-free survival probabilities at 5 years were 59.4% after the initial procedure and 81.1% after the final ablation procedure (average procedures per patient, 1.3).

Section Summary: Radiofrequency Ablation for AF

Numerous RCTs of RFA for isolation of the pulmonary veins versus medical management have reported that freedom from AF at 1 year is higher with RFA than with medical management. The trials mainly included patients who failed antiarrhythmic medications. These studies reported that most patients undergoing RFA were free of AF at 1 year. QOL was also improved in these trials for patients undergoing catheter ablation. A smaller number of studies have evaluated outcomes longer than 1 year and reported that late recurrences occur up to 5 years but were uncommon after the first year. Complications from RFA were reported at low rates in the RCTs, but the numbers of patients in these trials are too low to accurately estimate rates of uncommon events. Two RCTs have evaluated the use of catheter ablation as an initial strategy for paroxysmal AF; one RCT demonstrated reduced rates of AF recurrence, while the other reported reduced cumulative overall AF burden.

Cryoablation for AF

Earlier studies reporting on outcomes after cryoablation for AF were mainly case series and cohort studies reporting success rates in the range of those reported for RFA. Since 2013, several RCTs have compared cryoablation to medical therapy or RFA.

Systematic Reviews

Following the publication of the large FIRE AND ICE trial in 2016 (see the Randomized Controlled Trials section below), a large number of systematic reviews comparing cryoablation with RFA for AF have been published. We identified 4 systematic reviews, which varied in inclusion criteria, primary outcomes, and designs, and are summarized in Table 2. Despite their differences, these reviews have generally reported that efficacy outcomes were comparable between the procedures, while the specific types of complications differed.

Table 2: Systematic Reviews Comparing Cryoablation With RFA for AF

Study	Population	No. of Studies Included (Participants)	Main Outcomes	Relative Effect	95% CI
Chen et al (2017) ⁵⁵	Paroxysmal AF	9 RCTs, 29 non-RCTs (n=6218 cryoablation, n=9278 RFA)	Total complication (cryoablation vs RFA)	OR=1.37	1.19 to 1.57 ($I^2=38\%$)
Liu et al (2016) ⁵⁶	AF, refractory to medication	27 prospective (13 RCTs, 14 non-RCTs), 13 retrospective (N=11,395)	AF recurrence (cryoablation vs RFA)	RR=0.82	0.70 to 0.96
Cardoso et al (2016) ⁵⁷	AF, with follow-up >12 mo	5 RCTs, 17 non-RCTs (n=3706 cryoablation, n=4962 RFA)	Freedom from recurrent atrial tachyarrhythmia at ≥ 12 mo (cryoablation vs RFA)	OR=1.12	0.97 to 1.29
Buiatti et al (2017) ⁵⁸	Paroxysmal AF	3 RCTs, 2 multicenter cohort studies, 5 single-center prospective studies (n=2232 cryoablation, n=4241 RFA)	Recurrence of any atrial arrhythmia (cryoablation vs RFA)	RR=1.01	0.90 to 1.14 ($I^2=0$)

AF: atrial fibrillation; CI: confidence interval; OR: odds ratio; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RFA: radiofrequency ablation; RR: relative risk.

Cheng et al (2015) reported on a meta-analysis of RCTs and observational studies comparing cryoablation and RFA for AF. The meta-analysis included 11 studies (3 RCTs, 11 observational studies) with a total of 1216 patients. One RCT included only patients undergoing repeat treatment after an initial failed ablation procedure. In pooled analysis, 66.9% of those treated with cryoablation and 65.1% of those treated with RFA were free of AF after a mean 16.5 months follow up (RR=1.01; 95% CI, 0.94 to 1.07; $p=0.87$; $I^2=5\%$, $p=0.39$).

Earlier systematic reviews comparing cryoablation and RFA included varying numbers of RCTs and observational studies and had findings similar to those reported in more recent systematic reviews.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Cryoablation Compared with Medical Therapy

Packer et al (2013) reported results of the STOP AF trial, an RCT of cryoablation versus antiarrhythmic medications. This trial enrolled 245 patients with paroxysmal AF who had failed at least 1 (median, 1.2) membrane-active antiarrhythmic medications. Patients were randomized in 2:1 fashion to cryoballoon ablation (n=163) or drug therapy (n=82). At 1-year follow-up, 69.9% of patients in the ablation group were free of AF versus 7.3% in the medication group. The single-procedure success rate was 57.7%. There was also a significantly greater reduction in symptoms for the ablation group. Seventy-nine percent of the drug treatment group crossed over to cryoablation during the 12-month study follow-up because of recurrent, persistent AF. Cryoablation procedure-related adverse events occurred in 5 patients (3.1%); major AF events occurred in 3.1% of the cryoablation group compared with 8.5% of the drug-treatment group (noninferiority $p<0.001$). Phrenic nerve injury occurred at a rate of 13.5%, with 86% resolved at 12 months.

Andrade et al (2014) published a follow-up analysis of the STOP AF trial to evaluate the incidence and significance of early recurrence of AF after ablation. Of the 163 subjects randomized to cryoablation, 84 (51.5%) patients experienced early recurrence of AF, defined as any recurrence of AF lasting more than 30 seconds between 3 and 12 months postablation. The presence of early AF recurrence was associated with late AF recurrence: late AF recurrence occurred in 41 (25.1%) patients, and was more likely in those with early recurrence (55.6% in those with early recurrence vs 12.7% in those without early recurrence; $p<0.001$).

Cryoablation vs RFA

Kuck et al (2016) reported results of the FIRE AND ICE Trial, a multicenter RCT with a noninferiority design and blinded end point assessment, which compared RFA with cryoablation in individuals with symptomatic, treatment-refractory paroxysmal AF. The study enrolled 769 patients, of whom 750 were randomized and included in a modified intention-to-treat analysis (n=376 in the RFA group, n=374 in the cryoablation group). The study's tested the hypothesis that the cryoballoon would be noninferior to RFA in terms of a prespecified efficacy end point, which was time to the first documented clinical failure occurring more than 90 days after the index ablation period ("blinking period"). The study defined clinical failure as recurrence of AF or occurrence of atrial flutter or atrial tachycardia on ECT or 24-hour Holter monitoring, prescription of class I or III antiarrhythmic drugs, or repeat ablation. After 90 days, the primary efficacy end point occurred in 138 cryoablation group patients and in 143 RFA group patients (1-year Kaplan-Meier event rate estimates, 34.6% and 35.9%, respectively; HR=0.96; 95% CI, 0.76 to 1.22; p<0.001 for noninferiority). Cryoablation group patients had shorter total procedure time (124 minutes vs 141 minutes, p<0.001) and left atrial dwell time (92 minutes vs 109 minutes, p<0.001), but longer fluoroscopy time (22 minutes vs 17 minutes, p<0.001). The study's primary safety end point, a composite of death from any cause, stroke or transient ischemic attack from any cause, and serious adverse events, occurred in 40 patients in the cryoablation group and 51 patients in the RFA group (1-year Kaplan-Meier event rate estimates, 10.2% and 12.8%, respectively; HR=0.78; 95% CI, 0.52 to 1.18; p=0.024). In the cryoablation group, phrenic nerve injury was the most common adverse event reported (2.7%).

Kuck et al (2016) also reported on rehospitalization, repeat ablation, and QOL outcomes during 1000 days of follow-up. The cryoablation group had fewer hospitalizations (122 patients) than the RFA group (156 patients; HR=0.72; 95% CI, 0.57 to 0.91; p=0.01). In addition, they had fewer repeat ablations (44 patients vs 66 patients; HR=0.65; 95% CI, 0.45 to 0.95; p=0.03). Patients in both groups had improvements in QOL scores from preablation through 12 months postablation, but there were no significant differences in change in QOL between groups.

