

Obstructive and Central Sleep Apnea Treatment (for Pennsylvania Only)

Policy Number: CS116PA.AH

Effective Date: March 1, 2024

[➔ Instructions for Use](#)

Table of Contents	Page
Application	1
Coverage Rationale	1
Definitions	2
Applicable Codes	4
Description of Services	5
Clinical Evidence	7
U.S. Food and Drug Administration	28
References	30
Policy History/Revision Information	36
Instructions for Use	37

Related Policies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Durable Medical Equipment, Orthotics, Medical Supplies, and Repairs/Replacements (for Pennsylvania Only) • Orthognathic (Jaw) Surgery (for Pennsylvania Only) • Outpatient Surgical Procedures – Site of Services (for Pennsylvania Only)

Application

This Medical Policy only applies to the state of Pennsylvania. Any requests for services that do not meet criteria set in the PARP will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Refer to [Pennsylvania Exceptions, Pennsylvania Code, Title 55, Chapter 1101](#).

Coverage Rationale

Non-Surgical Treatment

Removable [Oral Appliances](#) are proven and medically necessary for treating [Obstructive Sleep Apnea \(OSA\)](#) as documented by a sleep study (e.g., [polysomnography](#) or [Home Sleep Apnea Testing](#)).

For many individuals, oral appliance therapy (OAT) may be an effective alternative to failed continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) therapy. Documentation of the following is required:

- A patient presenting with symptoms of OSA has been seen in a face-to-face evaluation with a qualified physician (MD or DO) trained in sleep medicine or with an [Advanced Practice Provider](#) working under the direct supervision of a sleep medicine physician prior to beginning treatment for OAT (AASM and AADSM, December 2012, AAO-HNS, November 2019)
- A treating physician (MD or DO) or an [Advanced Practice Provider](#) must diagnose OSA and recommend course of treatment (AAO-HNS, November 2019)
- If the patient refuses CPAP therapy, documentation of the refusal from the patient’s treating physician (MD or DO) or an [Advanced Practice Provider](#) must be supplied

For information on snoring and Oral Appliances, refer to the Medical Policy titled [Durable Medical Equipment, Orthotics, Medical Supplies, and Repairs/Replacements \(for Pennsylvania Only\)](#).

For medical necessity clinical coverage criteria for removable oral appliances, refer to the InterQual® CP: Durable Medical Equipment, Noninvasive Airway Assistive Devices.

Click [here](#) to view the InterQual® criteria.

The following are unproven and not medically necessary due to insufficient evidence of efficacy:

- Devices for treating [Positional OSA](#)
- Nasal dilator devices for treating [OSA](#)
- Intranasal expiratory resistance valve (e.g., Bongo Rx)
- Removable [Oral Appliances](#) for treating [Central Sleep Apnea](#)
- Prefabricated [Oral Appliance](#)/device
- Non-surgical electrical muscular training
- Mandibular repositioning devices (e.g., Slow Wave)
- Morning repositioning devices

Surgical Treatment

Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP), mandibular osteotomy (MO), and maxillomandibular osteotomy and advancement (MMA) are proven and medically necessary in an adult patient when all the following criteria are met:

- Diagnosis of moderate to severe OSA [[Apnea Hypopnea Index \(AHI\)](#) or [Respiratory Disturbance Index \(RDI\)](#) ≥ 15]
- Excessive daytime sleepiness documented with an [Epworth Sleepiness Scale \(ESS\)](#) > 10 or with another validated tool
- Failure of adequate trial of CPAP therapy
- Failure of adequate trial of oral appliance therapy

In addition, the following criteria needs to be met:

- For MMA, craniofacial disproportion or deformities with evidence of maxillomandibular deficiency
- For MO, retrolingual or lower pharyngeal function obstruction

Implantable hypoglossal nerve stimulation with an FDA approved device is proven and medically necessary in an adult patient with moderate to severe [OSA](#) when all the following criteria are met:

- Body Mass Index of (BMI) less than or equal to 32kg/m²; and
- [AHI](#) of ≥ 20 and ≤ 65 as determined with [Polysomnography \(Attended\)](#); and
- Total AHI < 25% for central + mixed apneas; and
- Absence of complete concentric collapse at the soft palate level; and
- Failure or intolerance of positive airway pressure (PAP) treatments [such as continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) or bi-level positive airway pressure (BPAP) machines]
 - PAP failure is defined as an inability to eliminate OSA (AHI of greater than 20 despite PAP usage) and PAP intolerance is defined as:
 - Inability to use PAP (greater than 5 nights per week of usage; usage defined as greater than 4 hours of use per night); or
 - Unwillingness to use PAP (for example, a patient returns the PAP system after attempting to use it)

Implantable neurostimulation devices for the treatment of [Central Sleep Apnea \(CSA\)](#) are unproven and not medically necessary due to insufficient evidence of safety and/or efficacy.

The following surgical procedures are unproven and not medically necessary for treating [OSA](#) due to insufficient evidence of efficacy:

- Laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP)
- Lingual suspension - also referred to as tongue stabilization, tongue stitch or tongue fixation
- Palatal implants
- Radiofrequency ablation of the soft palate and/or tongue base
- Transoral robotic surgery (TORS)
- Distraction osteogenesis for maxillary expansion (DOME)

Definitions

Advanced Practice Providers (APPs): Non-physician, direct care providers such as Physician Assistants (PAs) and Advanced Practice Registered Nurses (APRNs) (Sarzynski and Barry, 2019).

Apnea: The cessation of airflow ($\geq 90\%$ decrease in airflow compared to baseline) lasting at least 10 seconds. Apneas are classified as obstructive, mixed, or central based on the pattern of respiratory effort. An obstructive Apnea is associated with continued or increased inspiratory effort throughout the entire period of absent airflow. A central Apnea is associated with absent inspiratory effort throughout the entire period of absent airflow. Mixed Apneas are associated with absent inspiratory effort in the initial portion of the event, followed by resumption of inspiratory effort in the second portion of the event (American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM) Scoring Manual, 2020).

Apnea Hypopnea Index (AHI): The number of Apneas plus the number of Hypopneas during the entire sleeping period, times 60, divided by total sleep time in minutes; unit: event per hour (AASM Scoring Manual, 2020).

Central Sleep Apnea (CSA): Characterized by sleep disordered breathing associated with decreased or no respiratory effort accompanied by excessive daytime sleepiness, frequent nocturnal awakening, or both. CSA due to hypoventilation occurs when the stimulus to breathe is removed in patients with compromised neuromuscular ventilator control. Chronic ventilatory failure due to neuromuscular or chest wall disease can produce central apneas or hypopneas and may occur in patients with central nervous system disease (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services).

Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS): A self-administered questionnaire with 8 questions; respondents are asked to rate, on a 4-point scale (0-3), their usual chances of dozing off or falling asleep while engaged in eight different activities. The ESS score (the sum of 8 item scores, 0-3) can range from 0 to 24 (Johns, 1991).

Home Sleep Apnea Testing (HSAT): The use of unattended diagnostic studies to assess for OSA without the determination of sleep stage. The term specifies the condition being assessed (i.e., sleep Apnea) by current technology without implying that “sleep” quality, staging or time are determined. Not all such studies are performed at home; however, that is where the vast majority of patients undergo these tests (AASM Style Guide, 2015). Adequate HSAT occurs over a minimum of four hours and includes a minimum of the following sensors: nasal pressure, chest and abdominal respiratory inductance plethysmography, and oximetry (Kapur et al., 2017). HSAT is also referred to as out-of-center sleep testing or portable monitoring.

Hypopnea: An abnormal respiratory event lasting at least 10 seconds associated with at least a 30% reduction in airflow and with at least a 3% decrease in oxygen saturation from pre-event baseline or the event is associated with an arousal (AASM Scoring Manual, 2020).

Obstructive Sleep Apnea (OSA): The AASM defines Obstructive Sleep Apnea as a sleep related breathing disorder that involves a decrease or complete halt in airflow despite an ongoing effort to breathe.

OSA severity is defined as:

- Mild for AHI or RDI ≥ 5 and < 15
- Moderate for AHI or RDI ≥ 15 and ≤ 30
- Severe for AHI or RDI > 30 /hour

Oral Appliance: A device inserted into the mouth for treatment of snoring or OSA (Berry, 2012). These devices can be identified as prefabricated (ready-made), or custom made.

Physician or Practitioner: An individual who is qualified by education, training, licensure/regulation (when applicable) and facility privileging (when applicable) who performs a professional service within his/her scope of practice and independently reports that professional service (AMA CPT book, 2022).

Polysomnogram (Attended): A laboratory-based sleep study that uses multiple channels to record a wide range of physiological information, including brain activity, eye movements, body movements, breathing and heart rate (American Thoracic Society, 2015; updated 2019).

Positional Obstructive Sleep Apnea: The AASM defines Positional Obstructive Sleep Apnea as a lower AHI in the non-supine position than in the supine position (deVries, 2015).

Respiratory Disturbance Index (RDI): The number of Apneas plus the number of Hypopneas plus the number of Respiratory Effort-Related Arousals during the entire sleeping period, times 60, divided by total sleep time in minutes; unit: events per hour (AASM Scoring Manual, 2020).

Respiratory Effort-Related Arousal (RERA): A sequence of breaths characterized by increasing respiratory effort, inspiratory flattening in the nasal pressure or PAP device flow channel or an increase in end-tidal PCO₂ (children) leading to an arousal from sleep. Respiratory effort-related arousals do not meet criteria for Hypopnea and have a minimum duration of at least 10 seconds in adults or the duration of at least two breaths in children (AASM Scoring Manual, 2020).

Respiratory Event Index (REI): Total number of respiratory events scored during the entire sleeping period, times 60, divided by monitoring time in minutes; unit: events per hour. The REI is used for Home Sleep Apnea Testing (AASM Scoring Manual, 2020).

Applicable Codes

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

Coding Clarification: HCPCS code E0486 applies to the custom fabricated oral device/appliance used to reduce upper airway collapsibility, adjustable or nonadjustable and includes fitting and adjustment. Dental services (e.g., D9947, D9948 and D9949) are excluded from coverage under the medical plan; the member specific benefit plan document must be referenced prior to determining any coverage decision.

CPT Code	Description
21142	Reconstruction midface, LeFort I; 2 pieces, segment movement in any direction, without bone graft
21199	Osteotomy, mandible, segmental; with genioglossus advancement
21206	Osteotomy, maxilla, segmental (e.g., Wassmund or Schuchard)
21685	Hyoid myotomy and suspension
33276	Insertion of phrenic nerve stimulator system (pulse generator and stimulating lead[s]), including vessel catheterization, all imaging guidance, and pulse generator initial analysis with diagnostic mode activation, when performed
33277	Insertion of phrenic nerve stimulator transvenous sensing lead (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
33278	Removal of phrenic nerve stimulator, including vessel catheterization, all imaging guidance, and interrogation and programming, when performed; system, including pulse generator and lead(s)
33279	Removal of phrenic nerve stimulator, including vessel catheterization, all imaging guidance, and interrogation and programming, when performed; transvenous stimulation or sensing lead(s) only
33280	Removal of phrenic nerve stimulator, including vessel catheterization, all imaging guidance, and interrogation and programming, when performed; pulse generator only
33281	Repositioning of phrenic nerve stimulator transvenous lead(s)
33287	Removal and replacement of phrenic nerve stimulator, including vessel catheterization, all imaging guidance, and interrogation and programming, when performed; pulse generator
33288	Removal and replacement of phrenic nerve stimulator, including vessel catheterization, all imaging guidance, and interrogation and programming, when performed; transvenous stimulation or sensing lead(s)
41512	Tongue base suspension, permanent suture technique
41530	Submucosal ablation of the tongue base, radiofrequency, 1 or more sites, per session

CPT Code	Description
41599	Unlisted procedure, tongue, floor of mouth
42140	Uvulectomy, excision of uvula
42145	Palatopharyngoplasty (e.g., uvulopalatopharyngoplasty, uvulopharyngoplasty)
42299	Unlisted procedure, palate, uvula
64570	Removal of cranial nerve (e.g., vagus nerve) neurostimulator electrode array and pulse generator
64582	Open implantation of hypoglossal nerve neurostimulator array, pulse generator, and distal respiratory sensor electrode or electrode array
64583	Revision or replacement of hypoglossal nerve neurostimulator array and distal respiratory sensor electrode or electrode array, including connection to existing pulse generator
64584	Removal of hypoglossal nerve neurostimulator array, pulse generator, and distal respiratory sensor electrode or electrode array
93150	Therapy activation of implanted phrenic nerve stimulator system, including all interrogation and programming
93151	Interrogation and programming (minimum one parameter) of implanted phrenic nerve stimulator system
93152	Interrogation and programming of implanted phrenic nerve stimulator system during polysomnography
93153	Interrogation without programming of implanted phrenic nerve stimulator system

CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association

HCPCS Code	Description
A7049	Expiratory positive airway pressure intranasal resistance valve
E0485	Oral device/appliance used to reduce upper airway collapsibility, adjustable or nonadjustable, prefabricated, includes fitting and adjustment
E0486	Oral device/appliance used to reduce upper airway collapsibility, adjustable or nonadjustable, custom fabricated, includes fitting and adjustment
E0492	Power source and control electronics unit for oral device/appliance for neuromuscular electrical stimulation of the tongue muscle, controlled by phone application
E0493	Oral device/appliance for neuromuscular electrical stimulation of the tongue muscle, used in conjunction with the power source and control electronics unit, controlled by phone application, 90-day supply
E0530	Electronic positional obstructive sleep apnea treatment, with sensor, includes all components and accessories, any type
E1399	Durable medical equipment, miscellaneous
K1027	Oral device/appliance used to reduce upper airway collapsibility, without fixed mechanical hinge, custom fabricated, includes fitting and adjustment
L8679	Implantable neurostimulator, pulse generator, any type
L8680	Implantable neurostimulator electrode, each
L8686	Implantable neurostimulator pulse generator, single array, nonrechargeable, includes extension
S2080	Laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP)
S2900	Surgical techniques requiring use of robotic surgical system (list separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

Description of Services

Obstructive Sleep Apnea (OSA) is a breathing disorder that is defined by episodes of decrease or complete cessation of airflow during sleep. In OSA, airflow is obstructed when the muscles in the back of the throat fail to keep the airway open. Nocturnal respiration in individuals with OSA is characterized by episodes of Apnea (breathing cessation) and Hypopnea (marked

reduction in breathing volume). The signs and symptoms of untreated OSA include excessive daytime sleepiness, loud snoring, nocturnal choking, apneas or choking witnessed by bed partner, unrefreshing sleep, morning headaches, reduced libido and enuresis. Physiological effects of untreated OSA include fluctuating blood oxygen levels, increased heart rate, chronic daytime hypertension and impaired glucose tolerance/insulin resistance.

Central Sleep Apnea (CSA) is distinguished by a temporary interruption of neural output from the respiratory control center, resulting in loss of respiratory stimulation and airflow cessation. The International Classification of Sleep Disorders (ICSD) identifies 6 different forms of CSA. However, the underlying pathophysiology of central sleep apnea is due to either post-hyperventilation central apnea, which may be triggered by a variety of clinical conditions or central apnea secondary to hypoventilation, which has been described with opioid use hypoventilation. This condition occurs frequently in patients with heart failure and increases the risk for morbidity and mortality. It's estimated that CSA may be present in 30% to 50% of patients with heart failure. Currently available treatments for central sleep apnea are not widely accepted because of sparse effectiveness data, poor patient adherence, and potential safety risks. Implantable neurostimulation devices have however been studied for the treatment of CSA.

Diagnosis and evaluation of sleep apnea syndrome is determined through polysomnography (PSG) or limited channel testing. Treatment for OSA includes lifestyle modifications (weight loss, avoidance of alcohol or other agents that decrease upper airway patency), positional therapy, positive airway pressure (PAP), oral appliance therapy (OAT), electrostimulation devices and surgery. PAP therapy may use any one of the following techniques: continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), automatic positive airway pressure (APAP), bilevel positive airway pressure (BiPAP), variable positive airway pressure (VPAP).

Non-surgical oral appliances, worn during sleep, can be an effective treatment option for snoring and OSA. These devices work by keeping the airway open in one of three ways: by pushing the lower jaw forward (a mandibular advancement device or MAD), by preventing the tongue from falling back over the airway (a tongue-retaining device) or by combining both mechanisms.

A known side effect with the use of a nighttime non-surgical oral appliance (i.e., sleep apnea appliance) for OSA is occlusal discrepancy. Morning repositioning devices, which are used after removal of the nighttime oral appliance, guide the maxillary and mandibular teeth back into their normal alignment. However, it must be noted that despite the widespread use of this technique, no evidence to date has demonstrated its effectiveness (AADSM 2017).

It is the position of the American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM) that dentists and physicians work collaboratively managing sleep-related breathing disorders with OAT by conducting follow-up sleep testing to improve or confirm treatment efficacy along with periodic follow up visits (Ramar, 2015).

A nasal dilator operates by mechanically opening the nasal passages either externally or internally. External nasal dilators, also known as nasal strips, are positioned just below the bone of the nose which pull the nasal passages open. Internal nasal dilators come in a variety of shapes and sizes are positioned just inside the nose to prop the nostrils open.

A nasal expiratory positive airway pressure (EPAP) device is a one-way valve that attaches to the nostrils before sleep. These valves use the sleeper's own breathing to create a positive end-expiratory pressure with minimal resistance. This "high end-expiratory pressure leads to upper airway dilation with subsequent tracheal traction and increased lung volumes during exhalation, thereby making the upper airway more resistant to narrowing/closure during ensuing inspiration" (Lorenzi-Filho, et al. 2017). These devices are often times reusable, comfortable and easy for the patient to use.