Luik et al (2015) reported results of the FreezeAF trial, an RCT with a noninferiority design which compared RFA with an irrigated catheter with cryoablation in individuals with treatment-refractory paroxysmal AF. The study included 315 patients with paroxysmal AF refractory to treatment with at least 1 antiarrhythmic drug, who were randomized to RFA (n=159) or cryoablation (n=156). The study tested the null hypothesis that cryoablation was noninferiority to RFA in terms of a coprimary endpoint: the absence of AF in combination with absence of persistent complications at 6- and 12-month follow-ups. The coprimary end point was reached in 63.1% and in 64.1% of the RFA and cryoablation groups, respectively, at 6 months, and in and 73.6% and 73 % of the RFA and cryoablation groups, respectively, at 12 months. At 12 months postablation, the null hypothesis was rejected (null hypothesis risk difference, ≤ -0.15 ; risk difference, 0.029; 95% CI, -0.074 to 0.132; p<0.001).

An additional RCT by Hunter et al (2017) published in 2015 compared point-by-point RFA with cryoablation, but in one comparison group pulmonary vein isolation could be achieved with RFA if cryoablation was unsuccessful, and in the second comparison group a hybrid procedure

(cryoablation following RFA) was used, which makes isolating the relative efficacy of cryoablation difficult.

The Mesh Ablator versus Cryoballoon Pulmonary Vein Ablation of Symptomatic Paroxysmal AF (MACPAF) study was a single-center RCT comparing cryoablation with RFA with the HD Mesh Ablator Catheter (Bard Electrophysiology, purchased by Boston Scientific in 2013) for AF. The HD Mesh Ablator Catheter, which is not cleared for use in the United States, is a multielectrode RFA catheter that uses a mesh electrode to deliver radiofrequency energy to multiple points of contact. Primary short-term results for MACPAF were reported by Koch et al in 2012. The study randomized symptomatic paroxysmal AF to catheter ablation with the Arctic Front cryoablation catheter (Medtronic) or the HD Mesh Ablator Catheter. The study's primary end point was complete isolation of the pulmonary veins at the end of the procedure. Enrollment was initially planned for 108 patients with symptomatic paroxysmal AF inadequately controlled using antiarrhythmic drug treatment. However, at interim analysis, the HD Mesh Ablator demonstrated a lack of efficacy for the primary end point, and the study's data safety monitoring board terminated the trial early. Forty-four patients with drug-resistant paroxysmal AF were randomized at the time the study was terminated and comprised the intention-to-treat analysis cohort. The per-protocol analysis cohort included 32 patients. Three patients withdrew before the catheter procedure; 9 additional patients were excluded from analysis due to use of a noncompliant catheter (n=2), identification of a trigger arrhythmia, which was subsequently ablated (n=1), failure of transseptal puncture (n=1), or ablation occurring after the interim analysis (n=5). For the primary end point, by intention-to-treat analysis (complete pulmonary vein isolation), was achieved in 13 (56.5%) of 23 patients in the cryoablation group, compared with 2 (9.5%) of 21 patients in the mesh ablator group (p=0.001). In the per-protocol cryoablation group, 76.5% of subjects had complete pulmonary vein isolation. Major complications included 1 case of retroperitoneal hematoma in the cryoablation group and 1 case of pericardial tamponade requiring drainage in the mesh ablator group.

Malmberg et al reported results from an RCT comparing cryoablation with the Arctic Front cryoballoon catheter to RFA with the Pulmonary Vein Ablation Catheter. One hundred ten patients with paroxysmal or persistent AF were randomized, 54 to cryoablation and 56 to RFA. Complete pulmonary vein isolation was achieved in 98% of the cryoablation group compared with 93% of the RFA group (p=0.37). At 6-month follow-up, freedom from AF (absence of symptoms and no AF episodes on 7-day Holter monitoring or 12-lead electrocardiogram) without antiarrhythmic drug treatment was achieved in 52% of the cryoablation group and 38% of the RFA group (p=0.13).

Nonrandomized Studies

Case series of cryoablation published before the RCTs discussed above have reported success rates in the range of those reported for RFA. A prospective noncomparative interventional study reported in 2008 evaluated cryoablation in 346 patients; 74% of patients with paroxysmal AF, but only 42% of those with persistent AF, were free from AF at 12-month follow-up. One small analysis compared 20 patients undergoing cryoablation with 20 patients undergoing RFA, matched for age, sex, LVEF, and AF history. There were no significant differences between groups, including freedom from AF at 6 months, which was 55% in the cryoablation group and 45% in the RFA group.

Abugattas et al (2017) performed a multicenter retrospective study of patients with paroxysmal AF who underwent cryoballoon ablation. Patients who were at least 75 years old (n=53) were

compared with younger patients (n=106), with a mean follow-up of 14 months. After procedure completion, 84% of all patients reported resolution of atrial arrhythmic events. There were no significant differences in the success rates between groups, but older patients had more recurrences (15%) than younger patients (5%; p=0.03). The most common complication was transient phrenic nerve palsy; there was no significant difference in its incidence between groups. This study lacked procedural complication monitoring.

In the largest nonrandomized comparative study identified, Aryana et al compared ablation with a second-generation cryoballoon with RFA in a retrospective cohort of 1196 patients with paroxysmal and persistent AF. Of the overall study population, 76% had paroxysmal AF; 773 were treated with cryoablation and 423 with RFA. Procedural success and complication rates did not differ significantly between groups. For the study's primary end point, freedom from AF or atrial flutter or tachycardia at 12 months following a single ablation procedure without the use of antiarrhythmic medications was significantly higher for cryoablation-treated patients (76.6% vs 60.4%, p<0.001).

Another large nonrandomized study by Schmidt et al (2014) used data from a prospective German registry of catheter ablation procedures to compare RF with cryoablation for paroxysmal AF. The cohort included 905 patients who underwent cryoablation and 2870 patients who underwent RFA all of whom were enrolled from January 2007 to August 2011. The 2 groups were generally similar, with the exception that patients who underwent RFA were significantly more likely to have had valve disease (8.1% vs 3.0%, p<0.001) and an ejection fraction of 40% or less (2.4% vs 1.2%, p<0.05). Rates of acute success were similar for the 2 groups (97.5% for cryoablation vs 97.6% for RFA, p=0.92), as were rates of major procedure-related adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events (0.4% for cryoablation vs 0.2% for RFA, p=0.15). Overall procedural complication rates were similar for the 2 groups (4.6% for each group, p=1.0); the rate of postprocedural phrenic nerve palsy was significantly higher for the cryoablation group (2.1% for cryoablation vs 0% for RFA, p=0.15).

In a subsequent study, Schmidt et al (2016) compared 1-year outcomes for patients treated with RFA or cryoablation in the German registry described above. This cohort included 2306 patients with symptomatic paroxysmal AF who underwent ablation from January 2007 to January 2010 (n=607 cryoablation; n=1699 RFA). The groups did not differ significantly in rates of reduction of symptomatic AF at 1 year (77.7% in RFA patients vs 79.5% in cryoablation patients; p=0.42). At 1 year, fewer cryoablation-treated patients were taking an antiarrhythmic drug (27.5% vs 32.1%, p<0.05). Rates of major clinical adverse events did not differ significantly between groups at 1 year, with the exception of phrenic nerve paralysis, which was more common in cryoablation patients (1.1% vs 0.3%, p<0.05).

Su et al (2018) performed a multicenter, retrospective study of patients with drug-refractory paroxysmal AF who underwent cryoballoon ablation. The patients (N=452) were successfully treated with pulmonary vein isolation (99%); with transient phrenic nerve injury found to be the most common complication (1.5%). After 12 months, 87% (n=393) of patients had freedom from atrial arrhythmia.

Some studies have reported on comparisons between newer and older generations of devices, including 2 nonrandomized studies comparing cryoablation with a second generation device with RFA with a contact-force sensing catheter. One smaller nonrandomized study reported lower rates

of atrial tachycardias after cryoablation than after RFA, but with greater magnitude of effect with cryoablation with a second generation device.⁷⁰ Another smaller nonrandomized study reported shorter procedure times with cryoablation than with RFA, with no significant differences in resolution of AF.

Several studies have also reported on methods to reduce the risk of phrenic nerve injury with cryoballoon ablation, including fluoroscopy of spontaneous breathing and recordings of diaphragmatic electromyograms.

Longer Term Follow-Up

Similar to RFA, the available RCTs for cryoablation have reported primarily on short-term outcomes, though longer term outcomes after cryoablation have been reported.

Vogt et al reported longer-term follow up for 605 patients who underwent cryoablation for symptomatic, paroxysmal or persistent AF. Follow-up data beyond 12 months were available for 451 patients (median follow-up, 30 months). Of those with follow up available, 278 (61.6%) were free of AF recurrence with no need for repeat procedures after a 3-month blanking period. After 1, 2, and 3 repeat procedures, rates of freedom from AF were 74.9%, 76.2%, and 76.9%, respectively. Phrenic nerve palsy was the most common adverse event, occurring in 2% of patients, all of which resolved within 3 to 9 months. There were 2 periprocedural strokes, and 1 case each of periprocedural pericardial tamponade and pericardial effusion.

Smaller studies have reported longer term outcomes. Neumann et al reported 5-year outcomes after a single cryoablation procedure among 163 patients with symptomatic, drug-refractory paroxysmal AF. Fifty-three percent of subjects were free from recurrent AF, atrial tachycardia, or atrial flutter at 5 years of follow-up with no additional procedures (after a 3-month blanking period). Boho et al reported on follow-up to a median of 3 years after cryoablation for 205 patients with symptomatic paroxysmal or early persistent AF treated at a single institution. At the 6-, 12-, 24-, and 36-month follow-up, 88%, 71%, 49%, and 31% had no documented recurrence of AF. Davies et al reported AF recurrence rates (median follow up 56 months) for 200 patients with paroxysmal or persistent AF after cryoablation. During the follow up period, 46.7% and 35.6% of those with paroxysmal and persistent AF, respectively, had recurrence of symptomatic AF after a single procedure.

Section Summary: Cryoablation for AF

The evidence related to cryoablation for AF includes RCTs and numerous nonrandomized studies. The STOP AF trial, which compared cryoablation with antiarrhythmic medication therapy, reported that cryoablation is superior to medical management, and that rates of freedom from arrhythmia at 1 year in the cryoablation group were in the range reported for RFA. Interpretation of the MACPAF trial is limited by early termination due to the unexpectedly low efficacy of the RFA method used. While the Malmberg et al study suggests that cryoablation is comparable with RFA, success in the RFA group was also unusually low. Two RCTs published subsequently found that cryoablation is noninferior to RFA for pulmonary vein isolation.

OTHER ABLATION PROCEDURES

Most of the currently available research on ablation procedures for pulmonary vein isolation focuses on RFA or cryoablation. Other energy sources are under investigation. The CardioFocus Endoscopic Ablation System, involves a visually-guided balloon that uses laser energy to ablate cardiac tissue.

A prospective RCT by Dukkipati et al (2015) compared the visually guided laser balloon (VGLB) with RFA in patients with drug-refractory paroxysmal AF. Overall, 342 (170 VGLB, 172 RFA) underwent ablation, and 334 (167 VGLB, 167 RFA) were included in the primary efficacy end point analysis after 12 months of follow-up. The study's primary efficacy end point was freedom from treatment failure, which included documented symptomatic AF, ablation-induced or unknown origin left atrial flutter or atrial tachycardia, failure to acute isolate all pulmonary veins, use of any antiarrhythmic drugs, or left heart ablation surgery or implantable cardioverter defibrillator placement for AF. In a prespecified noninferiority analysis, 61.1% of those in the VGLB group met the primary efficacy end point, compared with 61.7% of the RFA group (absolute difference, -9.3%; $p=0.003$ for noninferiority). Overall, rates of primary adverse events did not differ significantly between groups (14.1% in the VGLB group vs 15.7% in the RFA group, $p=NS$). However, VGLB group patients had a lower rate of pulmonary valve stenosis (0% for VGLB group vs 2.9% for RFA group, $p=0.03$), but a higher rate of diaphragmatic paralysis (3.5% for VGLB group vs 0.6% for RFA group, $p=0.05$).

Schmidt et al (2017) performed a multicenter RCT comparing the efficacy and safety of the laser balloon with wide area circumferential pulmonary vein isolation using irrigated RFA and 3-dimensional mapping. In total, 134 patients with persistent AF were randomized to treatment with laser balloon catheter ablation ($n=68$) or RFA ($n=66$). Follow-up including 3-day Holter monitoring occurred at 3, 6, and 12 months. There were no significant differences in the primary efficacy end point of AF freedom between 3 and 12 months between those treated with laser balloon catheter ablation (71.2%) or those treated with RFA (69.3%).

Repeat Procedures

Repeated procedures for recurrent AF or atrial flutter were commonly performed in most of the clinical trials included in this evidence review. Of the 10 RCTs reviewed comparing RFA to medical management, only 2 did not include repeated procedures. In the other 5 studies, 1 or more repeated procedures were allowed, and success rates reported generally incorporated the results of up to 3 procedures. In 4 studies reporting these data, repeated procedures were performed in 8.2%, 9%, 20%, and 32% of patients randomized to ablation. In their RCT of catheter ablation of AF in patients with heart failure, Hunter et al reported that repeat procedures were required in 65.4% of the catheter ablation group. Stabile et al did not report specifics on how many patients actually underwent repeat procedures, but limited data in the publication suggests that up to 30% of treated patients were eligible for repeat procedures. In the Jais et al study, patients underwent a mean of 1.8 procedures per patient and a median of 2 procedures per patient, indicating that approximately 50% of patients in the ablation group underwent at least 1 repeated procedure.

Because of this high rate of repeat procedures, the results reported in these studies do not reflect the single-procedure success rate. Rather, they more accurately estimate the success rate of an ablation strategy that includes repeat procedures for recurrences that occur within the first year of

treatment. Nonrandomized evidence was suggested that early reablation increases the success of the procedure, when defined as maintenance of sinus rhythm at 1 year. There is variability in the protocol for when repeat procedures should be performed. There is also uncertainty concerning other details on repeat procedures, such as how soon after the initial procedure it should be done, the threshold of AF recurrence that should prompt a repeat, and whether medications should be tried before a repeat procedure.

Pokushalov et al reported results of an RCT comparing repeat catheter ablation with antiarrhythmic drug therapy for patients with paroxysmal AF who had failed an initial pulmonary vein isolation procedure. After an initial postablation blanking period, 154 patients with symptomatic AF recurrence were randomized to drug therapy (n=77) or repeat ablation (n=77). Patients were followed for 3 years with an implanted cardiac monitor. At the 3-year follow-up, 58% (45/77) of the repeat ablation group were free from AF or atrial tachycardia and antiarrhythmic drugs, compared with 12% (9/77) of the antiarrhythmic therapy group ($p<0.01$). In the antiarrhythmic drug group, 43 patients (56%) crossed over to receive repeat ablation; in the repeat ablation group, 21 (27%) patients required antiarrhythmic drug therapy. By intention-to-treat analysis, 65% (50/77) of the repeat ablation group and 45% (35/77) of the drug therapy group were free from AF or atrial tachycardia ($p=0.02$).

COMPLICATIONS

Individual clinical trials and case series have reported relatively low rates of complications, but may be limited in their ability to detect uncommon outcomes due to small sample sizes. In 2013, Gupta et al reported results from a systematic review of periprocedural complications following catheter ablation for AF. The authors included 192 studies that included at least 100 participants undergoing catheter ablation for symptomatic AF and that reported complications. The total sample size was 83,236 patients. The overall acute complication rate was 2.9% (95% CI, 2.6 to 3.2%), with significant heterogeneity across studies. The most common complications were vascular complications (1.4%), cardiac tamponade (1.0%), pericardial effusion (0.7%), stroke/transient ischemic attack (TIA; 0.6%), and pulmonary vein stenosis (0.5%).

In addition to the complication rates reported in clinical trials and case series, a number of database studies and postmarketing surveillance have reported complications in large numbers of patients. A representative sample of these studies is discussed next, some of which were included in the Gupta review (Shah et al, Dagues et al).