Positional therapy for OSA may be an effective method to treat patients in the short-term for whom OSA is improved by sleeping on the side. Devices to support positional therapy include but are not limited to vibrating devices, pillows, tennis balls, and chest vests that prevent the patient to sleep in the supine position.

There are a variety of surgical options used to treat OSA. The intention of surgery is to create a more open airway, so obstructions are less likely to occur.

Implantable hypoglossal nerve stimulation systems are ways to relieve upper airway obstruction. There are two hypoglossal nerve stimulation devices: The Inspire® Upper Airway Stimulation device (Inspire Medical) and the aura6000™ Sleep Therapy System (ImThera Medical). The Inspire device treats moderate to severe OSA and is designed for use in individuals who are

unable or unwilling to use a CPAP device. Inspire's construction and implantation are comparable to those of a pacemaker: a surgeon implants the device containing a neurostimulator subcutaneously in the individual's chest with one lead attached to the individual's hypoglossal nerve (cranial nerve XII) at the base of the tongue and one lead implanted in the individual's chest. The lead in the chest consists of a pressure sensor that detects breathing. Information about respiration rate is relayed to the device, which stimulates the hypoglossal nerve in the tongue. When stimulated, the tongue moves forward, thus opening the airway. The individual can operate the device by remote control, which the individual activates before going to sleep. The device turns on after 20 minutes to minimize disrupting the individual's sleep onset; the device turns off via remote when the individual wakes.

Clinical Evidence

Non-Surgical Treatment

Devices for Treating Positional OSA

There are a variety of devices used for treating positional OSA. The available literature addressing these devices is conflicting or inconclusive and thus future studies are warranted to demonstrate their safety and efficacy.

In a health technology assessment, Hayes (2021) reflects an overall low-quality body of evidence for the use of NightBalance for treatment of positional OSA. The evidence included 6 studies: 2 RCTs, 2 RCTs with a crossover design and 2 studies with pre- and post-test designs. Overall, the evidence lacked comparative studies and long-term efficacy.

In a product brief on NightBalance Lunoa by Philips Respironics, Inc., ECRI (2020) concludes that the evidence for this technology is inconclusive due to the lack of evidence available for review.

In a Cochrane review of randomized controlled trials, Srijiithesh et al. (2019) compared the efficacy of positional therapy versus CPAP and positional therapy versus inactive control (sham intervention or no positional therapy intervention) in people with OSA. Eight studies with 323 randomized participants met the inclusion criteria. The comparison between positional therapy and CPAP included 72 participants, while the comparison between positional therapy and inactive control included 251 participants. Three studies used supine vibration alarm devices, while five studies used physical positioning. The authors found that while positional therapy may have better adherence by participants, CPAP has a greater effect on improvement of AHI. The evidence was low to moderate and all studies were of short-term duration therefore future long-term studies are needed for long-term outcomes and efficacy.

In a pilot observational study, Hidalgo et al. (2019) evaluated efficacy of sleep position therapy in fourteen patients with positional OSA for four weeks. Criteria for participants to be included in study were > 18 years, had a diagnosis of positional OSA by polysomnography (PSG), an AHI > 10/h, total sleep time (TST) ≥ 180 minutes, supine time position > 30% and no previous CPAP treatment. A complete overnight PSG was performed at baseline and at 1 and 4 weeks after starting the study. After the initial PSG, each participant was given a vibrating positional device that was placed on the patient's forehead via a sticker; this device was to be used for the next four weeks. The device starts vibrating with increasing intensity and has four different vibration intensities when the patient lies in the supine position for more than 30 seconds. The vibration stops when the patient changes from the supine to the non-supine position. The authors found the use of this vibrating device decreased the median AHI in patients up to 31.6%; in addition, improvement in oxygen saturation was observed. It was concluded this type of device could be useful for patients with positional OSA, but further studies are warranted. Limitations included small participation size, limited follow-up for long-term compliance and lack of a placebo group. Further RCTs are required to confirm the efficacy of this device placed on the patient's forehead.

A multicenter trial randomized ninety-nine patients with mild to moderate positional OSA (POSA) to either a sleep position trainer (SPT) group or one with oral appliance therapy (de Ruyter et al. (2018), included in the Hayes Report above). SPT is a newer option for treating patients with positional OSA and the goal of the authors was to investigate the long-term efficacy, adherence and quality of life for this device. Eligible participants had a diagnosis of mild to moderate POSA (AHI of 5-30) and spent 10-90% of their sleep time in the supine position. The SPT group utilized the NightBalance device which was worn across the chest using a neoprene strap. The active comparator was a SomnoDent Flex device custom made by SomnoMed which included a blue chip for adherence. Analysis of the data indicated the AHI and oxygen desaturation index (ODI) were significantly reduced for both treatment groups at the 3- and 12-month follow up visits along with similar results for adherence

of the device usage in both groups. The main limitation of this study was the higher dropout rate over the course of the study that did not allow analysis of the complete randomized sample.

Barnes et al. (2017) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis on positional modification techniques in patients with supine OSA. Seven studies with 108 participants met the inclusion criteria in comparing any type of positional therapy (e.g., vibratory vests, foam backpacks, tennis balls) with any other intervention. In positional techniques compared to non-standard therapy, four studies included in the meta-analysis showed significant reduction in AHI favoring the positional techniques. In positional techniques compared to CPAP therapy, 2 studies showed significant reduction in AHI favoring CPAP. One study showed a significant reduction in AHI favoring the sleep position trainer when compared to a tennis ball vest. Additionally, the evidence suggested that there was no significant effect on sleepiness or sleep efficiency when position modification therapy (PMT) was compared to no treatment or the CPAP treatment. Although it was identified that participants have greater compliance with positional techniques than CPAP in the short-term, the authors found long-term results remain unclear specifically for electronic vibratory devices. In addition, CPAP is more effective at reducing AHI. Future studies should include multiple positional devices using an adequate number of participants, comparison group and long-term follow-up.

Nasal Dilators

The available evidence for nasal dilators is conflicting, but tends to support the ineffectiveness of these devices. In order to prove a benefit of nasal dilators, future research should demonstrate the clinical utility and long-term safety and efficacy of these devices.

Suzuki et al. (2022) conducted a study on 10 male participants and evaluated the airflow rate of the new nasal breathing stent (NBS) against those of existing nasal dilators. The following were the comparator dilators used: Max-Air Nose Cones[®] (NC) and Mute with hole[®] (MT) for internal nasal use, and Breathe Right[®] (BR), an external nasal dilator. The NBS design expands the nasal valve by pressing the depressor septi at the joint and is designed to facilitate airflow via the enhanced diameter differences at the entry and exit sections. Airflow movement was filmed with and without the appliance; high speed camera was used to measure and capture airflow velocity when the appliance was utilized. The authors found the mean velocity was significantly higher for the NBS than the other appliances used. Limitations included small sample size and lack of long-term OSA-specific outcomes. While this new device shows promise, further investigation on patients with OSA is necessary to examine the effects of NBS when compared to that of an oral appliance or CPAP.

Gelardi et al. (2019) studied 19 adult patients with a diagnosis of OSA and whether the use of internal nasal dilator was able to significantly reduce AHI and the oxygen desaturation index. Subjective parameters were evaluated by the patients, and included perception of nasal obstruction, sleep quality, and olfaction – these were all measured by a visual analogue scale (VAS). The VAS scores ranged from zero for completely blocked nose to 10 which indicated a completely patent nose; additional evaluation for smell, quality of sleep, and satisfaction. Daytime sleepiness was evaluated with the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS) – an ESS score of ≥ 10 was considered excessive daytime sleepiness. Cardiorespiratory nocturnal monitoring was performed on all participants. Oxyhemoglobin saturation, heart rate, body posture, oral-nasal air flow, snoring sounds, and thoracic and abdominal movements were recorded in detail. Each participant was given the Nas-air[®] device with appropriate instruction for the use. The results indicated the use of Nas-air[®] significantly reduced the AHI values (38.7 ± 30 vs 31.1 ± 27.4 ; $p = 0.000$) and ODI scores (36.4 ± 30.6 vs 29.0 ± 26.4 ; $p = 0.001$) In addition, the use of Nas-air[®] significantly increased the restoring sleep score (54.8 ± 26.2 vs 73.3 ± 21.7 ; $p = 0.000$). The authors concluded the results showed that Nas-air[®] is a new internal nasal dilator potentially capable to significantly improve respiratory outcomes and sleep quality for patients with OSA. However, the study had some limitations including lack of comparison with established treatments, the open-label study design, the lack of follow-up, and the low number of enrolled participants. Thus, further studies should be conducted to demonstrate the clinical utility of this device.

In a systematic review and meta-analysis, Camacho et al. (2016) evaluated internal (NoZovent) and external (Breathe Right Strips) nasal dilators as treatment for obstructive sleep apnea (OSA). Five studies were found for internal dilators and nine studies for external dilators. Twelve of the fourteen studies showed no significant change in the apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) with the use of the nasal dilators. Furthermore, the meta-analysis of the combined studies did not show any benefit of the device. The essential limitation of this study is the lower quality of published studies evaluating nasal dilators. Most studies were individual case-control or prospective case series studies with often smaller sample sizes lacking randomization and other significant drawbacks. Although nasal dilators have demonstrated improved nasal breathing, they have not shown improvement in OSA outcomes, except with mild improvement in apnea when internal nasal dilators were used.

Intranasal Expiratory Resistance Valve (e.g., Bongo Rx)

The evidence for intranasal expiratory resistance valves is limited and of low quality; these devices vary and the studies have small sample sizes. In order to prove a benefit of these appliances, future research should demonstrate the clinical utility and long-term safety and efficacy of these devices.

Sleeper et al. (2022) conducted a laboratory comparison to test the expiratory pressures generated by the following four expiratory positive airway pressure (EPAP) devices: ULTepap, Provent, Bongo Rx, and Theravent. Measurement of the expiratory and inspiratory pressures were captured by a Respironics digital pressure manometer. Prior to the measurement of each of the devices, the manometer was calibrated to zero. The authors found the expiratory pressures generated by ULTepap and Provent were similar, with ULTepap being slightly lower at all flow rates. The Bongo Rx and Theravent devices produced substantially lower backpressures than Provent and ULTepap, in addition to Bongo Rx having a significantly lower flow rate. In summary, the authors felt not all FDA cleared EPAP devices provide similar mechanical results and additional clinical trials comparing short- and long-term efficacy, patient satisfaction, and adherence are warranted. Limitations included lack of OSA-specific outcomes and lack of clinical evidence of efficacy.

In a randomized, partially blinded, placebo-controlled trial Rossi et al. (2013) evaluated the efficacy of the Provent nasal device for preventing the recurrence of obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) following continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) withdrawal in patients with moderate-to-severe OSA. The goal of the study was to determine if OSA patients could occasionally substitute the Provent device for their CPAP. Sixty-seven patients with OSA receiving CPAP were randomized to one of three groups for 2 weeks: continuing CPAP (n = 23), active Provent (n = 22) or placebo Provent (n = 22). The three groups were similar at baseline and their mean apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) before CPAP treatment was 38 events per hour. Primary outcomes included for the active Provent versus the placebo Provent were OSA severity (oxygen desaturation index (ODI)), AHI and Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS) score. Secondary outcomes for the active Provent versus the placebo Provent included ODI from ambulatory pulse oximetry and blood pressure (BP). For CPAP versus the active Provent or CPAP versus the placebo Provent, secondary outcomes included ODI/AHI, ESS and BP. OSA recurred in the active Provent and placebo Provent groups, and there was no significant difference in ODI, AHI and ESS between active Provent and placebo Provent at 2 weeks. ODI from ambulatory pulse-oximetry and BP at 2 weeks were not different in the active Provent versus the placebo Provent groups. ODI, AHI and BP, but not ESS, were significantly higher in the active Provent and placebo Provent groups compared with CPAP. The authors concluded that Provent cannot be recommended as an alternative short-term therapy for patients with moderate to severe OSA already on CPAP. The study provides evidence for inferiority of the Provent nasal device compared to CPAP and for the ineffectiveness of nasal dilator when compared to a placebo device.

Berry et al. (2011) conducted a multicenter randomized controlled trial investigating the efficacy of the Provent nasal device, a nasal expiratory positive airway pressure (EPAP) device for treating OSA. Two hundred and fifty patients with mild to severe OSA were randomized to treatment with EPAP (n = 127) or a similar sham device (n = 123) for 3 months. A total of 229 completed week 1 sleep studies (119 EPAP, 110 sham). This group was the intention to treat (ITT) group. Of these, 173 had an AHI > 5/hour on the device-off night and comprised the modified intention to treat (mITT) group (92 EPAP, 81 sham). One hundred ninety-five patients in the ITT group (100 EPAP, 95 sham) and 144 patients in the mITT group (77 EPAP, 67 sham) completed the 3-month study. All patients underwent a baseline clinic evaluation that included the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS). Polysomnography (PSG) was performed on 2 non-consecutive nights (random order: device-on, device-off) at week 1 and after 3 months of treatment. At week 1, the EPAP device significantly decreased the AHI compared to device-off nights and the difference was significantly greater than with the sham device (52.7% versus 7.3%, ITT analysis). At 3 months, 51% of the EPAP device users had a 50% or greater reduction in the AHI on device-on compared to device-off nights. The authors concluded that nasal EPAP significantly reduced the AHI and improved subjective daytime sleepiness compared to the sham treatment in patients with mild to severe OSA with excellent adherence. This study is limited by short follow-up, loss to follow up, lack of comparison with established treatment approaches, patient-reported adherence, a large number of exclusion criteria and a modified intention to treat group. A potential for bias exists due to manufacturer sponsorship of the study.

Kryger et al. (2011) conducted a 13-center extension study of the 3-month Berry trial. This study was designed to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of the Provent nasal device among participants who had responded in the initial study. Forty-one patients from the EPAP arm who met adherence and efficacy criteria were continued on therapy and returned for polysomnography (PSG) after 12 months of treatment. From the analyzable subject cohort (n = 34), results from the 12-month PSGs were compared against their baseline results. Median AHI was reduced from 15.7 to 4.7 events/h (week 1 device-off versus month 12 device-on). The decrease in the AHI (median) was 71.3%. The Epworth Sleepiness Scale decreased from 11.1 ± 4.2 to 6.0 ± 3.2. The median percentage of reported nights used (entire night) was 89.3%. The authors reported that long-term

adherence to EPAP was excellent in those who had a positive clinical response at month 3 of the Berry trial. As with the original trial, this study is limited by patient-reported adherence and a large number of exclusion criteria. Additionally, analyses limited to responders is inherently biased to assess objectively the impact of an intervention. Furthermore, a potential for bias exists due to manufacturer sponsorship of the study.

Walsh et al. (2011) evaluated tolerability, short-term efficacy and adherence of the Provent nasal device, an EPAP nasal device, in 59 patients with OSA who refused CPAP or used CPAP less than 3 hours per night. After demonstrating tolerability to the EPAP device during approximately 1 week of home use, 47 patients (80%) underwent a baseline polysomnogram (PSG1). Forty-three patients met AHI entry criteria and underwent PSG2 within 10 days of PSG1. Twenty-four patients (56%) met prespecified efficacy criteria and underwent PSG3 after 5 weeks of EPAP treatment. Compared to PSG1, mean AHI was significantly lower at both PSG2 and PSG3. For most patients AHI at PSG3 was similar to AHI at PSG2. Device use was reported an average of 92% of all sleep hours. The authors concluded that improvements in AHI and Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS) scores, combined with the high degree of treatment adherence observed, suggest that the EPAP device tested may become a useful therapeutic option for OSA. Limitations of the study include lack of randomization and control, small sample size and short-term follow-up. A potential for bias exists due to manufacturer sponsorship of the study.

In a multicenter, prospective study, Rosenthal et al. (2009) evaluated the efficacy of the Provent nasal device for the treatment of OSA and evaluated adherence to the device over a 30-day in-home trial period. Participants (n = 34) with a baseline apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) ≥ 5 were evaluated. Treatment was well tolerated and accepted by the participants. The authors documented an overall reduction in AHI; however, therapeutic response was variable (and at times inconsistent) among the participants. Further research is required to identify the ideal candidates for this new therapeutic option in the management of OSA. Lack of comparison group limits the validity of the study. A potential for bias exists due to manufacturer sponsorship of the study.

Colrain et al. (2008) conducted a pilot study to test the hypothesis that the application of expiratory resistance via a nasal valve device would improve breathing during sleep in subjects with OSA and in primary snorers. Thirty men and women were recruited for the study. Twenty-four had at least mild OSA (AHI > 5), and 6 were primary snorers. Subjects underwent 2 nights of polysomnographic evaluation, one with and one without a new nasal resistance device with the order of nights counterbalanced across participants. The device consisted of a small valve inserted into each nostril calibrated to provide negligible inspiratory resistance but increased expiratory resistance. Standard polysomnography was conducted to compare participants' sleep both with and without the device, with the scoring conducted blind to treatment condition. The apnea-hypopnea (AHI) and oxygen desaturation (O2DI) indices both significantly decreased, and the percentage of the night spent above 90% saturation significantly increased with device use. The results of this pilot study are suggestive of a therapeutic effect of expiratory nasal resistance for some OSA patients and indicate that this technique is worthy of further clinical study. The findings are limited by lack of comparison group and lack of comparison to standard treatment for OSA. A potential for bias exists due to manufacturer sponsorship of the study.

Several clinical trials which address EPAP devices are ongoing; refer to: <https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/home>.

Removable Oral Appliances for Treating CSA

CSA is the result of an impaired neurological function, and removable oral appliance devices are designed to manage physical obstructions. No relevant evidence has been identified to support the use of oral appliances for CSA.