Waldo et al reported the results of a U.S. Food and Drug Administration-directed postmarketing safety study involving 1275 patients from 6 prospective, multicenter studies of RFA using an open-irrigated catheter. A total of 4.9% (63/1275) of patients experienced acute complications within 7 days of the procedure. Vascular access complications were most common, ranging from 0.5% to 4.7% across the 6 studies. Exacerbations of heart failure occurred in 1.5% of patients, and 2 patients experienced cardiac tamponade. There were no strokes or TIAs reported after the procedure.

Shah et al used data from a California hospital database to evaluate complications in 4156 patients who underwent catheter ablation for AF. Major complications occurred in 5.1% (211/4156) of patients, with approximately half of these (2.6% [110/4156]) consisting of hemorrhage or hematoma at the vascular entry site. The most common cardiac complication was cardiac

perforation and/or tamponade, which occurred in 2.5% (104/4156) of patients. Less common rates of serious adverse events included death (0.02%), stroke/TIA (0.31%), and pneumothorax/hemothorax (0.1%). Factors predictive of complications were female sex, older age, prior hospitalizations for AF, and less hospital expertise with ablation.

In a study of Medicare beneficiaries, Ellis et al identified 6065 admissions from 168 hospitals in which RFA for AF was performed. The total rate of in-hospital complications was 9.1%, with vascular complications accounting for over half the complications (5.7%). The mortality rate was 0.4%, and 0.6% of patients suffered a stroke or TIA. Perforation or tamponade occurred in 3.1% of patients and pneumothorax in 0.4%. The presence of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or unstable angina was associated with a higher risk of complications, while obesity and hyperlipidemia were associated with a lower risk. Age and hospital volume were not significant predictors of risk, but low hospital RFA procedure volume was a significant predictor of in-hospital death.

Complications of catheter ablation were reported in a large cohort of 1000 patients undergoing ablation at a high-volume center in Europe. No deaths were definitely attributed to the procedure, but there were 2 deaths of uncertain cause within the first 30 days following ablation. Overall, 3.9% of patients had a major complication resulting from the procedure. Tamponade was the most serious life-threatening complication, occurring in 1.3% of patients. Major vascular complications occurred in 1.1%. Thromboembolism, cerebrovascular accident/TIA, atrioesophageal fistula, and endocarditis were all reported complications that occurred at a rate of less than 1%.

Cappato et al performed a multicenter, retrospective case series to estimate the overall mortality rate following ablation. Data were collected on 32,569 patients from 162 clinical centers worldwide. Thirty-two deaths were reported, for a mortality rate of 0.98 per 1000 patients. The most common causes of death were tamponade (n=8), stroke (n=5), atrioesophageal fistula (n=5), and pneumonia (n=2).

In the MACPAF study, 1 goal was to identify adverse events, particularly cerebral thromboembolism through the use of serial magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and neuropsychologic testing. While there is some evidence that RFA for patients with AF improves stroke risk, a clinically significant stroke or TIA attack occurs in 0.1% to 0.8% of patients undergoing catheter ablation, and several case series have demonstrated peridural brain lesions on diffusion weighted MRI imaging in up to 18% of patients undergoing catheter ablation of the left atrium. Thus, the MACPAF investigators evaluated patients pre- and postcatheter ablation with brain MRI at 3 Tesla and neurologic and neuropsychologic testing. Short-term outcomes from these evaluations were reported by Haeusler et al in 2013 and demonstrated that new ischemic lesions occurred in 41% of all patients. However, these brain lesions were not associated with cognitive dysfunction immediately after procedure. Longer term follow-up was reported by Herm et al in 2013. At follow-up MRI 6 months postprocedure, 31.3% of the acute brain lesions had formed a persistent glial scar. Similar to the short-term findings, there was no significant effect of either the ablation procedure or the presence of persistent brain lesions on attention or executive functions, short-term memory, or learning after 6 months.

Section Summary: Complications

Several large, database studies estimate the rate of adverse events from catheter ablation in the clinical care setting. The range of major adverse events in these studies is from 4 to 9%. Deaths have been reported and occur at rates less than 1%. Vascular complications at the groin site are the most common adverse events, occurring at rates of up to 5%. Serious cardiovascular adverse events such as tamponade and stroke occur uncommonly, at rates of approximately 1% or lower. There is some evidence that new ischemic lesions are commonly found on MRI after procedure, but the clinical significance of these defects is unclear.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

For individuals who have symptomatic paroxysmal or persistent atrial fibrillation (AF) who have failed antiarrhythmic drugs who receive radiofrequency ablation (RFA) or cryoablation, the evidence includes multiple randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, and quality of life. RCTs comparing RFA with antiarrhythmic medications have reported that freedom from AF is more likely after ablation than after medications. Results of long-term follow-up (5-6 years) after ablation have demonstrated that late recurrences continue in patients who are free of AF at 1 year. However, most patients who are AF-free at 1 year remain AF-free at 5 to 6 years. Multiple RCTs comparing cryoablation and RFA have found that cryoablation is noninferior to RFA for AF control. RFA and cryoablation differ in their adverse effect profiles. For example, cryoablation is associated with higher rates of phrenic nerve paralysis, but may permit a shorter procedure time. Given currently available data, it would be reasonable to consider both RFA and cryoablation effective for catheter ablation of AF foci or pulmonary vein isolation, provided there is a discussion about the risks and benefits of each. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have symptomatic AF and congestive heart failure who have failed rate control and antiarrhythmic drugs who receive RFA or cryoablation, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment, supported by RCTs. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, and quality of life. Based on 1 available multicenter RCT, the TEC Assessment found that the evidence was sufficient to conclude that catheter ablation improves outcomes more than the alternative, atrioventricular (AV) nodal ablation and pacemaker insertion. Findings from this RCT have been supported by other comparative studies, which have reported improvements in AF. It is reasonable to consider both RFA and cryoablation effective for catheter ablation of AF foci or pulmonary vein isolation, provided that there is a discussion about the risks and benefits of each. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have recurrent symptomatic paroxysmal AF who receive RFA or cryoablation as an initial rhythm-control strategy, the evidence includes RCTs, nonrandomized studies, and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, and quality of life. Two RCTs with low risk of bias compared catheter ablation for pulmonary vein isolation to antiarrhythmic medications. One RCT demonstrated reduced rates of AF recurrence, while the other reported reduced cumulative overall AF burden. Together, these results suggest that, when a rhythm-control strategy is desired, catheter ablation is a reasonable alternative to antiarrhythmic

drug therapy. While the RCTs comparing ablation to medical therapy were conducted using RFA, it is reasonable to consider both RFA and cryoablation effective for catheter ablation of AF foci or pulmonary vein isolation, provided that there is a discussion about the risks and benefits of each. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Clinical Input Received From Physician Specialty Societies and Academic Medical Centers

While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted.

2015 Input

In response to requests, input was received from 4 academic medical centers and 3 physician specialty societies (6 reviewers) while this policy was under review in 2015. Input was focused on the use of ablation as an initial procedure for symptomatic paroxysmal and persistent AF and on the use of cryoablation for AF. There was consensus supporting the use of RFA as an initial treatment for symptomatic paroxysmal AF, and the use of cryoablation as an alternative to RFA as treatment for AF. For the use of RFA as initial treatment for symptomatic persistent AF, support from clinical input was more mixed.

2011 Input

In response to requests, input was received from 2 academic medical centers and 2 physician specialty societies (3 reviewers) while this policy was under review in 2011. While the input was mixed, there was general agreement with the policy statements. One reviewer commented that use of cryoablation may have a specific role when ablation targets are close to the atrioventricular node.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Heart Rhythm Society et al

An expert consensus document on catheter and surgical catheter ablation for AF was developed jointly by 7 cardiac specialty societies (Heart Rhythm Society [HRS], European Heart Rhythm Association, European Cardiac Arrhythmia Society, American College of Cardiology [ACC], American Heart Association [AHA], Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society, Society of Thoracic Surgeons) in 2012. A related group of cardiac specialty societies (HRS, EHRA, ECAS, APHRS, Latin American Society of Cardiac Stimulation and Electrophysiology [SOLAECE]) updated these guidelines in 2018, suggesting the following recommendations for catheter ablation (Table 3).

Table 3. Guidelines for Management of Catheter Ablation for AF

Recommendation	COR	LOE
Symptomatic AF refractory or intolerant to at least 1 class 1 or 3 antiarrhythmic medication		
Paroxysmal: Catheter ablation is recommended	I	A
Persistent: Catheter ablation is reasonable	IIa	B-NR
Long-standing persistent: Catheter ablation may be considered	IIb	C-LD
Symptomatic AF prior to initiation of antiarrhythmic drug therapy with a class 1 or 3 antiarrhythmic agent		
Paroxysmal: Catheter ablation is reasonable	IIa	B-R
Persistent: Catheter ablation may be considered	IIa	C-EO
Longstanding Persistent: Catheter ablation may be considered	IIb	C-EO

AF: atrial fibrillation; COR: class of recommendation; LOE: level of evidence.

American College of Cardiology et al

In 2014, ACC, AHA, and HRS issued guidelines for management of patients with AF. The guidelines included the following recommendations for rate control and rhythm control (see Table 4):

Table 4. Guidelines for Rate and Rhythm in Management of AF

Recommendation	COR	LOE
Rate control		
“AV nodal ablation with permanent ventricular pacing is reasonable to control heart rate when pharmacological therapy is inadequate and rhythm control is not achievable.”	I	B
“AV nodal ablation with permanent ventricular pacing should not be performed to improve rate control without prior attempts to achieve rate control with medications.”	III ^a	C
Rhythm control		
“AF catheter ablation is useful for symptomatic paroxysmal AF refractory or intolerant to at least 1 class I or III antiarrhythmic medication when a rhythm-control strategy is desired.”	I	A
“Before consideration of AF catheter ablation, assessment of the procedural risks and outcomes relevant to the individual patient is recommended.”	I	C
“AF catheter ablation is reasonable for some patients with symptomatic persistent AF refractory or intolerant to at least 1 class I or III antiarrhythmic medication.”	IIa	A
“In patients with recurrent symptomatic paroxysmal AF, catheter ablation is a reasonable initial rhythm-control strategy before therapeutic trials of antiarrhythmic drug therapy, after weighing the risks and outcomes of drug and ablation therapy.”	IIa	B
“AF catheter ablation may be considered for symptomatic long-standing (>12 months) persistent AF refractory or intolerant to at least 1 class I or III antiarrhythmic medication when a rhythm-control strategy is desired).”	IIb	B
“AF catheter ablation may be considered before initiation of antiarrhythmic drug therapy with a class I or III antiarrhythmic medication for symptomatic persistent AF when a rhythm-control strategy is desired.”	IIb	C
“AF catheter ablation should not be performed in patients who cannot be treated with anticoagulant therapy during and after the procedure.”	III ^a	C
“AF catheter ablation to restore sinus rhythm should not be performed with the sole intent of obviating the need for anticoagulation.”	III ^a	C

AF: atrial fibrillation; AV: arteriovenous; COR: class of recommendation; LOE: level of evidence.

^a Not recommended.

Although the guideline authors did not make a specific recommendation about the use of cryoablation, they stated that “Cryoballoon ablation is an alternative to point-by-point radiofrequency ablation to achieve pulmonary vein isolation.”

European Society of Cardiology et al

In 2016, the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Society for Cardiothoracic Surgery (EACTS) issued guidelines on the management of AF. The guidelines included the following recommendations on rate and rhythm control and catheter ablation in AF (see Table 5).

Table 5. Guidelines for the Management of AF⁹⁸

Recommendation	COR	LOE
Rate control		
“In patients with permanent AF (i.e., where no attempt to restore sinus rhythm is planned), antiarrhythmic drugs should not routinely be used for rate control.”	III ^a	A
Rhythm control		
“Rhythm control therapy is indicated for symptom improvement in patients with AF.”	I	B
“Catheter ablation of symptomatic paroxysmal AF is recommended to improve AF symptoms in patients who have symptomatic recurrences of AF on antiarrhythmic drug therapy ... and who prefer further rhythm control therapy, when performed by an electrophysiologist who has received appropriate training and is performing the procedure in an experienced centre.”	I	A

AF: atrial fibrillation; COR: class of recommendation; LOE: level of evidence.

^a Not recommended.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage

There is no national coverage determination (NCD). In the absence of an NCD, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this policy are listed in Table 6.

Table 6. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
NCT00911508 ^a	Catheter Ablation vs Anti-arrhythmic Drug Therapy for Atrial Fibrillation Trial (CABANA)	2204	Jun 2018
NCT02274857 ^a	Randomized Evaluation of Atrial Fibrillation Treatment With Focal Impulse and Rotor Modulation Guided Procedures (REAFFIRM)	350	Oct 2018
NCT02150902	Augmented Wide Area Circumferential Catheter Ablation for Reduction of Atrial Fibrillation Recurrence (AWARE)	342	Dec 2018
NCT03365700	Cryoballoon Versus Conventional Radiofrequency Ablation for Persistent Atrial Fibrillation With AF Duration < 2 Years: the IRON-ICE Trial	303	Mar 2019
NCT01420393	A Randomized Ablation-based Atrial Fibrillation Rhythm Control Versus Rate Control Trial in Patients With Heart	600	Sep 2019

	Failure and High Burden Atrial Fibrillation		
NCT01420393	A Randomized Ablation-based Atrial Fibrillation Rhythm Control Versus Rate Control Trial in Patients With Heart Failure and High Burden Atrial Fibrillation	600	Sep 2019
NCT02106663	Evaluating the Efficacy of Circumferential Pulmonary Vein Ablation (CPVA) Versus Segmental Pulmonary Vein Isolation (SPVI) in Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation	100	May 2020
NCT03387982	Post Procedural Pain Assessment in Patients Undergoing Balloon Cryotherapy Compared to Radiofrequency Ablation (RFA) for Dysplastic Barrett's: A Prospective Study	84	Oct 2022
Unpublished			
NCT01687166 ^a	Clinical Evaluation of the Blazer Open-Irrigated Ablation Catheter for the Treatment of Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation (ZERO-AF)	298	Oct 2016 (completed)
NCT01925885	Focal Impulse and Rotor Modulation Ablation Trial for Treatment of Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation (FIRMAT-PAF)	1	Dec 2018 (terminated)

NCT: national clinical trial

^a Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

VI. Important Reminder

The purpose of this Medical Policy is to provide a guide to coverage. This Medical Policy is not intended to dictate to providers how to practice medicine. Nothing in this Medical Policy is intended to discourage or prohibit providing other medical advice or treatment deemed appropriate by the treating physician.

Benefit determinations are subject to applicable member contract language. To the extent there are any conflicts between these guidelines and the contract language, the contract language will control.

This Medical Policy has been developed through consideration of the medical necessity criteria under Hawaii's Patients' Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Act (Hawaii Revised Statutes §432E-1.4), generally accepted standards of medical practice and review of medical literature and government approval status. HMSA has determined that services not covered under this Medical Policy will not be medically necessary under Hawaii law in most cases. If a treating physician disagrees with HMSA's determination as to medical necessity in a given case, the physician may request that HMSA reconsider the application of the medical necessity criteria to the case at issue in light of any supporting documentation.