Prefabricated Oral Appliances/Devices

The evidence for prefabricated oral appliance or device is limited; there is little evidence to demonstrate the safety or efficacy of these devices in their use for OSA.

In an RCT, Johal and associates (2017) compare the effectiveness of ready-made versus custom made mandibular repositioning devices (MRD) in the management of mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnea (OSA). Thirty-five participants were randomized into receiving either the ready-made or custom made MRD. The primary outcome was measurement of AHI which was measured by an overnight home sleep study. The authors demonstrated custom made devices for MRD had a significant impact in the treatment of OSA in contrast to the ready-made devices. The participants overwhelmingly found the ready-made appliance difficult to tolerate due to the limitation in the device design and inability to address individual needs.

Limitations included small number of participants and a withdrawal of almost 30% of the patients after the 3-month treatment interval.

Non-Surgical Electrical Muscular Training

The evidence for nonsurgical electrical muscular stimulation is limited; there is little quality evidence to demonstrate the safety or efficacy in the use for OSA. Future studies are warranted which should include comparison groups and test for safety, efficacy, and long-term outcomes.

The eXciteOSA Device is a noninvasive, intraoral electrical muscle stimulation device for the treatment of mild obstructive sleep apnea and snoring. The device works by delivering electrical muscle stimulation through a mouthpiece that sits around the tongue. The system consists of a mouthpiece, a rechargeable control unit, and a mobile app that allows the patient to control and track therapy. The suggested use for the device is 20 minutes each day during a wakeful state for 6 weeks and then once per week thereafter (Hayes, 2021).

An ECRI (2022) clinical evidence assessment identifies very low-quality evidence from three pre-post studies which suggests eXciteOSA may improve symptoms in some patients with mild OSA, but does not draw any supportable conclusions. There are no published studies that provide a comparative analysis between eXciteOSA and other OSA treatments in patients with mild OSA. Limitations include high risk bias, lack of blinding and lack of long-term efficacy. The authors conclude that the evidence is inconclusive. Further RCTs with long-term outcomes are needed to address these gaps.

Moffa et al. (2022) conducted a systematic review to evaluate the efficacy of non-invasive electric stimulation devices for the treatment of primary snoring and obstructive sleep apnea. The review included literature published through September 2021 that reported use of an intraoral device that performs an awake neuromuscular electric stimulation of the tongue muscles. Four studies met inclusion criteria with two devices that were included in the review, Apone-Stim 400 Muscle Stimulator and eXciteOSA. Based on the review, the authors noted the non-invasive electric stimulation devices improved snoring by 50%. Additionally, two studies showed a significant apnea-hypopnea index improvement in mild OSA. The authors suggested intraoral non-invasive electrical stimulation devices can be a valid option for snoring. Limitations included lack of comparison to other treatment approaches or sham, as well as analyses focused on pre-post comparisons.

Kotecha et al. (2021, included in the ECRI report and Moffa systematic review above) assessed objective snoring and respiratory parameters on a case series of 70 patients with the novel eXciteOSA device. Inclusion criteria consisted of adults 18 years and older suffering from habitual snoring for greater than 6 months along with a live-in partner. Each participant received the eXciteOSA[®] with an explanation of how to use the device. The daily therapy of 20 minutes over 6 weeks consisted of a series of pulse bursts with intensity controlled to a tolerable level by patient. The primary outcome measure was to have a reduction in snoring. Epworth Sleepiness Score (ESS) was completed on all patients before and after the use of the device along with respiratory parameters (AHI, ODI and oxygen saturations). VAS was also obtained from the patient's partner. The mean AHI value was 5.94/h which dropped to 5.37/h following completion of eXciteOSA[®] device therapy. In addition, the ODI reduced from 4.92 to 4.73 post treatment. The authors concluded the device appears to be safe for patients with snoring and mild sleep apnea and could be a preferred option for patients. However, the study lacked a control group, lacked standard snoring parameters, addressed a small sample size, and lacked long-term outcomes.

Baptista et al. (2021, included in the ECRI report and Moffa systematic review above) evaluated daytime neuromuscular electrical training (NMES) of tongue muscles in patients suffering from mild sleep apnea and snoring. 115 participants over the age of 18 years, AHI < 15 and had a live-in partner were included in the study; 73 were male and 42 were female with an average mean age of 46 years. For two weeks prior to the study, the live-in partner was to rate their partner's snoring using the VAS; in addition, both the partner and participant completed sleep quality questionnaires, including the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) and ESS at the end of the two-week period. At the start of the study each participant was given the eXciteOSA device and instructed on its use. Participants were asked to use the device 20 minutes once/day for a total of 6 weeks; they were to record daily assessments of any side effects and adverse events. Patient compliance with the therapy was validated remotely via the smartphone application. The mean AHI reduced from 6.85 to 5.03, and the ODI from 5.68 to 4.33. 90% of patients demonstrated some reduction in their objective snoring time and the VAS scores for bed partners showed a significant reduction in their perception of their partner's snoring. No severe adverse events were noted, and the main side effect reported for 15% of the patients was oral pooling of their saliva. The authors concluded the eXciteOSA device was well tolerated with a significant reduction in AHI. Limitations were acknowledged by the authors which included the need for randomization and comparison, restriction in duration and follow-up of the study, and lack of long-term outcomes.

Several clinical trials which address the eXciteOSA device along with its safety and efficacy are ongoing; refer to: <https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/home>.

Mandibular Repositioning Devices (e.g., Slow Wave)

Extensive research of the medical literature was conducted, and no quality evidence was identified to support the efficacy and safety of mandibular repositioning devices which open the jaw vertically for OSA.

Morning Repositioning Devices

No published studies addressing the use of morning repositioning devices were identified; therefore, their effect on health outcomes is unproven.

Clinical Practice Guidelines

American Academy of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS)

It is the recommendation of the AAO-HNS that patients presenting with symptoms of OSA require a face-to-face evaluation conducted by a qualified physician trained in Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery or Sleep Medicine (one who maintains certification from the American Board of Sleep Medicine or one of the sponsoring sleep medicine boards of the American Board of Medical Specialties, including the American Board of Otolaryngology). (AAO-HNS website; 2014; revised 2019).

American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM)

The AASM Clinical Practice Guideline recommends continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) or automatic positive airway pressure (APAP) for ongoing treatment of OSA in adults (Patil, 2019).

AASM makes the following recommendations regarding oral appliance therapy (Ramar et al., 2015):

- When oral appliance therapy is prescribed by a sleep physician for an adult patient with OSA, the guidelines suggest that a qualified dentist use a custom, titratable appliance over non-custom oral devices. Strength of recommendation: Guideline. Quality of evidence: Low. Benefits clearly outweigh harms
- Sleep physicians should consider prescription of oral appliances, rather than no treatment, for adult patients with OSA who are intolerant of CPAP therapy or prefer alternate therapy. Strength of recommendation: Standard. Quality of evidence: Moderate. Benefits clearly outweigh harms
- Qualified dentists should provide oversight, rather than no follow-up, of oral appliance therapy in adult patients with OSA to survey for dental-related side effects or occlusal changes and reduce their incidence. Strength of recommendation: Guideline. Quality of evidence: Low. Benefits clearly outweigh harms
- Sleep physicians should conduct follow-up sleep testing to improve or confirm treatment efficacy, rather than conduct follow-up without sleep testing, for patients fitted with oral appliances. Strength of recommendation: Guideline. Quality of evidence: Low. Benefits clearly outweigh harms
- Sleep physicians and qualified dentists should instruct adult patients treated with oral appliances for OSA to return for periodic office visits, as opposed to no follow-up, with a qualified dentist and a sleep physician. Strength of recommendation: Guideline. Quality of evidence: Low. Benefits clearly outweigh harms

AASM practice parameters on the treatment of central sleep apnea do not list oral appliances as a treatment option (Aurora et al., 2012).

American Academy of Dental Sleep Medicine (AADSM)

In a 2014 consensus paper, the AADSM describes the purpose, function and physical features of an effective oral appliance. It identifies an effective oral appliance as a custom-fabricated, FDA approved device which is designed to maintain airway patency during sleep for the management of OSA (AADSM, 2018). It further states a sleep-related breathing disorder such as OSA should be diagnosed by a physician and then referred to a dentist for oral appliance therapy.

The AADSM and American Academy of Sleep Medicine recently updated their clinical practice guideline for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) and snoring with oral appliance therapy (OAT). The guideline included the following recommendation: “We suggest that qualified dentists provide oversight—rather than no follow-up—of oral appliance therapy in adult patients with obstructive sleep apnea, to survey for dental-related side effects or occlusal changes and reduce their incidence.” In addition, many of the side effects were thought to be best addressed prophylactically with use of a morning

occlusal guide to help prevent occlusal alterations or to minimize transient muscle contraction. However, it must be noted that despite the widespread use of this technique, no evidence to date has demonstrated its effectiveness (AADSM, 2017).

American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons (AAOMS)

In a position paper on evaluation and management of OSA, the AAOMS reveals oral appliances have been shown to be effective in patients with mild to moderate OSA. Custom-made oral appliances may be indicated for use in patients with severe OSA who have failed CPAP treatment. These custom-made appliances should be fitted by qualified dental personnel (AAOMS, 2013). The paper does not address prefabricated oral devices.

American College of Physicians (ACP)

The American College of Physicians (ACP) developed a clinical practice guideline on the management of obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in adults (Qaseem, et al., 2013). The guideline makes the following recommendations:

- All overweight and obese patients diagnosed with OSA should be encouraged to lose weight. (Grade: strong recommendation; low-quality evidence)
- Continuous positive airway pressure treatment is recommended as the initial therapy for patients diagnosed with OSA. (Grade: strong recommendation; moderate-quality evidence)

European Respiratory Society (ERS)

An ERS guideline (Randerath, 2021) on non-CPAP therapies for patients with OSA makes the following recommendations for adult patients with OSA:

- Based on very low-quality evidence, in adult patients with OSA, the panel suggest that CPAP be used versus custom made dual block mandibular advancement device (MAD)
- Based on low-quality evidence, the panel suggest myofunctional therapy can be used as a standard/regular treatment of OSA compared to no therapy at all, but only for specific cases seeking alternative treatments and who are reluctant to undertake surgical or mechanical strategies
- Based on low-quality evidence, the panel suggest using CPAP instead of myofunctional therapy for adult patients with OSA
- Based on a very low certainty of evidence, the panel suggest either positional therapy (using vibratory devices) or CPAP in adult patients with mild or moderate position dependent OSA as defined by a supine AHI at least twice as high as the non-supine AHI and no relevant non-supine AHI (< 15 events/hour)
- Based on a very low certainty of evidence, for patients with mild positional OSA, the panel suggest either vibrational positional therapy or custom made dual-block MAD be used

Surgical Treatment

In a case series, Sundman et al. (2021) investigated the long-term effectiveness of a modified uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP) for patients with OSA. Eight years after receiving a UPPP for OSA, sixty-five patients were offered a re-evaluation of their condition with a polysomnography and the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS); results were compared to their 2-year follow-up results. The authors found the modified UPPP was effective as a long-term solution for OSA patients although the AHI did decrease over time. Limitations included small sample size, the lack of comparison groups, and lack of female participants making generalization difficult.

A systematic review and meta-analysis performed by Zhou et al. (2021) evaluated the efficacy of eight different variations of maxillomandibular advancement (MMA) surgical treatment for patients with OSA. Eight articles including 227 patients were included. All studies included AHI results, but only five studies reported SpO₂, and six studies reported post-op ESS scores. The authors found MMA combined with uvulopalatopharyngoplasty with uvula preservation (HUPPP) had the highest efficacy rate than any of the other MMA combinations. Limitations included the small number of articles, in addition to the small number of patients within each of the studies (due to the newer MMA methods that have been developed in recent years), and a lack of indicators used in each of the studies for OSA analysis (three factors is not considered adequate to sufficiently evaluate OSA), thus not providing a satisfactory analysis.

The American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM) commissioned a task force of sleep medicine experts to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis on patients with a diagnosis of OSA and referred for surgical intervention (Kent et al., 2021). 274 articles, including RCTs and observational studies, met the criteria and were included in the analysis. The task force concentrated on four questions pertaining to the use of surgery to treat adult OSA: 1) Surgical treatment of patients who were

intolerant or unaccepting of PAP, 2) Surgical treatment of patients with obesity with bariatric surgery, 3) Surgical treatment of patients to facilitate PAP use, and 4) Surgical treatment as an initial therapy in patients with a major upper airway anatomical abnormality. For surgical treatment of patients intolerant or unaccepting of PAP, a total of 4 RCTs and 239 observational studies were analyzed; included in this were patients with oropharyngeal obstruction. Two RCTs and 15 observational studies were found addressing surgical treatment as an initial therapy in patients with a major upper airway anatomical abnormality. The participants in the two RCTs were mostly male with a mean BMI < 30 kg/m² and diagnosed with moderate to severe OSA; they also exhibited tonsillar hypertrophy with velopharyngeal obstruction and were intolerant or refused CPAP therapy. Overall, the task force determined that the overall quality of evidence was low for the use of surgical treatments as an initial therapy and for patients who are intolerant or unaccepting of CPAP due to risk of bias associated with observational studies and imprecision within the RCTs. Several areas were identified that warrant further investigation, but it was demonstrated that patients with major upper airway obstruction benefit from surgery and appropriate referral of patients with OSA for surgical consultation is vital. Limitations included variability in procedure choice and technique, non-standardized reporting of outcomes, small and heterogeneous study populations and selection bias, and lack of blinding. The authors identified further studies are required to better evaluate the patient's preference for PAP vs surgery as a first line therapy, additional comparative studies comparing surgery to medical therapies for OSA and long-term assessment of the surgical interventions.

MacKay et al. (2020) assessed the efficacy of a multi-level surgery (modified UPPP and minimally invasive tongue volume reduction) as a treatment for patients with obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) compared to conventional treatment. The multi-center randomized controlled trial included patients that were 18–70 years of age with moderate or severe OSA that was defined as an AHI of 15-30 and > 30 events/h of sleep. Additional inclusion criteria were BMI < 38, ESS > 8, failure of medically supervised attempts to use CPAP and, when appropriate, failure or refusal of use of a mandibular advancement device. The primary outcome measures were AHI and ESS at 6 months. 102 patients were included in the study of which 51 were randomized to the intervention arm and 51 were randomized to the control arm. For the intervention group, the mean AHI was 47.9 and ESS was 12.4 pre-procedure and at 6 months post-procedure AHI was 20.8 and ESS was 5.3. For the medical management group, the mean AHI was 45.3 and ESS was 11.1 at baseline and at 6 months the mean AHI was 34.5 and ESS was 10.5. The authors concluded that multi-level upper airway surgery resulted in significant reductions in frequency of sleep apnea and daytime sleepiness for patients with moderate to severe OSA in which prior conventional treatment failed. Limitations noted include establishment of long-term effectiveness, reduced generalizability due to exclusion criteria and underrepresentation of women, and inability to blind patients which may influence self-reported sleepiness.

Gao et al. (2019) conducted a systematic review and network meta-analysis on 89 randomized controlled trials which compared and ranked the effectiveness of minimally invasive treatments for adult OSA. Since only simple surgeries performed under local anesthesia (palatal implants, laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty, uvulopalatopharyngoplasty, septoplasty, and radiofrequency tissue ablation) were the focus, major surgeries such as maxillomandibular advancement and bariatric surgery were excluded. The findings of the authors support the guidelines that the first line treatment options for adult OSA to include PAP and MAD. Behavioral treatment which included exercise, physical therapy (PT), and Lifestyle Modification (LM) – via dietary control and weight loss, Myofunctional Therapy (MT) and Cervico-mandibular Support Collar (CMSC) were also included in the analysis. Results demonstrated that although exercise and CMSC yield insignificant effectiveness in AHI reduction when compared to no treatment, they rank first and second, respectively, in reducing ESS. In contrast, PT demonstrates significant effectiveness in AHI reduction but insignificant improvement in ESS. Among all interventions, PT ranks third in reducing both AHI and ESS. Results indicated that LM alone cannot be considered as an effective alternative to OSA treatment therefore LM lacks efficacy and ranks last in the management of adult OSA. The authors concluded that simple surgical procedures may not be curative for adult OSA; even though they improve scores for AHI or ESS, the findings are considered insignificant when compared with no treatment. According to the authors, at present, maxillomandibular advancement performed under general anesthesia has been recognized as an effective treatment for OSA because it improves polysomnographic parameters comparable to CPAP. The study is limited by the indirect nature of comparisons in network meta-analyses.

John et al. (2018) conducted a systematic review with meta-analysis on the effectiveness of MMA as a successful treatment modality in improving airway patency in patients with OSA. 462 patients from twenty studies were included for analysis. The authors found substantial improvements were seen following surgical intervention in outcome measures for AHI, RDI, ESS and LSAT and concluded MMA is a successful treatment option for OSA. Limitations included selection bias for article identification, only one article was an RCT, lack of parallel comparison group undergoing a different treatment, and few studies reported MMA as an isolated primary procedure.

In a 2017 overview of eleven systematic reviews, Tan et al. assessed the evidence for the pharyngeal airway dimension changes following mandibular advancement surgery with or without concomitant maxillary surgery. Data from reviews that reported respiratory parameter changes were also included. Studies of specific target groups such as edentulous and morbidly obese patients, as well as those with cleft lip and palate, syndromic or distraction osteogenesis were excluded. Two SRs reported on the effects of various orthognathic surgeries on the pharyngeal airway, and eight focused on MMA and other surgical treatment related specifically to OSA. Additionally, were two focused on pharyngeal airway analyses, four reviews analyzed changes in respiratory parameters, and the remainder evaluated both. The results showed a relatively high success rate of MMA and a significant reduction in AHI for the treatment of OSA as shown by increased linear, cross-sectional and volumetric measurements. For mandibular advancement alone, five studies reported significantly enlarged pharyngeal airway dimensions. This result was proved unstable during a long-term follow-up of 12 years, with lower parts of the pharyngeal airways relapsing to pre-operative values. This review is limited by the quality of the SRs that were reviewed, and the authors recommended it be read with caution.