VII. References

1. Verma A, Jiang CY, Betts TR, et al. Approaches to catheter ablation for persistent atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. May 7 2015;372(19):1812-1822. PMID 25946280
2. Fadahunsi O, Talabi T, Olowoyeye A, et al. Ablation of complex fractionated atrial electrograms for atrial fibrillation rhythm control: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Can J Cardiol*. Jun 2016;32(6):791-802. PMID 26514747

3. Providencia R, Lambiase PD, Srinivasan N, et al. Is there still a role for complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation in addition to pulmonary vein isolation in patients with paroxysmal and persistent atrial fibrillation? meta-analysis of 1415 patients. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* Oct 2015;8(5):1017-1029. PMID 26082515
4. Hu X, Jiang J, Ma Y, et al. Is there still a role for additional linear ablation in addition to pulmonary vein isolation in patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation? An updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Cardiol.* Apr 15 2016;209:266-274. PMID 26897081
5. Scott PA, Silberbauer J, Murgatroyd FD. The impact of adjunctive complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation and linear lesions on outcomes in persistent atrial fibrillation: a meta-analysis. *Europace.* Mar 2016;18(3):359-367. PMID 26559915
6. Theis C, Konrad T, Mollnau H, et al. Arrhythmia termination versus elimination of dormant pulmonary vein conduction as a procedural end point of catheter ablation for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: a prospective randomized trial. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* Oct 2015;8(5):1080-1087. PMID 26297786
7. Shemin RJ, Cox JL, Gillinov AM, et al. Guidelines for reporting data and outcomes for the surgical treatment of atrial fibrillation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Mar 2007;83(3):1225-1230. PMID 17307507
8. Fuster V, Ryden LE, Cannom DS, et al. ACC/AHA/ESC 2006 guidelines for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation--executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the 2001 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation). *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Aug 15 2006;48(4):854-906. PMID 16904574
9. Lee MA, Weachter R, Pollak S, et al. The effect of atrial pacing therapies on atrial tachyarrhythmia burden and frequency: results of a randomized trial in patients with bradycardia and atrial tachyarrhythmias. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Jun 4 2003;41(11):1926-1932. PMID 12798559
10. Kay GN, Ellenbogen KA, Giudici M, et al. The Ablate and Pace Trial: a prospective study of catheter ablation of the AV conduction system and permanent pacemaker implantation for treatment of atrial fibrillation. APT Investigators. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol.* Jun 1998;2(2):121-135. PMID 9870004
11. Falk RH. Management of atrial fibrillation--radical reform or modest modification? *N Engl J Med.* Dec 5 2002;347(23):1883-1884. PMID 12466514

12. Van Gelder IC, Hagens VE, Bosker HA, et al. A comparison of rate control and rhythm control in patients with recurrent persistent atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. Dec 5 2002;347(23):1834-1840. PMID 12466507
13. Wyse DG, Waldo AL, DiMarco JP, et al. A comparison of rate control and rhythm control in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. Dec 5 2002;347(23):1825-1833. PMID 12466506
14. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Catheter ablation of the pulmonary veins as a treatment for atrial fibrillation. *TEC Assessments*. 2008;Volume 23:Tab 11.
15. Jais P, Cauchemez B, Macle L, et al. Catheter ablation versus antiarrhythmic drugs for atrial fibrillation: the A4 study. *Circulation*. Dec 9 2008;118(24):2498-2505. PMID 19029470
16. Khan MN, Jais P, Cummings J, et al. Pulmonary-vein isolation for atrial fibrillation in patients with heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 23 2008;359(17):1778-1785. PMID 18946063
17. Oral H, Pappone C, Chugh A, et al. Circumferential pulmonary-vein ablation for chronic atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 2 2006;354(9):934-941. PMID 16510747
18. Pappone C, Augello G, Sala S, et al. A randomized trial of circumferential pulmonary vein ablation versus antiarrhythmic drug therapy in paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: the APAF Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Dec 5 2006;48(11):2340-2347. PMID 17161267
19. Stabile G, Bertaglia E, Senatore G, et al. Catheter ablation treatment in patients with drug-refractory atrial fibrillation: a prospective, multi-centre, randomized, controlled study (Catheter Ablation For The Cure Of Atrial Fibrillation Study). *Eur Heart J*. Jan 2006;27(2):216-221. PMID 16214831
20. Wazni OM, Marrouche NF, Martin DO, et al. Radiofrequency ablation vs antiarrhythmic drugs as first-line treatment of symptomatic atrial fibrillation: a randomized trial. *JAMA*. Jun 1 2005;293(21):2634-2640. PMID 15928285
21. Nyong J, Amit G, Adler AJ, et al. Efficacy and safety of ablation for people with non-paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Nov 22 2016;11:CD012088. PMID 27871122
22. Forleo GB, Mantica M, De Luca L, et al. Catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation in patients with diabetes mellitus type 2: results from a randomized study comparing pulmonary vein isolation versus antiarrhythmic drug therapy. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Jan 2009;20(1):22-28. PMID 18775050
23. Mont L, Bisbal F, Hernandez-Madrid A, et al. Catheter ablation vs. antiarrhythmic drug treatment of persistent atrial fibrillation: a multicentre, randomized, controlled trial (SARA study). *Eur Heart J*. Feb 2014;35(8):501-507. PMID 24135832

24. Vaidya K, Arnott C, Russell A, et al. Pulmonary vein isolation compared to rate control in patients with atrial fibrillation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart Lung Circ.* Aug 2015;24(8):744-752. PMID 25890871
25. Shi LZ, Heng R, Liu SM, et al. Effect of catheter ablation versus antiarrhythmic drugs on atrial fibrillation: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Exp Ther Med.* Aug 2015;10(2):816-822. PMID 26622399
26. Chen HS, Wen JM, Wu SN, et al. Catheter ablation for paroxysmal and persistent atrial fibrillation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Apr 18 2012;4(4):CD007101. PMID 22513945
27. Ganesan AN, Shipp NJ, Brooks AG, et al. Long-term outcomes of catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Heart Assoc.* Apr 2013;2(2):e004549. PMID 23537812
28. Noheria A, Kumar A, Wylie JV, Jr., et al. Catheter ablation vs antiarrhythmic drug therapy for atrial fibrillation: a systematic review. *Arch Intern Med.* Mar 24 2008;168(6):581-586. PMID 18362249
29. Gjesdal K, Vist GE, Bugge E, et al. Curative ablation for atrial fibrillation: a systematic review. *Scand Cardiovasc J.* Feb 2008;42(1):3-8. PMID 18273730
30. Nair GM, Nery PB, Diwakaramenon S, et al. A systematic review of randomized trials comparing radiofrequency ablation with antiarrhythmic medications in patients with atrial fibrillation. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.* Feb 2009;20(2):138-144. PMID 18775040
31. Zhuang Y, Yong YH, Chen ML. Updating the evidence for the effect of radiofrequency catheter ablation on left atrial volume and function in patients with atrial fibrillation: a meta-analysis. *JRSM Open.* Mar 2014;5(3):2054270414521185. PMID 25057380
32. Wilber DJ, Pappone C, Neuzil P, et al. Comparison of antiarrhythmic drug therapy and radiofrequency catheter ablation in patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA.* Jan 27 2010;303(4):333-340. PMID 20103757
33. Marrouche NF, Brachmann J, Andresen D, et al. Catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation with heart failure. *N Engl J Med.* Feb 1 2018;378(5):417-427. PMID 29385358
34. Hakalahti A, Biancari F, Nielsen JC, et al. Radiofrequency ablation vs. antiarrhythmic drug therapy as first line treatment of symptomatic atrial fibrillation: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Europace.* Mar 2015;17(3):370-378. PMID 25643988
35. Morillo CA, Verma A, Connolly SJ, et al. Radiofrequency ablation vs antiarrhythmic drugs as first-line treatment of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation (RAAFT-2): a randomized trial. *JAMA.* Feb 19 2014;311(7):692-700. PMID 24549549