Zaghi et al. (2016) conducted a meta-analysis on the success and effectiveness of MMA for OSA. Forty-five articles were included for review which included 518 patients. Study inclusion criteria included adults 18 years of age and older who underwent an MMA along with preop and postop outcomes for AHI and/or RDI. In addition, the following individual patient data was extracted from each article: prior OSA surgery, BMI, SpO₂, ESS score, posterior airway space, length of maxilla advancement, length of mandible advancement, and Sella-Nasion points A and B angles. The main outcome measure was the change in the AHI or RDI score. The authors found 90% of patients experienced improvements in their AHI and RDI scores following surgical intervention. The authors concluded MMA is a highly effective treatment for OSA that was proved by substantial improvements in both AHI and RDI. Limitations included studies that included only reported patient data thus introducing selection bias and absence of long-term follow up (i.e., 10-15 years post-surgical treatment) and, in general, lack of comparison group of participants undergoing a different treatment approach.

Sommer et al. (2016) evaluated the effectiveness of tonsillectomy with UPPP in adults with OSA in a two-center randomized controlled trial. The trial was prospective and included patients between the ages of 18-65 with OSA confirmed by polysomnography (PSG) with an AHI > 15, tonsillar hypertrophy with velopharyngeal obstruction confirmed by physical exam, and rejection or poor compliance with CPAP. The primary outcome measured was AHI and secondary outcomes measured included ESS, snoring, and oxygenation. There were 19 patients in the control group and 23 patients in the treatment group. Results reported included 18 patients in the treatment group and 16 in the control group. The baseline AHI for the control group was 35.7 ±19.4/hr. compared to the treatment group which was 33.7 ±14.6/hr. After three months, patients in the treatment group had an AHI of 15.4 ±14.1 compared to the control group which was 28.6 ±19.4/hr. Results also indicated an improvement in ESS and snoring. Limitations of the study include loss of patients to follow-up in both the treatment and control group as well as a short follow-up period which prevented evaluation of long-term efficacy.

In a 2015 retrospective cohort study, Butterfield et al. investigated the linear and volumetric morphologic changes that occur in the pharyngeal airway in 15 patients after treatment of OSA using MMA via a LeFort I osteotomy and bilateral sagittal split osteotomy with rigid internal fixation. Inclusion criteria included age 18-65, a diagnosis of OSA from an in clinic polysomnogram, an obstruction in the oropharynx using the Mallampati classification, BMI less than 40, and inability to tolerate C-PAP after a minimum of 3 months. The nasopharynx and oropharynx were measured as the volume from the posterior nasal spine to the tip of the uvula and the tip of the uvula to the tip of the epiglottis, respectively. Patients underwent lateral cephalometric and cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) radiographs pre-operatively and post-operatively at 2 and 29 months. The surgical changes of the posterior airway space and occlusal plane rotation were measured using Cephalometric for Orthognathic Surgery analysis. The results showed that after surgery, the AHI decreased by 83.1% and the ESS decreased by 53.3%. The percent of REM sleep increased by 68%. The total airway volume (AV) had increased by 80.43%, the minimal cross-sectional area (minCSA) increased by 212.59%, airway index (AI) had increased significantly by 109.13% (p < .001), the airway length (AL) had decreased by 12.63%, and the posterior airway space (PAS) had increased by 106.28%. There was a significant increase in both the nasopharyngeal volume and the oropharynx volume of 76% and 89% respectively. The authors concluded that MMA increases the total AV, tightens the lateral pharyngeal walls, and changes the shape of the airway from circular to oblong, resulting in an airway that is less likely to collapse. This study is limited by the lack of comparison group, a small sample size and a retrospective design.

Schendel et al. (2014) assessed upper-airway changes following MMA in patients with moderate to severe OSA by measuring for volumetric, height, cross-sectional surface area, and diameter changes. Ten patients were included in this study. There was a 237% increase in total volume of the upper-airway space (UAS) which was greater in the retropalatal region compared to the

retroglossal region. The average change in the retropalatal space was an increase of 664%. The average increase in retroglossal space was 101%. The most significant changes were seen in the transverse axis in both the retropalatal and retroglossal spaces. The authors noted the hyoid to mandibular plane measurement decreased postoperatively which indicated an elevation of the hyoid bone which is a predictor of airway obstruction. The AHI decreased from an average of 42 preoperatively to 4 postoperatively. Limitations include lack of comparison group, small sample size and patient body position as the study only measured airway space in a seated, upright position and did not measure supine and sleeping which is when tissues further relax and can obstruct airflow.

Browaldh et al. (2013) conducted a prospective single center randomized controlled trial to assess the efficacy of UPPP in patients with obstructive sleep apnea syndrome (OSAS). Inclusion criteria were men and women > 18 years of age; AHI \geq 15 events per hour of sleep; ESS \geq 8; marked daytime sleepiness \geq 3 times a week; body mass index < 36 kg/m²; Friedman stage I or II; and failure of CPAP and mandibular repositioning device that had not been used in the previous three months. The primary outcomes measurement was the change in AHI measured by polysomnography (PSG) at 6 months. 65 patients were included in this study, 32 of which were in the treatment arm and 33 in the control arm. At the 6-month follow-up, the AHI for the intervention group decreased by 60% from 53.3 (19.7) events/hour to 21.1 (16.7) events/hour and the control group mean AHI decreased by 11% from 52.6 (21.7) events/hour to 46.8 (22.8) events/hour. This was a significant difference between the two groups. The limitation in this study was a lack of longer follow-up duration which the authors acknowledged and noted that they considered it unethical to leave patients in the control group untreated for a longer time. Those patients in the control group received surgical treatment after the second evaluation with PSG.

Yaremchuk et al. (2011) evaluated 40 patients who had a UPPP or some form of UPPP surgical intervention. The ESS results were used to identify excessive sleepiness in OSA patients. The authors found after surgical intervention, patients had a reduction in their ESS scores; and only three patients did not have improvement. The authors concluded most patients had a substantially higher ESS score following UPPP than previous CPAP usage. The study is limited by lack of comparison group.

Caples et al. (2010) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of literature reporting outcomes following various upper airway surgeries for the treatment of OSA in adults, including maxillomandibular advancement (MMA), pharyngeal surgeries such as uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP), laser assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP) and radiofrequency ablation (RFA), as well as multi-level and multi-phased procedures. The authors found that the published literature is comprised primarily of case series, with few controlled trials and varying approaches to pre-operative evaluation and postoperative follow-up. Surgical morbidity and adverse events were reported but not systematically analyzed. The change in the apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) was the primary measure of efficacy. Substantial and consistent reductions in the AHI were observed following MMA; adverse events were uncommonly reported. Outcomes following pharyngeal surgeries were less consistent; adverse events were reported more commonly. Papers describing positive outcomes associated with newer pharyngeal techniques and multi-level procedures performed in small samples of patients appear promising. The authors concluded that further research is needed to better clarify patient selection, as well as efficacy and safety of upper airway surgery in those with OSA. The findings are limited to the lack of comparison group in several of the included studies.

In a case series, Lundkvist et al. (2009) evaluated 139 men and 19 women with a median age of 45 years and a median BMI of 29 kg/m² who underwent a UPPP. Preoperative results presented an oxygen desaturation index (ODI) of 23 and ESS was 12. All patients had a follow up visit 2 months following surgery and a questionnaire at 1 year. Out of the 158 patients, 120 had a second sleep apnea recording at one year following surgery; the results showed a significant decrease in the ODI from a median of 23 to 8. The BMI remained unchanged for 117 patients. Upon analysis of the data, the authors found that a UPPP surgical intervention was safe and effective for patients who had failed or refused non-surgical treatment. A limitation of the study included lack of comparison group.

Hypoglossal Nerve Stimulation

In a clinical evidence assessment by ECRI (2021), evidence from one systematic review and six non-randomized comparison studies suggest that the Inspire[®] Upper Airway Stimulation (UAS) system may outperform other surgeries in improving sleep and reducing OSA symptoms. The authors note that the evidence is somewhat favorable with the following limitations in the body of evidence: short follow-up, small sample sizes, retrospective design, and patient attrition. Future controlled studies that provide long-term data are needed to validate Inspire benefits and compare it against CPAP therapy.

A Hayes report concluded that the overall quality of the evidence evaluating hypoglossal nerve stimulation (HNS) for treating OSA is very low. However, evidence does suggest that the intervention is relatively safe and may reduce the severity of OSA

and improve PROMs (excessive daytime sleepiness, function, quality of life) for patients with OSA that have failed or are intolerant to CPAP therapy. Stimulation of the hypoglossal nerve may provide a treatment option for patients with moderate-to-severe OSA for whom CPAP has failed to provide relief, but the procedure may carry risks for complications and post implantation surgical procedures. Additional good-quality comparative studies with larger sample sizes are needed to define the patient population that is most likely to respond to this therapy option (Hayes, 2018. Updated 2021).

Costantino et al. (2020) conducted a meta-analysis of nine case series which evaluated HNS for treatment of moderate to severe OSA comparing before and after treatment. Inspire was implanted in 68% of the patients with success rate of 75% at five years. In contrast, 18% of the patients were treated with the Aura 6000 system with a success rate of 35%. All primary clinical outcomes such as AHI, ODI and ESS showed improvement at the 12- and 60-month assessment. Several minor adverse effects were experienced by several patients, but all were non-serious and found resolution. While the authors found HNS was an effective and safe surgical procedure for patients with OSA, a subgroup analysis demonstrated there is not enough data to compare clinical outcomes to different stimulation systems. The STAR trial (refer to Strollo and Woodson below) was the only study to include long-term data, a limitation of this analysis along with lack of comparison groups or RCTs.

Kompelli et al. (2018) performed a meta-analysis of available HNS studies to analyze objective and subjective outcomes and side effects of treated OSA. A comprehensive literature search of PubMed and Scopus was performed, and 16 case series were found that included the analysis of 381 patients. At 6 months, the mean Sleep Apnea Quality of Life Index (SAQLI) improved by 3.1 (95%CI, 2.6-3.7). At 12 months, the mean AHI was reduced by 21.1 (95%CI, 16.9-25.3), the mean ODI was reduced by 15.0 (95%CI, 12.7-17.4), the mean ESS was reduced by 5.0 (95%CI, 4.2-5.8), the mean Functional Outcomes of Sleep Questionnaire (FOSQ) improved by 3.1 (95%CI, 2.6-3.4). Unexpected events of the study included pain, tongue abrasion, and internal/external device malfunctions. The authors concluded that HNS is a safe and effective treatment for CPAP refractory OSA, however further studies comparing HNS to other therapies are required.

The Stimulation Therapy for Apnea Reduction (STAR) trial (Strollo et al. 2014, included in the Hayes and ECRI reports and Costantino (2020) above) evaluated the clinical safety and effectiveness of upper airway stimulation at 12 months for the treatment of moderate to severe obstructive sleep apnea. Using a multicenter, prospective case series design, an upper airway stimulation device was surgically implanted in patients with obstructive sleep apnea who had difficulty either accepting or adhering to CPAP therapy. The primary outcome measures were the apnea-hypopnea index (AHI; the number of apnea or hypopnea events per hour, with a score of ≥ 15 indicating moderate-to-severe apnea) and the oxygen desaturation index (ODI; the number of times per hour of sleep that the blood oxygen level drops by ≥ 4 percentage points from baseline). Secondary outcome measures were the ESS, the FOSQ, and the percentage of sleep time with the oxygen saturation less than 90%. The study included 126 participants; 83% were men. The mean age was 54.5 years, and the mean body-mass index (the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters) was 28.4. The median AHI score at 12 months decreased 68%, from 29.3 events per hour to 9.0 events per hour; the ODI score decreased 70%, from 25.4 events per hour to 7.4 events per hour. Secondary outcome measures showed a reduction in the effects of sleep apnea and improved quality of life. In the randomized phase, the mean AHI score did not differ significantly from the 12-month score in the nonrandomized phase among the 23 participants in the therapy-maintenance group (8.9 and 7.2 events per hour, respectively); the AHI score was significantly higher (indicating more severe apnea) among the 23 participants in the therapy-withdrawal group (25.8 vs. 7.6 events per hour). The ODI results followed a similar pattern. The rate of procedure-related serious adverse events was less than 2%. The authors concluded that upper airway stimulation led to significant improvements in objective and subjective measurements of the severity of obstructive sleep apnea. The lack of a control group limits the validity of the results of this study. This study was funded by Inspire Medical Systems.

Follow-up studies of the same patient population at 18 and 36 months, indicate that the treatment effects are maintained over time. Limitations are the same as the original study (Strollo et al., 2015; Woodson et al., 2016).

In a subgroup analysis of the STAR trial, Woodson et al. (2014, included in the Hayes and ECRI reports and Costantino (2020) above) assessed the efficacy and durability of upper airway stimulation via the hypoglossal nerve on obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) severity including objective and subjective clinical outcome measures. The study included a consecutive cohort of 46 responders at 12 months from a prospective phase III trial of 126 implanted participants. Participants were randomized to either therapy maintenance ("ON") group or therapy withdrawal ("OFF") group for a minimum of 1 week. Short-term withdrawal effect as well as durability at 18 months of primary (apnea hypopnea index and oxygen desaturation index) and secondary outcomes (arousal index, oxygen desaturation metrics, Epworth Sleepiness Scale, Functional Outcomes of Sleep Questionnaire, snoring, and blood pressure) were assessed. Both the therapy withdrawal group and the maintenance group demonstrated significant

improvements in outcomes at 12 months compared to study baseline. In the randomized assessment, therapy withdrawal group returned to baseline, and therapy maintenance group demonstrated no change. At 18 months with therapy on in both groups, all objective respiratory and subjective outcome measures showed sustained improvement similar to those observed at 12 months. The authors concluded that withdrawal of therapeutic upper airway stimulation results in worsening of both objective and subjective measures of sleep and breathing, which when resumed results in sustained effect at 18 months. The authors state that reduction of obstructive sleep apnea severity and improvement of quality of life were attributed directly to the effects of the electrical stimulation of the hypoglossal nerve. The author-reported limitations of this study include the selection bias of only including responders to upper airway stimulation device therapy and the lack of subject or investigator blinding. This study was funded by Inspire Medical Systems.

Implantable Neurostimulation Devices for the Treatment of Central Sleep Apnea (CSA)

The remedē system (ZOLL® Medical Corporation) is an implantable device intended to treat adults with moderate to severe CSA (Hayes 2022). The current evidence for implantable neurostimulation devices for the treatment of central sleep apnea is insufficient thus requiring additional research for its safety and efficacy.

A 2022 Hayes technology assessment concluded there is very-low-quality body of evidence evaluating the use of phrenic nerve stimulation (PNS) with the remedē System in adults with CSA. The evidence is insufficient to draw conclusions about the efficacy and safety of PNS due to an evidence base consisting of 3 fair- to poor-quality studies with small sample sizes and 2 of the 3 studies having limited follow-up. The clinical impact for patients with CSA, especially those with heart failure, remains uncertain. While results suggest a statistically significant reduction in apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) events, average AHI scores did not achieve normal-to-mild disease severity. According to the authors of the report, studies that compare the efficacy, safety, patient acceptance, and cost-effectiveness of PNS with other noninvasive, available therapies for CSA are needed. In addition, studies with longitudinal data are needed to assess the effect of PNS on CSA-related morbidity and mortality.

An updated 2021 ECRI clinical evidence assessment on the remedē System focused on the safety and efficacy for treating patients with moderate to severe CSA. The available evidence suggests transvenous phrenic nerve stimulation (TPNS) with remedē improves sleep quality and quality of life (QOL) in patients with moderate to severe CSA for up to five years. The literature consisted of 1 systematic review (SR), 3 publications of 1 RCT, and 1 pre-/post-treatment study. The systematic review consisted of five studies that compared the severity of apnea patients with active remedē implants against controls. The RCT compared a change in apnea severity by collecting AHI scores over a 5-year period along with conducting patient global assessments and daytime sleepiness in patients with active remedē implants against controls that received inactive remedē implants; however, after six months the study was no longer considered an RCT due to the permission of patients in the control arm to cross over to active stimulation. The pre-/post-treatment study reported apnea severity, daytime sleepiness, QOL, deaths, and AEs in 57 patients with moderate to severe CSA that were treated with remedē system. Limitations included high risk of bias in the SR due to small sample size, single center focus and subjective outcomes in the unblinded patients; risk of bias in the RCT due to reporting of subjective measures; and small sample size along with lack of controls for the pre-/post-treatment study. Additional studies that compare remedē with alternative treatment options and long-term outcomes to assess and compare the system's safety and efficacy are needed.

Potratz et al. (2021) conducted a prospective case series of 24 patients with heart failure (HF) and CSA diagnosed by polysomnography. They evaluated polysomnography (to determine hypoxemic burden), echocardiography and a standardized 6-min walk test prior to device implantation (baseline) and after 6 months of follow-up. The results showed the 6-min walk distance was 369.5 ± 163.5 m at baseline and significantly improved during follow-up (to 410 ± 169.7 m). Hypoxemic burden, determined based on time with oxygen saturation < 90%, improved from 81 ± 55.8 min at baseline to 27.9 ± 42.8 min during PNS therapy. The authors concluded that in addition to safely and effectively treating CSA, PNS is also associated with improved physical performance capacity and reduced hypoxemic burden in patients with HF. The study is however limited by lack of comparison group. Although the findings are promising, the clinical benefits of PNS therapy in this patient population needs to be determined in a large, randomized controlled study with robust and objective clinical endpoints, including mortality.

In a Post Approval Study (PAS) to the remedē System Pivotal Trial (Costanzo et al., 2016), Costanzo et al. (2021) collected clinical evidence addressing long-term safety and efficacy through five years following the placement of the remedē implant which supplied transvenous phrenic nerve stimulation (TPNS). Fifty-two out of the original 151 participants took part to the five-year visit. Clinical data was collected for AHI, central-apnea index (CAI), arousal index, oxygen desaturation index, and sleep architecture. The median ESS for participants at baseline was 9 and dropped to 6 by the five-year visit demonstrating a clinically meaningful reduction; AHI and CAI showed similar results for improvement. Severe adverse effects (SAEs) were minimal and

included one lead dislocation, two stimulation lead component failures and one implant infection. The authors suggest TPNS delivered with remedē is safe and effective resulting in improved sleep for patients. Limitations included lack of control group, lack of data availability for a large proportion of initial participants, which could have led to an underestimation of SAEs.

In a 2020 systematic review and meta-analysis, Voigt et al. compared the outcomes of therapies for patients with CSA and heart failure (HF) with reduced ejection fraction (REF). Nineteen randomized studies were identified that met the inclusion criteria of AHI ≥ 10 , predominant CSA, and heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF) $\leq 50\%$. Most trials examined adaptive servo ventilation (ASV) (8 studies) and continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) (9 studies). The author identified only one randomized controlled trial for transvenous phrenic nerve stimulation (TPNS) described in detail below (Costanzo, et al. 2016).

As a follow up to the study discussed below (Costanzo, et al. 2016), Costanzo et al. (2018, included in Hayes report above) conducted an analysis of all 96 patients randomized in the manufacturer sponsored remedē System Pivotal Trial. Effectiveness data from treatment and former control groups were pooled based on months since therapy activation. Changes from baseline to 6 and 12 months in sleep metrics, Epworth Sleepiness Scale, patient global assessment health-related quality of life, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHFQ), and echocardiographic parameters are reported. Heart Failure (HF) hospitalization, cardiovascular death, and the composite of HF hospitalization or cardiovascular death within 6 months were reported by the original randomized group assignment for safety assessment. Sleep metrics and quality of life improved from baseline to 6 and 12 months. At 12 months, MLHFQ scores changed by -6.8 ± 20.0 . The 6-month rate of HF hospitalization was 4.7% in treatment patients and 17.0% in control patients. Reported adverse events were as expected for a transvenous implantable system. The authors concluded that phrenic nerve stimulation reduces CSA severity in patients with HF. In parallel, this CSA treatment was associated with benefits on HF quality of life. These findings are limited by the lack of comparison group undergoing a different treatment.

In a manufacturer sponsored, prospective, multicenter randomized clinical trial, Costanzo, et al. (2016, included in Hayes report above) sought to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of unilateral neurostimulation in patients with central sleep apnea. Patients were recruited from 31 hospital-based centers in Germany, Poland, and the USA. Participants had to have been medically stable for at least 30 days, have received appropriate guideline recommended therapy, be aged at least 18 years, be expected to tolerate study procedures, and willing and able to comply with study requirements. Eligible patients with an AHI of at least 20 events per hour, tested by a polysomnography, underwent device implantation and were randomly assigned by a computer-generated method to either stimulation (treatment) or no stimulation (control) for 6 months. The primary effectiveness endpoint in the intention-to-treat population was the comparison of the proportions of patients in the treatment versus control groups achieving a 50% or greater AHI reduction from baseline to 6 months, measured by a full-night polysomnography assessed by masked investigators in a core laboratory. The primary safety endpoint of 12-month freedom from serious adverse events related to the procedure, system, or therapy was evaluated in all patients. 151 eligible patients were randomly assigned to the treatment or control groups. In the analysis of results, significantly more patients in the treatment group had an AHI reduction from baseline of 50% or greater at 6 months (51%), as compared to the control group (11%; difference between groups 41%, 95% CI 25–54, $p < 0.0001$). 138 of 151 patients had no serious-related adverse events at 12 months. Seven cases of related-serious adverse events occurred in the control group and six cases were reported in the treatment group. 27 of 73 patients in the treatment group reported non-serious therapy-related discomfort that was resolved with simple system reprogramming in 26 patients but was unresolved in one patient. According to the authors, this study shows that transvenous neurostimulation can significantly reduce the severity of central sleep apnea and concluded it may be a promising therapeutic approach. Further research is needed to determine the clinical relevance of these findings. One of the study limitations was that patients and physicians were aware of treatment assignment, which could have introduced biases. Lack of long-term follow up and a relatively small sample size are other limitations of this study.

Abraham et al. (2015, included in Hayes report above) conducted a small (57 patients) prospective, multicenter, case series pilot study to evaluate chronic, transvenous, unilateral phrenic nerve stimulation to treat CSA using the implantable Respicardia remedē System. Results showed improvement in AHI, central apnea index, arousals, sleep efficiency, and rapid eye movement sleep after 3 months of treatment. These improvements were sustained at 6 months and were accompanied by alleviation of both sleepiness and heart failure symptoms. The author's conclusion was that transvenous, unilateral phrenic nerve stimulation appears safe and effective for treating CSA, but as the study was limited by its size, the lack of a parallel control arm, and the diversity of the patient population, they recommended that findings should be confirmed in a prospective, randomized, controlled trial.

The TREAT-CSA Study is a study registered in clinicaltrials.gov in 2015 that was terminated in 2017 (NCT02577445). It was designed as a cohort study comparing approximately 300 participants with or without implantation of the *remedé*® system to treat sleep-disordered breathing. The study appears to have been terminated after recruitment of 31 participants. Results reported on clinicaltrials.gov show that among the 17 participants implanted with the *remedé*® system, there were 6 (35%) severe adverse events, including cardiac decompensation, cardiac arrest, other cardiac disorders, lead dislocation, and acute renal failure. None of the 14 participants without implantation of the *remedé*® system developed severe adverse events. The clinicaltrials.gov entry also reports 4 (23%) other (not including serious) adverse events among the 17 participants with implantation of the *remedé*® system, while none of the participants without implantation of the *remedé*® system developed such adverse events.

Laser-Assisted Uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP)

There is insufficient quality evidence to conclude LAUP is effective for obstructive sleep apnea treatment therefore, additional research involving larger, well-designed studies is needed to establish its safety and efficacy.

Camacho et al. (2017) performed a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the use of laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP) alone as a treatment for obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in adults. Twenty-three adult studies including 717 patients were selected for review. Individual patient data analyses demonstrate a 23% success rate ($\geq 50\%$ reduction in apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) and < 20 events/hr.) and an 8% cure rate. Additionally, 44% of patients had worsening of their AHI after LAUP. In this meta-analysis, LAUP reduced AHI by 32% among all patients, while the LSAT only changed minimally. There are three important points to note in this review: First, LAUP can potentially worsen obstructive sleep apnea. Second, primary snoring patients who no longer snore after LAUP should be tested for OSA post-operatively if they develop signs and symptoms of OSA. Third, given that reflexogenic dilation of the pharyngeal airway is at least partially mediated by pharyngeal mucosa afferent nerve fibers, it is possible that by destroying the surface of the soft palate with a laser, that there may be blunting of the reflexogenic dilation of the pharyngeal airway. The authors conclude that LAUP should be performed with caution or not performed at all given the unfavorable results of currently published studies. Limitations in this review are that most studies were case series studies, and only two were randomized controlled trials.

Lin et al. (2006) conducted a prospective, controlled trial in which they evaluated LAUP as treatment for moderately severe or severe OSA in 25 subjects. After LAUP, impedance in non-responders remained elevated, but impedance in responders returned to levels comparable to those in the 15 healthy controls.

An RCT conducted by Larrosa et al. (2004, included in the Camacho systematic review) focused primarily on LAUP for treatment of snoring; however, it included some patients with mild OSA and evaluated outcomes other than snoring intensity. Patients were randomized to LAUP or a placebo surgery control group. This study was small ($n = 25$) and did not involve any follow-up after the post treatment assessment at 3 months; however, it found that there were no statistically significant differences between the control group and LAUP treatment group in snoring, daytime sleepiness, apnea-hypopnea index, or QOL measures. A shortcoming of the trial is that patients underwent only one LAUP treatment rather than the multiple treatments provided by Terris and Ferguson (see below).

Ferguson et al. (2003, included in the Camacho systematic review) conducted a small RCT ($n = 45$) with 8 months of follow-up to evaluate LAUP versus no treatment for mild OSA. Although patients who underwent an average of 2.4 LAUP procedures had statistically significant improvements in snoring and apnea-hypopnea index relative to the control group, improvements in daytime sleepiness and sleep apnea QOL scores were not statistically significant. Moreover, the benefits were limited, corresponding to a 44% decrease in mean snoring intensity and 35% decrease in apnea-hypopnea index.

Terris et al. (2002) also conducted a randomized trial of LAUP but used a randomized crossover design in which patients were randomly assigned to LAUP or RFA of the palate and then allowed to undergo the non-assigned treatment if their assigned treatment did not provide adequate improvement. Although this study was small ($n = 17$) and involved only 16 weeks of follow-up, the results suggest that multiple LAUP and RFA treatments of the palate reduce snoring but do not significantly reduce the other symptoms of sleep-disordered breathing such as daytime sleepiness or upper airway collapse.

Lysdahl et al. (2002) compared the outcomes of 121 patients treated for bronchopathy, the majority of whom also reported apneas. Sixty-one were treated with uvulopalatopharyngoplasty and 60 with laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty. The patients were requested to assess the frequency of symptoms associated with OSA prior to surgery, at 3-month follow up and 5 to 8 years postoperatively. Both groups reported significant improvements; however, UPPP was superior to LAUP in terms of all clinical

effect parameters. However, the surgeries are not directly comparable as more tissue is removed in UPPP, and the OSA was self-reported.

Lingual Suspension/Tongue Fixation

No studies on the long-term success of this procedure are available, and there is little quality clinical data to demonstrate its efficacy.

Lingual suspension is intended to keep the tongue from falling back over the airway during sleep. This procedure involves inserting a bone screw into the lower jaw. A cable is then threaded through the base of the tongue and anchored to the bone screw. It is usually performed in conjunction with other procedures.

Bostanci and Turhan (2016) evaluated, in a systematic review, existing research for the effectiveness and safety of two tongue base suspension (TBS) techniques (Repose[®] system and modified TBS) with or without uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP) in obstructive sleep apnea. Seven studies met the eligibility criteria, mostly case series or observational studies comparing two different TBS techniques. Four of seven studies (62 patients) used the Repose[®] system and three studies (51 patients) used the modified TBS technique. The success rates were higher in the studies that used the modified technique (74.5 %) versus those that used the Repose[®] (25.8 %) system. Ten studies which included 300 patients met the eligibility criteria for TBS combined with UPPP. Seven of ten studies included 176 patients which used the Repose[®] system, and three studies included 124 patients which used the modified TBS technique. The success rates in this group were similar between the modified TBS technique (73.4 %) and Repose[®] system (67.6 %). When the aggregate data of 413 patients were compared, the modified TBS technique was found to be associated with significantly higher success rates. The authors found the evidence supported primarily grade C recommendation for the benefits of both techniques with or without UPPP, but none of the results were convincing enough to provide an answer to the question of which TBS technique is most effective and safe for patients with hypopharyngeal obstruction especially in the tongue base. Limitation of the included studies was lack of comparison with other established approaches to OSA treatment.

Handler et al. (2014) performed a systematic review of suture-based tongue suspension procedures as a stand-alone therapy for hypopharyngeal obstruction in OSA. The review also compared outcomes of tongue suspension as part of various multilevel approaches to OSA surgery. Studies published after 1997 were included and involved four cohorts: tongue suspension alone, tongue suspension with UPPP, tongue suspension with genioglossus advancement (GA) plus UPPP and tongue suspension with genioglossus advancement with hyoid suspension (GAHM) plus UPPP. Twenty-seven studies were included. Six studies qualified for the tongue suspension-alone group with a surgical success rate of 36.6%. Eight studies qualified for the cohort of tongue suspension with UPPP with a surgical success rate of 62.3%. Eighteen studies qualified for the remaining two cohorts: GA plus UPPP and GAHM plus UPPP. The surgical success rates for both were 61.1%. Surgical outcomes were similar among the various combined procedures. Author noted limitations include the inability to measure statistical significance due to lack of patient demographic data for the individual studies. Secondly, of the studies used to create the surgical cohorts, three were level 2 evidence, while the remaining 24 were considered level 4 evidence. Lastly, some studies used pre- and postoperative respiratory distress index (RDI), while others used the AHI, making comparisons difficult. The findings are limited by the lack of comparison with established approaches to OSA treatment. (Authors Kuhnel 2005, Miller 2002, DeRowe 2000 and Woodson 2000 which were previously cited in this policy, are included in the Handler (2014) systematic review).

In a multicenter, prospective case series, Woodson et al. (2010) assessed the safety and effectiveness of an adjustable lingual suspension device (Advance System) for treating OSA. Forty-two surgically naive patients with moderate to severe OSA and tongue base obstruction underwent surgical insertion of a midline tissue anchor into the posterior tongue and connected to an adjustable mandibular bone anchor with a flexible tether. Outcomes included changes in AHI, sleepiness, sleep-related quality-of-life, snoring, swallowing, speech and pain. After six months, all patients noted improvement for AHI, sleepiness and sleep-related quality of life. Post implant pain scores were mild to moderate at day one and resolved by day five. Device related adverse events included wound infection (7%) and edema or seroma (5%), which resolved. However, in 31 percent of patients, asymptomatic tissue anchor barb fractures were observed radiographically. The tissue anchor failure rate of the tested device precludes its clinical use. Further investigation is warranted. The findings of this case series are limited by the lack of comparison group.

Palatal Implants

There is insufficient evidence to conclude palatal implants are effective for obstructive sleep apnea treatment. Additional research involving larger, randomized control trials is needed to establish their safety, efficacy and long-term outcomes.

Palatal implants consist of three small woven polyester or similar inserts that are placed in the soft palate to stiffen the palate and thereby reduce the number of episodes of partial or complete blockage of breathing during sleep. Pillar® and Elevo® are trade names using this technology. The woven consistency of the polyester inserts is designed to facilitate an inflammatory response that results in the formation of a fibrous capsule surrounding each insert which stiffens the palate and reduce snoring (Berry 2015).

Gillespie et al. (2011) conducted a small RCT on fifty-one patients with mild to moderate sleep apnea to determine if the Pillar palatal implant system could decrease CPAP pressures which in turn would lead to higher patient compliance and satisfaction with CPAP therapy. The participants received a preloaded delivery system that contained either the pillar implant (active treatment) or no implant (sham). Physicians inserting the implant were instructed to not inspect the inside of the device once the preloaded cartridge had been discharged; no major adverse determinations were noted. Primary outcome assessment was CPAP pressures and collected by a smartcard device at 30, 60 and 90 days postimplant procedure. Secondary outcomes included Functional Outcome of Sleep Questionnaire (FOSQ), the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS), and a 10-cm visual analog scale (VAS) for CPAP satisfaction with 0 indicating no satisfaction and 10 indicating complete satisfaction. The study failed to identify between-group differences in the changes in CPAP pressure or in adherence to treatment over time. The authors found while the active treatment group did have a slight improvement in CPAP satisfaction compared to the sham group, it was unclear as to why. The findings did not support the use of pillar implants to aid in the treatment for improved CPAP compliance.

Choi et al. (2013) performed a meta-analysis of studies evaluating the efficacy of the Pillar implant for treating mild to moderate OSA. Seven studies were included: 5 case series (n = 287) and 2 controlled trials (n = 76). Mean follow-up duration ranged from 3 to 29 months. The Pillar implant significantly reduced the Epworth Sleepiness Scale and the AHI compared to pre-procedure values. The authors concluded that the Pillar implant has a moderate effect on mild to moderate OSA but acknowledged that most of the relevant studies were case series and not placebo controlled. Most studies were also limited by short-term follow-up.

In a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial (n = 22), Maurer et al. (2012) assessed the effects of palatal implants in patients with mild to moderate sleep apnea due to palatal obstruction. Respiratory parameters and sleep efficiency (evaluated by polysomnography), snoring (evaluated by the bed partner) and daytime sleepiness (evaluated by ESS) were assessed before and 90 days after surgery. The AHI, hypopnea index (HI) and lowest oxygen saturation (LSAT) showed statistically significant improvement in the treatment group. Snoring as rated by bed partners also showed statistically significant improvement within the treatment group. There was no statistical difference when comparing the means of the treatment group with the placebo group. There was no peri- or postoperative complications and no extrusions during the follow-up period. The authors concluded that the study supports the idea that palatal implants lead to a reduction in respiratory events in patients with mild to moderate OSA, although a statistically significant superiority of palatal implants over placebo could not be demonstrated in this trial. In addition, the significance of this study is limited by the small sample size.

Friedman et al. (2008, reviewed in the Choi systematic review reported above) performed a double-blinded, placebo-controlled RCT that enrolled 62 patients with mild-to-moderate OSA who underwent palatal implantation (Treatment Group, n = 31) or mock implantation (Control Group, n = 31). In the patients who completed 3 months of follow-up, mean AHI scores had decreased from 24 to 16 points for the Treatment Group versus an increase from 20 to 21 (14) points for the Control Group. Although improvements were statistically significant, they were relatively small. Furthermore, the study was limited by short follow-up.

In a multi-institution, double-blind, placebo-controlled study, Steward et al. (2008, reviewed in the Choi systematic review reported above) randomly assigned one hundred patients with mild to moderate OSA and suspected retropalatal obstruction to treatment with three palatal implants or sham placebo. Palate implants demonstrated efficacy over placebo for several important outcome measures with minimal morbidity, but overall effectiveness remained limited. The investigators concluded that further study is needed.