36. Cosedis Nielsen J, Johannessen A, Raatikainen P, et al. Radiofrequency ablation as initial therapy in paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 25 2012;367(17):1587-1595. PMID 23094720
37. Nielsen JC, Johannessen A, Raatikainen P, et al. Long-term efficacy of catheter ablation as first-line therapy for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: 5-year outcome in a randomised clinical trial. *Heart*. Mar 2017;103(5):368-376. PMID 27566295
38. Zhu M, Zhou X, Cai H, et al. Catheter ablation versus medical rate control for persistent atrial fibrillation in patients with heart failure: A PRISMA-compliant systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Jul 2016;95(30):e4377. PMID 27472728
39. Anselmino M, Matta M, Castagno D, et al. Catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation in chronic heart failure: state-of-the-art and future perspectives. *Europace*. May 2016;18(5):638-647. PMID 26857188
40. Hunter RJ, Berriman TJ, Diab I, et al. A randomized controlled trial of catheter ablation versus medical treatment of atrial fibrillation in heart failure (the CAMTAF trial). *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. Feb 2014;7(1):31-38. PMID 24382410
41. Jones DG, Haldar SK, Hussain W, et al. A randomized trial to assess catheter ablation versus rate control in the management of persistent atrial fibrillation in heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. May 7 2013;61(18):1894-1903. PMID 23500267
42. Geng J, Zhang Y, Wang Y, et al. Catheter ablation versus rate control in patients with atrial fibrillation and heart failure: A multicenter study. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Dec 2017;96(49):e9179. PMID 29245366
43. Joy PS, Gopinathannair R, Olshansky B. Effect of ablation for atrial fibrillation on heart failure readmission rates. *Am J Cardiol*. Nov 1 2017;120(9):1572-1577. PMID 28886855
44. Reddy VY, Dukkipati SR, Neuzil P, et al. Randomized, controlled trial of the safety and effectiveness of a contact force-sensing irrigated catheter for ablation of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: results of the TactiCath Contact Force Ablation Catheter Study for Atrial Fibrillation (TOCCASTAR) Study. *Circulation*. Sep 8 2015;132(10):907-915. PMID 26260733
45. Nakamura K, Naito S, Sasaki T, et al. Randomized comparison of contact force-guided versus conventional circumferential pulmonary vein isolation of atrial fibrillation: prevalence, characteristics, and predictors of electrical reconnections and clinical outcomes. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. Dec 2015;44(3):235-245. PMID 26387117

46. Afzal MR, Chatta J, Samanta A, et al. Use of contact force sensing technology during radiofrequency ablation reduces recurrence of atrial fibrillation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart Rhythm*. Sep 2015;12(9):1990-1996. PMID 26091856
47. Hussein AA, Saliba WI, Martin DO, et al. Natural history and long-term outcomes of ablated atrial fibrillation. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. Jun 2011;4(3):271-278. PMID 21493959
48. Teunissen C, Kassenberg W, van der Heijden JF, et al. Five-year efficacy of pulmonary vein antrum isolation as a primary ablation strategy for atrial fibrillation: a single-centre cohort study. *Europace*. Sep 2016;18(9):1335-1342. PMID 26838694
49. Bunch TJ, May HT, Bair TL, et al. Atrial fibrillation ablation patients have long-term stroke rates similar to patients without atrial fibrillation regardless of CHADS2 score. *Heart Rhythm*. Sep 2013;10(9):1272-1277. PMID 23835257
50. Weerasooriya R, Khairy P, Litalien J, et al. Catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation: are results maintained at 5 years of follow-up? *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jan 11 2011;57(2):160-166. PMID 21211687
51. Tzou WS, Marchlinski FE, Zado ES, et al. Long-term outcome after successful catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. Jun 1 2010;3(3):237-242. PMID 20335557
52. Bertaglia E, Tondo C, De Simone A, et al. Does catheter ablation cure atrial fibrillation? Single-procedure outcome of drug-refractory atrial fibrillation ablation: a 6-year multicentre experience. *Europace*. Feb 2010;12(2):181-187. PMID 19887458
53. Sawhney N, Anousheh R, Chen WC, et al. Five-year outcomes after segmental pulmonary vein isolation for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol*. Aug 1 2009;104(3):366-372. PMID 19616669
54. Anselmino M, Grossi S, Scaglione M, et al. Long-term results of transcatheter atrial fibrillation ablation in patients with impaired left ventricular systolic function. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Jan 2013;24(1):24-32. PMID 23140485
55. Takigawa M, Takahashi A, Kuwahara T, et al. Long-term follow-up after catheter ablation of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: the incidence of recurrence and progression of atrial fibrillation. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. Apr 2014;7(2):267-273. PMID 24610740
56. Chun KR, Schmidt B, Metzner A, et al. The 'single big cryoballoon' technique for acute pulmonary vein isolation in patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: a prospective observational single centre study. *Eur Heart J*. Mar 2009;30(6):699-709. PMID 19109353

57. Paylos JM, Hoyt RH, Ferrero C, et al. Complete pulmonary vein isolation using balloon cryoablation in patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. *Rev Esp Cardiol*. Nov 2009;62(11):1326-1331. PMID 19889345
58. Chen CF, Gao XF, Duan X, et al. Comparison of catheter ablation for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation between cryoballoon and radiofrequency: a meta-analysis. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. Apr 2017;48(3):351-366. PMID 28063111
59. Liu XH, Chen CF, Gao XF, et al. Safety and efficacy of different catheter ablations for atrial fibrillation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol*. Aug 2016;39(8):883-899. PMID 27197002
60. Cardoso R, Mendirichaga R, Fernandes G, et al. Cryoballoon versus radiofrequency catheter ablation in atrial fibrillation: a meta-analysis. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Oct 2016;27(10):1151-1159. PMID 27422848
61. Buiatti A, von Olshausen G, Barthel P, et al. Cryoballoon vs. radiofrequency ablation for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: an updated meta-analysis of randomized and observational studies. *Europace*. Mar 01 2017;19(3):378-384. PMID 27702864
62. Cheng X, Hu Q, Zhou C, et al. The long-term efficacy of cryoballoon vs irrigated radiofrequency ablation for the treatment of atrial fibrillation: A meta-analysis. *Int J Cardiol*. Feb 15 2015;181:297-302. PMID 25540844
63. Xu J, Huang Y, Cai H, et al. Is cryoballoon ablation preferable to radiofrequency ablation for treatment of atrial fibrillation by pulmonary vein isolation? A meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. Mar 2014;9(2):e90323. PMID 24587324
64. Andrade JG, Khairy P, Guerra PG, et al. Efficacy and safety of cryoballoon ablation for atrial fibrillation: a systematic review of published studies. *Heart Rhythm*. Sep 2011;8(9):1444-1451. PMID 21457789
65. Packer DL, Kowal RC, Wheelan KR, et al. Cryoballoon ablation of pulmonary veins for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: first results of the North American Arctic Front (STOP AF) pivotal trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Apr 23 2013;61(16):1713-1723. PMID 23500312
66. Andrade JG, Khairy P, Macle L, et al. Incidence and significance of early recurrences of atrial fibrillation after cryoballoon ablation: insights from the multicenter Sustained Treatment of Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation (STOP AF) Trial. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. Feb 2014;7(1):69-75. PMID 24446022
67. Kuck KH, Brugada J, Furnkranz A, et al. Cryoballoon or radiofrequency ablation for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 09 2016;374(23):2235-2245. PMID 27042964

68. Kuck KH, Furnkranz A, Chun KR, et al. Cryoballoon or radiofrequency ablation for symptomatic paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: reintervention, rehospitalization, and quality-of-life outcomes in the FIRE AND ICE trial. *Eur Heart J*. Oct 07 2016;37(38):2858-2865. PMID 27381589
69. Luik A, Radzewitz A, Kieser M, et al. Cryoballoon versus open irrigated radiofrequency ablation in patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: the prospective, randomized, controlled, noninferiority FreezeAF Study. *Circulation*. Oct 6 2015;132(14):1311-1319. PMID 26283655
70. Hunter RJ, Baker V, Finlay MC, et al. Point-by-point radiofrequency ablation versus the cryoballoon or a novel combined approach: a randomized trial comparing 3 methods of pulmonary vein isolation for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation (The Cryo Versus RF Trial). *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Dec 2015;26(12):1307-1314. PMID 26727045
71. Koch L, Haeusler KG, Herm J, et al. Mesh ablator vs. cryoballoon pulmonary vein ablation of symptomatic paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: results of the MACPAF study. *Europace*. Oct 2012;14(10):1441-1449. PMID 22523379
72. Malmborg H, Lonnerholm S, Blomstrom P, et al. Ablation of atrial fibrillation with cryoballoon or duty-cycled radiofrequency pulmonary vein ablation catheter: a randomized controlled study comparing the clinical outcome and safety; the AF-COR study. *Europace*. Nov 2013;15(11):1567-1573. PMID 23703361
73. Neumann T, Vogt J, Schumacher B, et al. Circumferential pulmonary vein isolation with the cryoballoon technique results from a prospective 3-center study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jul 22 2008;52(4):273-278. PMID 18634982
74. Linhart M, Bellmann B, Mittmann-Braun E, et al. Comparison of cryoballoon and radiofrequency ablation of pulmonary veins in 40 patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: a case-control study. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Dec 2009;20(12):1343-1348. PMID 19656254
75. Abugattas JP, Iacopino S, Moran D, et al. Efficacy and safety of the second generation cryoballoon ablation for the treatment of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation in patients over 75 years: a comparison with a younger cohort. *Europace*. Nov 1 2017;19(11):1798-1803. PMID 28402529
76. Aryana A, Singh SM, Kowalski M, et al. Acute and long-term outcomes of catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation using the second-generation cryoballoon versus open-irrigated radiofrequency: a multicenter experience. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Aug 2015;26(8):832-839. PMID 25917655
77. Schmidt M, Dorwarth U, Andresen D, et al. Cryoballoon versus RF Ablation in paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: results from the German Ablation Registry. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Jan 2014;25(1):1-7. PMID 24134539