In a retrospective, case series, Friedman et al. (2006a) evaluated the Pillar implant system alone and in combination with other procedures for treatment of mild-to-moderate OSA/hypopnea syndrome (OSAHS). A total of 125 patients who had mild-to-

moderate OSAHS were assigned to palatal implantation alone (Palatal Group, n = 29), or in combination with other procedures. The authors report an “objective cure rate” of 34%. The study is limited by lack of comparison group receiving treatments other than the Pillar implant system.

Walker et al. (2006, reviewed in the Choi systematic review reported above) studied the Pillar implant system in 53 patients in a 90-day multicenter noncomparative study. Inclusion criteria were OSA caused by palatal obstruction, an AHI score of 10 to 30, a BMI less than or equal to 32 kg/m², age greater than or equal to 18 years, and a soft palate of sufficient length for the implants. Mean AHI score decreased from 25.0 at baseline to 22 at 90 days follow-up. Although this decrease was small, it was statistically significant (p = 0.05). These findings were limited by lack of comparison group receiving established OSA treatments.

Three other small, uncontrolled studies have been performed to evaluate the Pillar Palatal Implant System for mild-to moderate OSA. These studies enrolled 16 to 26 patients who had an AHI score of 5 to 30. These studies reported that, compared with baseline, patients obtained small-to-moderate but statistically significant improvements in outcomes such as AHI and Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS) scores at up to 1 year of follow-up; however, these studies do not provide reliable evidence of efficacy since they did not involve any control or comparison groups (Friedman, 2006b; Goessler, 2007, reviewed in the Choi systematic review reported above; Nordgard, 2007).

Radiofrequency Ablation of the Soft Palate and/or Tongue

While the evidence for radiofrequency ablation may provide support for short-term results for patients with OSA, additional larger studies and randomized trials are needed to support the long-term safety, efficacy of this procedure.

Radiofrequency tissue volume reduction (RFTVR) involves the use of low-intensity radiofrequency energy to shrink the size of the uvula, soft palate and/or tongue. Somnoplasty™ and Coblation® are two trade names using this technology. The procedure may be performed in conjunction with other therapies.

An ECRI (2020) clinical evidence assessment on radiofrequency ablation for treating OSA determined the evidence was of low quality and inconclusive. All 29 studies were determined to have high bias, very small sample sizes and lack of control groups. In addition, the studies assessed patients with varying severities of OSA, lacked long term outcome results and were inconsistent in radiofrequency ablation sites.

Amali et al. (2017) conducted a randomized clinical trial which compared the efficacy of modified radiofrequency tissue ablation (MRFTA) with that of uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP) in patients with mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnea (OSA). Forty patients with mild to moderate OSA were randomly divided into two groups: one for UPPP and the other for MRFTA. Evaluation was made immediately before surgery based on the apnea hypopnea index (AHI), Sleep Apnea Quality of Life Index (SAQLI) and Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS), and again 6 months postoperatively. The results demonstrated the postoperative AHI scores were improved significantly in both groups, although the postoperative AHI in the UPPP group was significantly lower than in the MRFTA group (p = .02). Comparing postoperative ESS scores in the 2 groups showed no significant difference (p = .24) and the SAQLI total score were significantly higher in the MRFTA group. The authors concluded MRFTA as well as UPPP can greatly improve daytime sleepiness and AHI, especially in patients with mild OSA. MRFTA proved to be more effective than UPPP to enhance quality of life of patients with OSA. Further studies with longer follow-up are required to evaluate long-term safety and efficacy of these procedures. The findings are limited by lack of comparison to other non-surgical approaches to OSA.

Baba et al. (2015) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to determine the efficacy of temperature-controlled radiofrequency tissue ablation (TCRFTA) to alleviate symptoms of OSA. A total of 20 studies were included in the meta-analysis. Effectiveness of TCRFTA was measured separately at the base of tongue and soft palate, and for multilevel intervention using the respiratory disturbance index (RDI), lowest oxygen saturation (LSAT), Epworth sleepiness scale (ESS) and bed partner's rating of snoring using a visual analogue scale (VAS snoring). The authors concluded that, in the short term, TCRFTA is clinically effective in reducing respiratory disturbance index (RDI) levels and symptoms of sleepiness in patients with OSA syndrome when directed at the base of tongue or as a multilevel procedure but had limited efficacy on the soft palate. Author noted limitations include heterogeneity between studies, short term follow-up and inclusion of lower quality studies. (publications by Atef 2005, Steward 2004a and 2004b, Terris 2002, Woodson 2001 and 2003 which were previously cited in this policy, are included in the Baba (2015) systematic review).

Franklin et al. (2009) conducted a systematic review evaluating the efficacy (randomized controlled trials only) and adverse effects (including observational studies) of surgery for OSA. The authors reported that only a small number of randomized controlled trials with a limited number of patients assessing some surgical modalities for sleep apnea are available. For RFA, the studies reviewed did not support any benefit on daytime sleepiness, apnea reduction or quality of life. Furthermore, several persistent adverse effects were detected.

In a pilot randomized study, RFTVR of palate and uvula was compared to radiofrequency channeling (Bassiouny, 2007). The authors concluded that their preliminary findings “confirms the favorable effects of radiofrequency in the treatment of patients with snoring and mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) particularly on snoring.”

Hofmann et al. (2006) compared temperature controlled RFTVR to conventional surgery using a non-randomized comparative (cohort study) design. Both UPPP and RFTVR reduced snoring, but UPPP led to improvement in AHI and HI, while RFTVR did not. While postoperative pain was shorter in duration for RFTVR, the number of treatments was higher, leading to a comparable length of postoperative pain.

Transoral Robotic Surgery (TORS)

TORS has been introduced as a novel tool for accessing and resecting tissue from the tongue base and hypopharynx. Based on studies using TORS to treat head and neck cancers, researchers are investigating the use of this technology for patients with OSA along with the procedure’s safety and efficacy. The published literature is limited by lack of comparison group and therefore high risk of bias. Studies that include concurrent comparison groups, long-term follow-up, and sufficient power to demonstrate safety and efficacy are lacking.

Lechien et al. (2021) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating outcomes of transoral robotic surgery (TORS) for base of tongue reduction in obstructive sleep apnea syndrome (OSAS). Outcomes measured were changes over time in AHI, changes over time in daytime sleepiness (scored by ESS), changes in lowest O₂ saturation levels, and surgical success rate. There were 1,690 patients included in the review. The overall summary estimates showed the reduction of AHI was 24.25, reduction of ESS was 7.92, increase of lowest O₂ saturation was 6.04%, and overall surgical success was 69%. The authors note many weaknesses within the analysis which limited the capacity to make definitive conclusions including the profile of patients requiring TORS BOT reduction differing across studies (selection bias), surgical techniques differed amongst studies which may impact the reliability of the conclusions, and discrepancies in definitions of postoperative complications which led to biases and heterogeneity between studies in the prevalence of complications. According to the authors, the main weakness is the low level of evidence of the included studies which were mostly retrospective chart reviews. Additionally, some cases may have overlapped as several authors were collaborating and some patients may have been included in more than one study. The authors suggest improved methodology of future studies by recommending the comparison of future studies through use of similar and standardized criteria and definitions. (Lee et al. (2012) and Friedman et al. (2012) which were previously cited in this policy are included in this meta-analysis).

Tsou and Chang (2020) conducted a systematic review of eight articles which compared the clinical outcomes and success rates of TORS with that of other alternative procedures such as coblation tongue base resection (CTBR), upper airway stimulation (UAS), radiofrequency, CO₂ laser, and endoscopic partial midline glossectomy (EPMG). Clinical outcomes assessed were AHI, O₂ saturation and ESS score. While the authors found all the procedures significantly reduced AHI and ESS scores along with increase in O₂ saturation, no significant differences between the surgical procedures were found in operation time, in success rates or complication rates; the success rate of TORS was no more effective than that of the other compared alternative procedures. Limitations of analysis included lack of RCTs, lack of long-term outcomes, comparison to non-established approaches, and the retrospective design of most of the included studies.

Lan et al. (2019, included in Tsou and Chang (2020) and Lechien (2021) systematic reviews cited above) retrospectively compared the efficacy of trans-oral robotic surgery (TORS) with that of coblation assisted tongue base reduction surgery in patients with obstructive sleep apnea syndrome (OSAS). Thirty-three cases were analyzed; sixteen received TORS and seventeen received coblation surgery. Both groups received concomitant uvulopalatoplasty and surgical outcomes were evaluated by comparing the initial polysomnography results with a follow-up PSG within at least 3 months after the surgery. ESS and complications were also utilized in the comparison between the two groups. The authors found no difference in the success rate between the two procedures. Limitations were this the retrospective nature of the study and lack of comparison with established approaches to OSA; another limitation was the difficulty in comparisons due to the different surgical

techniques utilized for TORS. The authors concluded surgical performance in combination with uvulopalatoplasty is an effective approach for OSAS, however future randomized controlled trials are needed to evaluate the efficacy of TORS.

Miller et al. (2017) conducted systematic review and meta-analysis on the effect of transoral robotic surgery (TORS) base of tongue (BOT) reduction sleep-related outcomes in patients with obstructive sleep apnea (OSA). Studies on TORS BOT reduction as part of OSA treatment in adult patients with pre- and postoperative apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) scores were included. Studies on TORS as treatment for diseases other than OSA were excluded. A total of six case series were reviewed and 353 patients met inclusion criteria. Pooled analyses (baseline vs. post-surgery) showed significant improvement in the following: AHI (44.3 ± 22.4 to 17.8 ± 16.5 , $p < .01$), ESS (12.9 ± 5.4 to 5.8 ± 3.7 , $p < .01$), lowest oxygen saturation (79.0 ± 9.5 to 84.1 ± 6.5 , $p < .01$), and snoring visual analog scale (9.3 ± 0.8 to 2.4 ± 2.43 , $p < .01$). Surgical success rate was 68.4%. Cure rate was 23.8%. The authors concluded TORS BOT is considered successful in the majority of adult patients with OSA, however further studies must be performed to optimize patient selection criteria to achieve higher rates of success. The findings are however limited by lack of comparison group in the included studies and the retrospective nature of most of these studies. (Lee et al. (2012), Friedman et al. (2012) and Vicini et al. (2010) which were previously cited in this policy are included in this meta-analysis).

Justin et al. (2016) conducted a systematic review of the literature evaluating the effectiveness, complications and safety of TORS for the treatment of OSA. Sixteen studies were included. Three of these studies were case series with comparison to historical controls and the other were case series without comparison group. TORS was almost always combined with other sleep surgery procedures. The summary estimate of the decrease in AHI using TORS as part of a multilevel surgical approach was 24.0. The summary estimate of a decrease in ESS score was 7.2 and of the overall surgical "success" (defined as AHI < 20 and 50% reduction) was 48.2%. Three large studies reported complication rates with an average of 22.3%. The authors concluded that initial results for the use of TORS as part of a multilevel surgical approach for OSA are promising for select patients. However, the morbidity may be greater than with other techniques, offsetting its advantages in visualization and precision. More prospective studies are needed to determine the optimal role of this tool. The findings are limited by lack of concurrent comparison group in the included studies. (Lee et al. (2012), Friedman et al. (2012) and Vicini et al. (2010) which were previously cited in this policy are included in this meta-analysis).

Distraction Osteogenesis for Maxillary Expansion (DOME)

There is insufficient quality evidence to conclude DOME is effective for the treatment of adult OSA. The published literature lacks randomized control trials needed to establish the safety, efficacy and long-term outcomes. Future studies including comparison groups are warranted.

In a retrospective case series, 75 patients with a diagnosis of OSA intolerant of CPAP along with no palatine or lingual tonsillar hypertrophy underwent a DOME procedure (Yoon et al., 2020). The custom designed hybrid (bone-borne and tooth-borne) distractors were individually fabricated for each patient using 3-D cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) and placed with mini-screws. The expander device was activated 5 to 7 days postop by using an axial screw for expansion daily. This continued for 3 months but the device was kept in place for an additional 6 to 8 months. Each patient completed the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS) and Nasal Obstruction Symptom Evaluation (NOSE) questionnaires before to and during the 3-to-6-month postop period. The participants followed the attended PSG process which was conducted and scored 3 to 8 months following the DOME procedure. Apnea and hypopnea were both measured as well. The authors determined the results showed significant improvements in alleviating nasal obstruction, decreasing AHI, and improving the amount of REM sleep. Limitations of the study included small sample size, lack of parallel comparison group, and lack of long-term outcomes.

Abdelwahab et al. (2019) retrospectively evaluated a case series of 32 patients with OSA that underwent DOME by assessing subjective and objective outcomes. The patients included in the study were intolerant to CPAP, had no hypertrophy of either the lingual or palatine tonsils, had class 3 or 4 Mallampati and a suffered a narrow palatal arch. The procedure was performed with application of the maxillary expander with fixation of 4 to 6 screws to the midpalate and maxillary bone and then performance of LeFort I maxillary osteotomy. Postoperatively the patients were taught to turn the expander daily for the next five weeks. NOSE and ESS scores were obtained for evaluation. The authors found that DOME procedure widened the maxilla and therefore was deemed successful by improvement of the NOSE and ESS scores. Limitations included lack of comparison group, small sample size, retrospective design, single institution experience, and lack of long-term outcomes.

Liu et al. (2017) described the safety and efficacy of DOME for a case series of 20 patients. Each patient underwent pre- and post-DOME polysomnographies along with outcome measurements from ESS, NOSE rhinomanometry and CT measurements

of the nasal floor. Following the surgical procedure, significant decline was noted in all the measurements along with airflow resistance and it was concluded that the DOME procedure was successful at widening the maxilla in all the adult patients with OSA. However, limitations included lack of comparison group, small sample size and no long-term data for safety and efficacy.

Clinical Practice Guidelines

American Academy of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS)

The AAO-HNS considers Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP) a valid and safe treatment for OSA in appropriately selected patients. “UPPP and its modifications are important treatments for OSA in patients who have demonstrated an inability to consistently use continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) therapy or other medical treatments.” (AAO-HNS website; revised January 2019).

The AAO-HNS considers upper airway stimulation (UAS) via the hypoglossal nerve for the treatment of adult OSA syndrome to be a safe and effective second-line treatment for patients with moderate to severe OSA and intolerant or unable to achieve benefit with positive pressure therapy. (AAO-HNS website; revised November 2019).

An AAO-HNS (2016) position statement recommends tongue-based suspension as effective and even comparable to genioglossus advancement when considered as part of a comprehensive approach in symptomatic adult patients with OSA and adult patients with moderate to severe OSA. (AAO-HNS website; 2016).

American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM)

In a practice parameter document, the AASM recommends weight reduction be combined with other primary treatments for patients with moderate to severe OSA (Morgenthaler, et al. 2006).

The AASM recommends surgery as a treatment option for OSA when noninvasive treatments such as CPAP or oral appliances have been unsuccessful. The use of hypoglossal nerve stimulation is not addressed as a therapeutic option (Aurora, 2010a).

A 2010 AASM practice parameter (Aurora, 2010a; Aurora, 2010b; Caples, 2010) on surgical options for OSA makes the following recommendations:

- Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty (UPPP): UPPP as a single surgical procedure, with or without tonsillectomy, does not reliably normalize the AHI when treating moderate to severe OSA. Therefore, patients with severe OSA should initially be offered positive airway pressure (PAP) therapy, while those with moderate OSA should initially be offered either PAP therapy or oral appliances. The clinical evidence for UPPP is very low quality (Option recommendation – either inconclusive or conflicting evidence or conflicting expert opinion). This recommendation is a change from the previous practice parameter
- Maxillomandibular Advancement (MMA) Surgery: MMA is indicated for surgical treatment of severe OSA in patients who cannot tolerate or who are unwilling to adhere to PAP therapy, or in whom oral appliances, which are more often appropriate in mild and moderate OSA patients, have been considered and found ineffective or undesirable. Although the clinical evidence is very low quality, studies tend to demonstrate consistent effectiveness in severe OSA. MMA is not well described in mild and moderate OSA making recommendations in less severe OSA unclear (Option recommendation – either inconclusive or conflicting evidence or conflicting expert opinion)
- Multi-Level or Stepwise Surgery (MLS): Multi-level surgery, as a combined procedure or as stepwise multiple operations, is acceptable in patients with narrowing of multiple sites in the upper airway, particularly when UPPP as a sole treatment has failed (Option recommendation – either inconclusive or conflicting evidence or conflicting expert opinion)
- Radiofrequency Ablation (RFA): RFA can be considered as a treatment in patients with mild to moderate OSA who cannot tolerate or who are unwilling to adhere to positive airway pressure therapy, or in whom oral appliances have been considered and found ineffective or undesirable. The clinical evidence for RFA is very low quality (Option recommendation – either inconclusive or conflicting evidence or conflicting expert opinion)
- Laser-Assisted Uvulopalatoplasty (LAUP): LAUP is not routinely recommended as a treatment for OSA syndrome. LAUP does not generally normalize the AHI and the literature does not demonstrate significant improvement in secondary outcomes. Some studies actually saw worsening of the overall AHI. The clinical evidence for LAUP is low quality. (Standard recommendation – generally accepted patient-care strategy)
- Palatal Implants: Palatal implants may be effective in some patients with mild obstructive sleep apnea who cannot tolerate or who are unwilling to adhere to positive airway pressure therapy, or in whom oral appliances have been considered and found ineffective or undesirable. There is limited research that adequately assesses the efficacy of palatal implants for the

treatment of OSA. Available studies suggest marginal efficacy (Option recommendation – either inconclusive or conflicting evidence or conflicting expert opinion)

The AASM recommends surgery as a treatment option for OSA when noninvasive treatments such as CPAP or oral appliances have been unsuccessful; and one of the most common surgical methods is the uvulopalatopharyngoplasty procedure. (AASM website; accessed June 25, 2021).

The AASM (Aurora 2016) recommends the following for treatment of central sleep apnea syndrome (CSAS) related to CHF:

- Recommendation 1: Adaptive servo-ventilation (ASV) targeted to normalize the apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) should not be used for the treatment of CSAS related to CHF in adults with an ejection fraction \leq 45% and moderate or severe CSA predominant, sleep-disordered breathing. (STANDARD AGAINST)
- Recommendation 2: Adaptive servo-ventilation (ASV) targeted to normalize the apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) can be used for the treatment of CSAS related to CHF in adults with an ejection fraction $>$ 45% or mild CHF related CSAS. (OPTION)

Sleep Foundation

The Sleep Foundation suggests surgery is rarely a first line form of treatment for OSA. Surgery is to be considered when treatments such as CPAP or oral appliance therapy have been unsuccessful. (Sleep Foundation website; accessed June 8, 2022).

American Sleep Apnea Association (ASAA)

The ASAA position is that while positive airway pressure therapy is the first line of treatment for moderate to severe sleep apnea, patient compliance represents a problem. For the noncompliant patient, surgery may be a feasible alternative. The surgeon must first determine what part of the upper airway is causing the obstruction to airflow. The sites of obstruction could be anywhere in the upper respiratory tract including the nose, tongue and throat.

It considers that there are many surgical options for the treatment of sleep apnea for patients who cannot tolerate CPAP therapy. Because the airway pattern and the severity of obstruction vary greatly between individuals, the surgical regimen must be catered to a particular individual. Often it takes a combination of procedures to achieve success. A logical stepwise approach must be taken when a patient seeks surgery, and it is a requisite that the patient finds a surgeon who understands both the pathophysiology of sleep apnea and the anatomy of the upper respiratory tract to ensure the best chance of success (ASAA, 2015).

European Respiratory Society (ERS)

An ERS guideline (Randerath et al., 2021) on non-CPAP therapies for patients with OSA makes the following recommendations for adult patients with OSA:

- Based on very low-quality evidence, the panel suggest that hypoglossal nerve stimulation (HNS) should not be used as first-line treatment for OSA patients in general. However, the panel suggest that HNS compared to no treatment should be considered as a salvage treatment in patients with symptomatic OSA, who cannot be sufficiently treated with CPAP, BiPAP or MAD and an AHI $<$ 50events/hour
- Based on very low-quality evidence, in adult patients with OSA, the panel suggest using either MMO or CPAP

ERS published a review for additional new therapies which were explored, and the GRADE system used to assess the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations (Verbraecken et al, 2021). The final recommendation concluded that maxillo-mandibular osteotomy had overall certainty of evidence to be low to very low but could be used to benchmark quality of care for people with OSA across Europe and to improve outcomes.

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)

A comparative effectiveness report for 2011 from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) conducted a systematic review of the evidence on OSA diagnosis and treatment in adults. The report made the following conclusions:

- The strength of evidence is high that AHI is an independent predictor of CPAP compliance
- The strength of evidence is moderate that the Epworth Sleepiness Scale is an independent predictor of CPAP compliance
- The strength of evidence is moderate to show that the use of mandibular advancement devices (MAD) improves sleep apnea signs and symptoms

- The strength of evidence is moderate that CPAP is superior to MAD in improving sleep study measures
- The strength of evidence is insufficient to determine the relative merits of surgical treatments versus CPAP
- The strength of evidence is insufficient regarding the relative merit of MAD versus surgery in the treatment of OSA

Limitations in the evidence review included lack of trials evaluating long-term clinical outcomes, the strength of evidence, and publication bias.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

International procedures guidance from NICE states the current evidence on the safety and efficacy of hypoglossal nerve stimulation for moderate to severe OSA is limited in quantity and quality therefore the use of this procedure should only be used with special arrangements for clinical management, consent and research (NICE, 2017).

A NICE guideline states that current evidence on soft-palate implants for obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) raises no major safety concerns, but there is inadequate evidence that the procedure is efficacious in the treatment of this potentially serious condition for which other treatments exist. Therefore, soft-palate implants should not be used in the treatment of OSA (NICE, 2007).

Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)/Department of Defense (DoD)

The 2019 guideline for the management of chronic insomnia disorder and OSA makes the following recommendations for patients with OSA:

- In appropriate patients with mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnea (apnea-hypopnea index < 30 per hour), suggest offering mandibular advancement devices, fabricated by a qualified dental provider, as an alternative to positive airway pressure therapy. (Weak)
- For patients with obstructive sleep apnea with an apnea-hypopnea index of 15 – 65 per hour and a body mass index < 32 kg/m² who cannot adhere to positive airway pressure therapy, suggest evaluation for surgical treatment with hypoglossal nerve stimulation therapy. (Weak)
- For patients with severe obstructive sleep apnea who cannot tolerate or are not appropriate candidates for other recommended therapies, suggest evaluation for alternative treatment with maxillomandibular advancement surgery. (Weak)

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

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

Oral appliances for OSA are regulated by the FDA, but products are too numerous to list. Refer to the following website for more information (use product codes LRK or LQZ). Refer to:

<http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmnmn.cfm>. (Accessed June 7, 2022)

The Lunoa System (NightBalance BV) received 510(k) Premarket Notification (K180608) from the FDA on June 5, 2018. Refer to: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmnmn.cfm?ID=K180608>. (Accessed June 7, 2022)

Bongo, manufactured by InnoMed Healthscience, Inc., received 510(k) approval (K180619) from the FDA on August 16, 2018. The device is an intranasal appliance indicated for use in the treatment of mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in adults > 66 lbs. Refer to the following website for additional information:

https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf18/K180619.pdf. (Accessed June 7, 2022)

Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) systems for surgery are regulated by the FDA as Class II devices, and a large number of these RFA systems have been approved via the 510(k) process. The following devices are among the RFA devices specifically approved for coagulation of tissues in the head and neck:

- The Somnoplasty™ System, manufactured by Olympus (formerly Gyrus ENT), received 510(k) approval (K982717) from the FDA on November 2, 1998. Intended for the reduction of the incidence of airway obstructions in patients suffering from upper airway resistance syndrome (URAS) or obstructive sleep apnea syndrome (OSAS), the system generates heat for creating finely controlled lesions at precise locations within the upper airway. As the tissue heals, it reduces tissue volume, opening the airway. Refer to: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf/K982717.pdf

- Coblation® technology, manufactured by ArthroCare ENT, received 510(k) approval (K030108) from the FDA on February 3, 2003. The system is a bipolar, high frequency electrosurgical system indicated for ablation, resection and coagulation of soft tissue and hemostasis of blood vessels in otorhinolaryngology (ENT) surgery. Using low temperatures, the technology destroys tissue using radiofrequency energy to excite electrolytes in a conductive medium, such as saline. Refer to: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf3/K030108.pdf (Accessed June 7, 2022)

The eXciteOSA device (DEN200018) is a removable tongue muscle stimulation device that delivers neuromuscular stimulation to the tongue in order to reduce snoring and mild obstructive sleep apnea (AHI < 15) for patients that are 18 years or older. The FDA concluded this device as de novo on February 5, 2021 and classified it into Class II (product code QNO). Refer to the following website for additional information: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpmn/denovo.cfm?id=DEN200018>. (Accessed June 7, 2022)

Slow Wave DS8 received 510(k) Premarket Notification (K191320) from the FDA on October 2, 2020. It is used to reduce or alleviate snoring in sleeping adults with mild to moderate OSA. Refer to: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpmn/pmn.cfm?ID=K191320>. (Accessed July 25, 2022)

The remedē® System, manufactured by Zoll, is an implantable phrenic nerve stimulator indicated for the treatment of moderate to severe central sleep apnea (CSA) in adult patients that received FDA approval on October 6, 2017. Refer to: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpma/pma.cfm?id=P160039>. (Accessed June 7, 2022)

The AIRvance™ Tongue Suspension system (formerly Repose™), manufactured by Medtronic ENT, received 510(k) approval (K981677) from the FDA on August 27, 1999. The system is intended for anterior tongue base suspension by fixation of the soft tissue of the tongue base to the mandible bone using a bone screw with pre-threaded suture. It is also suitable for the performance of a hyoid procedure. It is indicated for the treatment of OSA and/or snoring. Refer to: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf/K981677.pdf. (Accessed June 7, 2022)

The Pillar® System for treating obstructive sleep apnea, manufactured by Medtronic ENT, received 510(k) approval (K040417) from the FDA on July 28, 2004. The system of palatal implants is intended to stiffen the soft palate tissue, which may reduce the incidence of upper airway obstruction in patients suffering from mild to moderate OSA. Refer to: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf4/K040417.pdf. (Accessed June 7, 2022)

The FDA granted premarket approval (PMA) on April 30, 2014, to the Inspire Upper Airway Stimulation (UAS) system (Inspire Medical Systems Inc.) (P130008), which includes the Model 3024 Implantable Pulse Generator, the Model 4063 Stimulation Lead, the Model 4323 Sensing Lead, the Model 2740 Physician Programmer, and the Model 3032 Patient Programmer for treatment of patients with an AHI ≥ 20 and ≤ 65. Inspire UAS is used in adults who have been confirmed to fail or cannot tolerate PAP treatments such as CPAP or BPAP machines, and who do not have a complete concentric collapse at the soft palate level.

PAP failure is defined as an inability to eliminate OSA (AHI of greater than 20 despite PAP usage) and PAP intolerance is defined as: inability to use PAP (greater than 5 nights per week of usage; usage defined as greater than 4 hours of use per night); or unwillingness to use PAP (for example, a patient returns the PAP system after attempting to use it). Product documentation also note that “Body Mass Index (BMI) greater than 32 was not studied as part of the pivotal trial. Based on data from the feasibility study it may be associated with decreased likelihood of response to treatment. Use of Inspire UAS in higher BMI patients is not recommended due to unknown effectiveness and safety.”

The device is also referred to as the Inspire II (search *MNQ* in the Product Code field at: 510(k) Premarket Notification Database). The FDA mandated 2 post-approval studies: a prospective, single-arm cohort study to evaluate the long-term safety of the device in 124 subjects over 5 years, and a multicenter, prospective, single-arm cohort study to evaluate long-term safety and effectiveness of the device and effectiveness of the physician training program in 127 subjects over 5 years. Refer to:

- <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpma/pma.cfm?id=P130008>
- https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf13/P130008C.pdf
- https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf13/P130008D.pdf

(Accessed June 7, 2022)

Additional Product Information

- Advance System (Aspire Medical) is an adjustable tongue base suspension system that is not, yet FDA approved for marketing in the U.S.
- Aura6000 (ImThera Medical) is an implantable hypoglossal nerve stimulation system that is not yet FDA approved for marketing in the U.S.

References

Abdelwahab M, Yoon A, Okland T, et al. Impact of distraction osteogenesis maxillary expansion on the internal nasal valve in obstructive sleep apnea. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2019 Aug;161(2):362-367.

Abraham WT, Jagielski D, Oldenburg O, et al. Phrenic nerve stimulation for the treatment of central sleep apnea. *JACC Heart Fail.* 2015 May;3(5):360-9.

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). Diagnosis and Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea in Adults. Comparative Effectiveness Review Number 32. July 2011. https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/sleep-apnea_research.pdf. Accessed July 22, 2022.

Amali A, Motiee-Langroudi M, Saedi B, et al. A comparison of uvulopalatopharyngoplasty and modified radiofrequency tissue ablation in mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnea: a randomized clinical trial. *J Clin Sleep Med.* 2017 Sep 15;13(9):1089-1096.

American Academy of Dental Sleep Medicine (AADSM). Dental Sleep Medicine Standards for Screening, Treating and Managing Adults with Sleep-Related Breathing Disorders. 2018. https://www.aadsm.org/docs/Levine_Article_Final.pdf. Accessed May 31, 2022.

American Academy of Dental Sleep Medicine (AADSM). *Journal of Dental Sleep Medicine.* Management of Side Effects of Oral Appliance Therapy for Sleep-Disordered Breathing. Volume 4, Number 4, October 2017. <https://aadsm.org/docs/JDSM.04.04.pdf>. Accessed June 8, 2022.

American Academy of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS) website. <http://www.entnet.org/sites/default/files/Guidance-Documents.pdf>. Accessed June 8, 2022.

American Academy of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS) website. Position Statement: Tongue Suspension. September 2016. <https://www.entnet.org/resource/position-statement-tongue-suspension>. Accessed August 24, 2022.

American Academy of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS) website. Position Statement: Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty. <https://www.entnet.org/resource/position-statement-uvulopalatopharyngoplasty>. November. Accessed August 24, 2022.

American Academy of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS) website. Position Statement: Hypoglossal Nerve Stimulation for Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea (OSA). Revised November 2019. <https://www.entnet.org/resource/position-statement-hypoglossal-nerve-stimulation-for-treatment-of-obstructive-sleep-apnea-osa>. Accessed August 24, 2022.

American Academy of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS) website. Position Statement: Use of Oral Appliances for the Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea (OSA). Revised November 2019. <https://www.entnet.org/resource/position-statement-use-of-oral-appliances-for-the-treatment-of-obstructive-sleep-apnea-osa>. Accessed August 24, 2022.

American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM). AASM Style Guide for Sleep Medicine Terminology. Updated November 2015. <https://aasm.org/download-free-aasm-style-guide-for-sleep-medicine-terminology/>. Accessed May 27, 2022.

American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM). AASM Manual for the Scoring of Sleep and Associated Events: Rules, terminology and technical specifications. V2.6. January 2020.

American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM). Obstructive Sleep Apnea. <https://aasm.org/resources/factsheets/sleepapnea.pdf>. Accessed June 8, 2022.

American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM) and American Academy of Dental Sleep Medicine (AADSM). Policy Statement on the Diagnosis and Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea. December 7, 2012. <https://aadsm.org/docs/jointpolicy.pdf>. Accessed June 8, 2022.

American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons (AAOMS). Position Paper on Evaluation and Management of Obstructive Sleep Apnea. 2013. https://www.aaoms.org/docs/govt_affairs/advocacy_white_papers/osa_position_paper.pdf. Accessed June 8, 2022.

American Medical Association (AMA) CPT Professional edition code book. 2022.

American Sleep Apnea Association (ASAA). Varieties of OSA surgery. 2020. <https://www.sleepapnea.org/treat/sleep-apnea-treatment-options/sleep-apnea-surgery/>. Accessed June 8, 2022.

American Thoracic Society. Patient Education/Information Series. Sleep studies: in the sleep laboratory and in the home. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2015 Aug 15;192(4):p3-4; online version updated October 2019.

Atef A, Mosleh M, Hesham M, et al. Radiofrequency vs. laser in the management of mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnea: does the number of treatment sessions matter? *J Laryngol Otol*. 2005;119(11):888-893.

Aurora RN and Morgenthaler TI. On the goodness of recommendations: the changing face of practice parameters. *Sleep*. 2010b;33(10):1273-6.

Aurora RN, Casey KR, Kristo D, et al. Practice parameters for the surgical modifications of the upper airway for obstructive sleep apnea in adults. *Sleep*. 2010a;33(10):1408-1413.

Aurora RN, Chowdhuri S, Ramar K, et al. The treatment of central sleep apnea syndromes in adults: practice parameters with an evidence-based literature review and meta-analyses. *Sleep*. 2012 Jan 1;35(1):17-40. Updated May 2016.

Aurora RN, Collop NA, Jacobowitz O, et al. Quality measures for the care of adult patients with obstructive sleep apnea. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2015 Mar 15;11(3):357-83.

Aurora RN, Bista SR, Casey KR, et al. Updated Adaptive Servo-Ventilation Recommendations for the 2012 AASM Guideline: "The Treatment of Central Sleep Apnea Syndromes in Adults: Practice Parameters with an Evidence-Based Literature Review and Meta-Analyses". *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2016 May 15;12(5):757-61.

Baba RY, Mohan A, Metta VV, et al. Temperature controlled radiofrequency ablation at different sites for treatment of obstructive sleep apnea syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep Breath*. 2015 Sep;19(3):891-910.

Baptista PM, Martínez Ruiz de Apodaca P, Carrasco M, et al. Daytime neuromuscular electrical therapy of tongue muscles in improving snoring in individuals with primary snoring and mild obstructive sleep apnea. *J Clin Med*. 2021 Apr 27;10(9):1883.

Bassiouny A, El Salamawy A, Abd El-Tawab M, et al. Bipolar radiofrequency treatment for snoring with mild to moderate sleep apnea: a comparative study between the radiofrequency assisted uvulopalatoplasty technique and the channeling technique. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2007 Jun;264(6):659-67.

Barnes H, Edwards BA, Joosten SA, et al. Positional modification techniques for supine obstructive sleep apnea: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep Med Rev*. 2017;36:107-115.

Berry RB, Kryger MH, Massie CA. A novel nasal expiratory positive airway pressure (EPAP) device for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea: a randomized controlled trial. *Sleep*. 2011;34(4):479-485.

Berry RB. *Sleep Medicine Pearls*, third edition. Chapter: Introduction, pages 341-348. Philadelphia: Elsevier, 2015.

Berry RB. *Fundamentals of Sleep Medicine*. Chapter 20: Oral Appliance and Surgical Treatment for Obstructive Sleep Apnea, pages 350-351. Philadelphia: Elsevier, 2012.

Bostanci A, Turhan M. A systematic review of tongue base suspension techniques as an isolated procedure or combined with uvulopalatopharyngoplasty in obstructive sleep apnea. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2016 Oct;273(10):2895-901.