78. Schmidt M, Dorwarth U, Andresen D, et al. German ablation registry: Cryoballoon vs radiofrequency ablation in paroxysmal atrial fibrillation-One-year outcome data. *Heart Rhythm*. Apr 2016;13(4):836-844. PMID 26681608
79. Su W, Orme GJ, Hoyt R, et al. Retrospective review of Arctic Front Advance Cryoballoon Ablation: a multicenter examination of second-generation cryoballoon (RADICOOOL trial). *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. Apr 2018;51(3):199-204. PMID 29478173
80. Jourda F, Providencia R, Marijon E, et al. Contact-force guided radiofrequency vs. second-generation balloon cryotherapy for pulmonary vein isolation in patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation-a prospective evaluation. *Europace*. Feb 2015;17(2):225-231. PMID 25186456
81. Squara F, Zhao A, Marijon E, et al. Comparison between radiofrequency with contact force-sensing and second-generation cryoballoon for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation catheter ablation: a multicentre European evaluation. *Europace*. May 2015;17(5):718-724. PMID 25840289
82. Julia J, Chierchia GB, de Asmundis C, et al. Regular atrial tachycardias following pulmonary vein isolation for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: a retrospective comparison between the cryoballoon and conventional focal tip radiofrequency techniques. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. Mar 2015;42(2):161-169. PMID 25597847
83. Wasserlauf J, Pelchovitz DJ, Rhyner J, et al. Cryoballoon versus radiofrequency catheter ablation for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol*. Apr 2015;38(4):483-489. PMID 25627795
84. Linhart M, Nielson A, Andrie RP, et al. Fluoroscopy of spontaneous breathing is more sensitive than phrenic nerve stimulation for detection of right phrenic nerve injury during cryoballoon ablation of atrial fibrillation. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Aug 2014;25(8):859-865. PMID 24724724
85. Lakhani M, Saiful F, Parikh V, et al. Recordings of diaphragmatic electromyograms during cryoballoon ablation for atrial fibrillation accurately predict phrenic nerve injury. *Heart Rhythm*. Mar 2014;11(3):369-374. PMID 24252287
86. Vogt J, Heintze J, Gutleben KJ, et al. Long-term outcomes after cryoballoon pulmonary vein isolation: results from a prospective study in 605 patients. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Apr 23 2013;61(16):1707-1712. PMID 23199518
87. Neumann T, Wojcik M, Berkowitsch A, et al. Cryoballoon ablation of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: 5-year outcome after single procedure and predictors of success. *Europace*. Aug 2013;15(8):1143-1149. PMID 23419659

88. Boho A, Misikova S, Spurny P, et al. A long-term evaluation of cryoballoon ablation in 205 atrial fibrillation patients: a single center experience. *Wien Klin Wochenschr.* Oct 2015;127(19-20):779-785. PMID 26142169
89. Davies AJ, Jackson N, Barlow M, et al. Long term follow-up of pulmonary vein isolation using cryoballoon ablation. *Heart Lung Circ.* Mar 2016;25(3):290-295. PMID 26621109
90. Dukkupati SR, Cuoco F, Kutinsky I, et al. Pulmonary vein isolation using the visually guided laser balloon: a prospective, multicenter, and randomized comparison to standard radiofrequency ablation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Sep 22 2015;66(12):1350-1360. PMID 26383722
91. Schmidt B, Neuzil P, Luik A, et al. Laser balloon or wide-area circumferential irrigated radiofrequency ablation for persistent atrial fibrillation: a multicenter prospective randomized study. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* Dec 2017;10(12). PMID 29217521
92. Lellouche N, Jais P, Nault I, et al. Early recurrences after atrial fibrillation ablation: prognostic value and effect of early reablation. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.* Jun 2008;19(6):599-605. PMID 18462321
93. Pokushalov E, Romanov A, De Melis M, et al. Progression of atrial fibrillation after a failed initial ablation procedure in patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: a randomized comparison of drug therapy versus reablation. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* Aug 2013;6(4):754-760. PMID 23748210
94. Gupta A, Perera T, Ganesan A, et al. Complications of catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation: a systematic review. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* Dec 1 2013;6(6):1082-1088. PMID 24243785
95. Shah RU, Freeman JV, Shilane D, et al. Procedural complications, rehospitalizations, and repeat procedures after catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Jan 10 2012;59(2):143-149. PMID 22222078
96. Dagues N, Hindricks G, Kottkamp H, et al. Complications of atrial fibrillation ablation in a high-volume center in 1,000 procedures: still cause for concern? *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.* Sep 2009;20(9):1014-1019. PMID 19490383
97. Waldo AL, Wilber DJ, Marchlinski FE, et al. Safety of the open-irrigated ablation catheter for radiofrequency ablation: safety analysis from six clinical studies. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol.* Sep 2012;35(9):1081-1089. PMID 22817524
98. Ellis ER, Culler SD, Simon AW, et al. Trends in utilization and complications of catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation in Medicare beneficiaries. *Heart Rhythm.* Sep 2009;6(9):1267-1273. PMID 19716081

99. Cappato R, Calkins H, Chen SA, et al. Prevalence and causes of fatal outcome in catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. May 12 2009;53(19):1798-1803. PMID 19422987
100. Haeusler KG, Koch L, Herm J, et al. 3 Tesla MRI-detected brain lesions after pulmonary vein isolation for atrial fibrillation: results of the MACPAF study. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. Jan 2013;24(1):14-21. PMID 22913568
101. Herm J, Fiebach JB, Koch L, et al. Neuropsychological effects of MRI-detected brain lesions after left atrial catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation: long-term results of the MACPAF study. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. Oct 2013;6(5):843-850. PMID 23989301
102. Calkins H, Kuck KH, Cappato R, et al. 2012 HRS/EHRA/ECAS expert consensus statement on catheter and surgical ablation of atrial fibrillation: recommendations for patient selection, procedural techniques, patient management and follow-up, definitions, endpoints, and research trial design: a report of the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS) Task Force on Catheter and Surgical Ablation of Atrial Fibrillation. Developed in partnership with the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA), a registered branch of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Cardiac Arrhythmia Society (ECAS); and in collaboration with the American College of Cardiology (ACC), American Heart Association (AHA), the Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS), and the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS). Endorsed by the governing bodies of the American College of Cardiology Foundation, the American Heart Association, the European Cardiac Arrhythmia Society, the European Heart Rhythm Association, the Society of Thoracic Surgeons, the Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society, and the Heart Rhythm Society. *Heart Rhythm*. Apr 2012;9(4):632-696 e621. PMID 22386883
103. Calkins H, Hindricks G, Cappato R, et al. 2017 HRS/EHRA/ECAS/APHRS/SOLAECE expert consensus statement on catheter and surgical ablation of atrial fibrillation. *Europace*. Jan 1 2018;20(1):e1-e160. PMID 29016840
104. 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):e1-76. PMID 24685669
105. Kirchhof P, Benussi S, Kotecha D, et al. 2016 ESC Guidelines for the management of atrial fibrillation developed in collaboration with EACTS. *Europace*. Nov 2016;18(11):1609-1678. PMID 27567465
106. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association. Catheter Ablation as Treatment for Atrial Fibrillation. Medical Policy Reference Manual. 2.02.19. Revised May 2018.