Browaldh N, Nerfeldt P, Lysdahl M, et al. SKUP3 randomised controlled trial: polysomnographic results after uvulopalatopharyngoplasty in selected patients with obstructive sleep apnoea. *Thorax*. 2013 Sep;68(9):846-53.

Butterfield KJ, Marks PL, McLean L, et al. Linear and volumetric airway changes after maxillomandibular advancement for obstructive sleep apnea. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2015 Jun;73(6):1133-42.

Camacho M, Nesbitt NB, Lambert E, et al. Laser-Assisted uvulopalatoplasty for obstructive sleep apnea: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep*. 2017 Mar 1;40(3).

Camacho M, Malu OO, Kram YA, et al. Nasal dilators (Breathe Right Strips and NoZavent) for snoring and OSA: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pulm Med*. 2016;2016:4841310.

Caples SM, Rowley A, Prinsell JR, et al. Surgical modifications of the upper airway for obstructive sleep apnea in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep*. 2010;33(10):1396-1407.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). [Epworth Sleepiness Scale | NIOSH | CDC](#). Accessed August 17, 2022.

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Local Coverage Determination (LCD): Transvenous Phrenic Nerve Stimulation in the Treatment of Central Sleep Apnea (L37929). <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=37929>. Accessed June 8, 2022.

Choi JH, Kim SN, Cho JH. Efficacy of the Pillar implant in the treatment of snoring and mild-to-moderate obstructive sleep apnea: a meta-analysis. *Laryngoscope*. 2013 Jan;123(1):269-76.

ClinicalTrials.gov. Respicardia, Inc. Pivotal Trial of the remedē System. (NCT01816776).

Coblation website. <https://www.smith-nephew.com/key-products/key-ent/airway-management/laryngeal-soft-palate-overview/>. Accessed June 8, 2022.

Colrain IM, Brooks S, Black J. A pilot evaluation of a nasal expiratory resistance device for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2008 Oct 15;4(5):426-33.

Costantino A, Rinaldi V, Moffa A, et al. Hypoglossal nerve stimulation long-term clinical outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep Breath*. 2020 Jun;24(2):399-411.

Costanzo MR, Ponikowski P, Coats A, et al. Phrenic nerve stimulation to treat patients with central sleep apnea and heart failure. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2018 Dec;20(12):1746-1754.

Costanzo MR, Ponikowski P, Javaheri S, et al. Transvenous neurostimulation for central sleep apnea: a randomized controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2016; 388(10048):974-82.

Costanzo MR, Javaheri S, Ponikowski P, et al. Remedē® System Pivotal Trial Study Group. Transvenous phrenic nerve stimulation for treatment of central sleep apnea: five-year safety and efficacy outcomes. *Nat Sci Sleep*. 2021 Apr 29;13:515-526.

DeRowe A, Gunther E, Fibbi A, et al. Tongue-base suspension with a soft tissue-to-bone anchor for obstructive sleep apnea: preliminary clinical results of a new minimally invasive technique. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2000 Jan;122(1):100-3.

de Ruiter MHT, Benoist LBL, de Vries N, et al. Durability of treatment effects of the Sleep Position Trainer versus oral appliance therapy in positional OSA: 12-month follow-up of a randomized controlled trial [published correction appears in *Sleep Breath*. 2018 May;22(2):451]. *Sleep Breath*. 2018;22(2):441-450.

ECRI Institute. Clinical Evidence Assessment. eXciteOSA (Signifier Medical Technologies Ltd.) for Treating Obstructive Sleep Apnea. January 2022.

ECRI Institute. Clinical Evidence Assessment. Mandibular Advancement Devices for Treating Obstructive Sleep Apnea. March 2022.

ECRI Institute. Clinical Evidence Assessment. Radiofrequency Ablation for Treating Obstructive Sleep Apnea. April 2004. Updated September 2020.

ECRI Institute. Clinical Evidence Assessment. Remedē System (Respicardia, Inc.) for Treating Moderate to Severe Central Sleep Apnea. Plymouth Meeting, PA. September 2018. Updated June 2021.

ECRI Institute. Product Brief. Inspire upper airway stimulation therapy (Inspire Medical Systems, Inc.) for treating obstructive sleep apnea. January 2014. Updated November 2021.

ECRI Institute. Product Brief. NightBalance Lunoa (Philips Respironics, Inc.) for Treating Positional obstructive Sleep Apnea. January 2020.

Epworth Sleepiness Scale. <https://epworthsleepinessscale.com/about-the-ess/>. Accessed August 17, 2022.

Ferguson KA, Heighway K, Ruby RR. A randomized trial of laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty in the treatment of mild obstructive sleep apnea. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2003;167(1):15-19.

Franklin KA, Anttila H, Axelsson S, et al. Effects and side-effects of surgery for snoring and obstructive sleep apnea—a systematic review. *Sleep*. 2009 Jan;32(1):27-36.

Friedman M, Hamilton C, Samuelson CG, et al. Transoral robotic glossectomy for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea-hypopnea syndrome. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2012 May;146(5):854-62.

Friedman M, Schalch P, Joseph NJ. Palatal stiffening after failed uvulopalatopharyngoplasty with the Pillar Implant System. *Laryngoscope*. 2006b;116(11):1956-1961.

Friedman M, Schalch P, Lin HC, et al. Palatal implants for the treatment of snoring and obstructive sleep apnea/hypopnea syndrome. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2008;138(2):209-216.

Friedman M, Vidyasagar R, Bliznikas D, et al. Patient selection and efficacy of pillar implant technique for treatment of snoring and obstructive sleep apnea/hypopnea syndrome. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2006a;134(2):187-196.

Gao YN, Wu YC, Lin SY, et al. Short-term efficacy of minimally invasive treatments for adult obstructive sleep apnea: A systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Formos Med Assoc*. 2019;118(4):750–765.

Gelardi M, Intiglietta P, Porro G, et al. Internal nasal dilator in patients with obstructive sleep apnea. *Acta Biomed*. 2019;90(2-S):19–23. Published 2019 Jan 11.

Gillespie MB, Wylie PE, Lee-Chiong T, et al. Effect of palatal implants on continuous positive airway pressure and compliance. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2011 Feb;144(2):230-6.

Goessler UR, Hein G, Verse T, et al. Soft palate implants as a minimally invasive treatment for mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnea. *Acta Otolaryngol*. 2007;127(5):527-531.

Handler E, Hamans E, Goldberg AN, Mickelson S. Tongue suspension: an evidence-based review and comparison to hypopharyngeal surgery for OSA. *Laryngoscope*. 2014 Jan;124(1):329-36.

Hayes, Inc. Emerging Technology Report. eXciteOSA Device for Mild Obstructive Sleep Apnea. Landsdale, PA: Hayes Inc., February 2021.

Hayes, Inc. Hayes Medical Technology Directory. Hypoglossal nerve stimulation for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. Landsdale, PA: Hayes Inc., October 2018. Updated December 2021.

Hayes, Inc. Hayes Medical Technology Directory. NightBalance (Philips) for the Treatment of Positional Obstructive Sleep Apnea. Landsdale, PA: Hayes Inc., January 2020. Archived February 2021.

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Assessment. Phrenic Nerve Stimulation (remedē System) for Central Sleep Apnea. April 2022.

Hidalgo Armas L, Turino C, Cordero-Guevara J, et al. A new postural device for the treatment of positional obstructive sleep apnea. A pilot study. *Respir Med*. 2019;151:111-117. doi:10.1016/j.rmed.2019.02.005.

Hofmann T, Schwantzer G, Reckenzaun E, et al. Radiofrequency tissue volume reduction of the soft palate and UPPP in the treatment of snoring. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2006;263(2):164-170.

Johal A, Haria P, Manek S, et al. Ready-made versus custom-made mandibular repositioning devices in sleep apnea: a randomized clinical trial. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2017 Feb 15;13(2):175-182.

John CR, Gandhi S, Sakharia AR, et al. Maxillomandibular advancement is a successful treatment for obstructive sleep apnoea: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2018 Dec;47(12):1561-1571.

Johns MW. A new method for measuring daytime sleepiness: the Epworth sleepiness scale. *Sleep*. 1991 Dec;14(6):540-5.

Justin GA, Chang ET, Camacho M, et al. Transoral robotic surgery for obstructive sleep apnea: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2016 May;154(5):835-46.

Kapur VK, Auckley DH, Chowdhuri S, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline for Diagnostic Testing for Adult Obstructive Sleep Apnea: An American Academy of Sleep Medicine Clinical Practice Guideline. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2017 Mar 15;13(3):479-504.

Kent D, Stanley J, Aurora RN, et al. Referral of adults with obstructive sleep apnea for surgical consultation: an American Academy of Sleep Medicine systematic review, meta-analysis, and GRADE assessment. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2021 Dec 1;17(12):2507-2531.

Khan A, Ramar K, Maddirala S, et al. Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty in the management of obstructive sleep apnea: the mayo clinic experience. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2009 Sep;84(9):795-800.

Kompelli AR, Ni JS, Nguyen SA, et al. The outcomes of hypoglossal nerve stimulation in the management of OSA: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World J Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2018 Sep 25;5(1):41-48.

Kotecha B, Wong PY, Zhang H, et al. A novel intraoral neuromuscular stimulation device for treating sleep-disordered breathing. *Sleep Breath*. 2021 Mar 26.

Kryger MH, Berry RB, Massie CA. Long-term use of a nasal expiratory positive airway pressure (EPAP) device as a treatment for obstructive sleep apnea (OSA). *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2011 Oct 15;7(5):449-53B.

Kuhnel T; Schurr C; Wagner B, et al. Morphological changes of the posterior airway space after tongue base suspension. *Laryngoscope*. 2005 Mar;115(3):475-80.

Kushida CA, Morgenthaler TI, Littner MR, et al. Practice parameters for the treatment of snoring and obstructive sleep apnea with oral appliances: an update for 2005. *Sleep*. 2006 Feb 1;29(2):240-3.

Lan WC, Chang WD, Tsai MH, Tsou YA. Trans-oral robotic surgery versus coblation tongue base reduction for obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. *Peer J*. 2019;7:e7812. Published 2019 Oct 2.

Larrosa F, Hernandez L, Morello A, et al. Laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty for snoring: does it meet the expectations? *Eur Respir J*. 2004;24(1):66-70.

Lechien JR, Chiesa-Estomba CM, Fakhry N, et al. Surgical, clinical, and functional outcomes of transoral robotic surgery used in sleep surgery for obstructive sleep apnea syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Head Neck*. 2021 Jul;43(7):2216-2239.

Lee JM, Weinstein GS, O'Malley BW Jr, et al. Transoral robot-assisted lingual tonsillectomy and uvulopalatopharyngoplasty for obstructive sleep apnea. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol*. 2012 Oct;121(10):635-9.

Lin CC, Lee KS, Chang KC, et al. Effect of laser-assisted uvulopalatoplasty on oral airway resistance during wakefulness in obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2006;263(3):241-7.

Liu SY, Guillemainault C, Huon LK, et al. Distraction Osteogenesis Maxillary Expansion (DOME) for adult obstructive sleep apnea patients with high arched palate. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2017 Aug;157(2):345-348.

Lorenzi-Filho G, Almeida FR, Strollo PJ. Treating OSA: Current and emerging therapies beyond CPAP. *Respirology*. 2017 Nov;22(8):1500-1507.

Lundkvist K, Januszkiwicz A, Friberg D. Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty in 158 OSAS patients failing non-surgical treatment. *Acta Otolaryngol*. 2009 Nov;129(11):1280-6.

Lysdahl M, Haraldsson PO. Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty versus laser uvulopalatoplasty: prospective long-term follow-up of self-reported symptoms. *Acta Otolaryngol*. 2002 October 1;122(7):752-7.

MacKay S, Carney AS, Catcheside PG, et al. Effect of multilevel upper airway surgery vs medical management on the apnea-hypopnea index and patient-reported daytime sleepiness among patients with moderate or severe obstructive sleep apnea: the SAMS randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2020 Sep 22;324(12):1168-1179.

Maurer JT, Sommer JU, Hein G, et al. Palatal implants in the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea: a randomized, placebo-controlled single-centre trial. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2012 Jul;269(7):1851-6.

Medtronic website. <https://www.medtronic.com/it-it/operatori-sanitari/products/ear-nose-throat/sleep-disordered-breathing/pillar-procedure-system-snoring-sleep-apnea.html>. Accessed June 7, 2022.

Miller SC, Nguyen SA, Ong AA, et al. Transoral robotic base of tongue reduction for obstructive sleep apnea: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Laryngoscope*. 2017 Jan;127(1):258-265.

Miller FR, Watson D, Malis D., et al. Role of the tongue base suspension suture with The Repose System bone screw in the multilevel surgical management of obstructive sleep apnea. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2002;126(4):392-398.

Moffa A, Giorgi L, Carnuccio L, et al. New non-invasive electrical stimulation devices for treatment of snoring and obstructive sleep apnoea: a systematic review. *Sleep Breath*. 2022 Apr 23.

Morgenthaler TI, Kapen S, Lee-Chiong T, et al. Standards of Practice Committee; American Academy of Sleep Medicine. Practice parameters for the medical therapy of obstructive sleep apnea. *Sleep*. 2006 Aug;29(8):1031-5.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). IPG241. Soft-palate implants for obstructive sleep apnoea. November 2007.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) IPG598. Hypoglossal nerve stimulation for moderate to severe obstructive sleep apnoea. November 2017.

Nordgard S, Hein G, Stene BK, et al. One-year results: palatal implants for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2007;136(5):818-822.

Patil SP, Ayappa IA, Caples SM, et al. Treatment of Adult Obstructive Sleep Apnea with Positive Airway Pressure: An American Academy of Sleep Medicine Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and GRADE Assessment. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2019 Feb 15;15(2):335-343.

Pennsylvania Code and Bulletin, Title 55, Chapter 1101.31. Scope.
<http://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/Display/pacode?file=/secure/pacode/data/055/chapter1101/s1101.31.html&d=reduce>. Accessed September 19, 2022.

Potratz M, Sohns C, Dumitrescu D, et al. Phrenic nerve stimulation improves physical performance and hypoxemia in heart failure patients with central sleep apnea. *J Clin Med*. 2021 Jan 8;10(2):202.

Qaseem A, Holty JE, Owens DK, et al. Management of obstructive sleep apnea in adults: a clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;159:471-483.

Ramar K, Dort LC, Katz SG, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea and snoring with oral appliance therapy: an update for 2015. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2015 Jul 15;11(7):773-827.

Randerath W, Verbraecken J, de Raaff CAL, et al. European Respiratory Society guideline on non-CPAP therapies for obstructive sleep apnoea. *Eur Respir Rev*. 2021 Nov 30;30(162):210200.

Rosenthal L, Massie CA, Dolan DC, et al. A multicenter, prospective study of a novel nasal EPAP device in the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea: efficacy and 30-day adherence. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2009 Dec 15;5(6):532-7.

Rossi VA, Winter B, Rahman NM, et al. The effects of Provent on moderate to severe obstructive sleep apnea during continuous positive airway pressure therapy withdrawal: a randomized controlled trial. *Thorax*. 2013 Sep;68(9):854-9.

Sarzynski E, Barry H. Current evidence and controversies: advanced practice providers in healthcare. *Am J Manag Care*. 2019 Aug;25(8):366-368. PMID: 31419093.

Schendel SA, Broujerdi JA, Jacobson RL. Three-dimensional upper-airway changes with maxillomandibular advancement for obstructive sleep apnea treatment. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2014 Sep;146(3):385-93.

Sleep Foundation. Treatments for Obstruction Sleep Apnea. <https://www.sleepfoundation.org/sleep-apnea/obstructive-sleep-apnea/treatments>. Accessed June 8, 2022.

Sleeper G, Rashidi M, Strohl KP, et al. Comparison of expiratory pressures generated by four different EPAP devices in a laboratory bench setting. *Sleep Med*. 2022 May 13;96:87-92.

Sommer UJ, Heiser C, Gahleitner C, et al. Tonsillectomy with Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty in Obstructive Sleep Apnea. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*. 2016 Jan 11;113(1-02):1-8.

Somnoplasty website. <https://medical.olympusamerica.com/>. Accessed June 8, 2022.

Srijithesh PR, Aghoram R, Goel A, et al. Positional therapy for obstructive sleep apnoea. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019;5(5):CD010990.

Steward DL, Huntley TC, Woodson BT, et al. Palate implants for obstructive sleep apnea: multi-institution, randomized, placebo-controlled study. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2008 Oct;139(4):506-10.

Steward DL, Weaver EM, Woodson BT. A comparison of radiofrequency treatment schemes for obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2004a;130(5):579-585.

Steward DL. Effectiveness of multilevel (tongue and palate) radiofrequency tissue ablation for patients with obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. *Laryngoscope*. 2004b;114(12):2073-2084.

Strollo PJ Jr, Gillespie MB, Soose RJ, et al. Stimulation Therapy for Apnea Reduction (STAR) Trial Group. Upper airway stimulation for obstructive sleep apnea: durability of the treatment effect at 18 months. *Sleep*. 2015 Oct 1;38(10):1593-8.

Strollo PJ Jr, Soose RJ, Maurer JT, et al. STAR Trial Group. Upper-airway stimulation for obstructive sleep apnea. *N Engl J Med*. 2014 Jan 9;370(2):139-49.

Sundaram S, Bridgman SA, Lim J, Lasserson TJ. Surgery for obstructive sleep apnoea. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2005 Oct 19;(4):CD001004.

Sundman J, Browaldh N, Fehrm J, et al. Eight-year follow-up of modified uvulopalatopharyngoplasty in patients with obstructive sleep apnea. *Laryngoscope*. 2021 Jan;131(1):E307-E313.

Suzuki H, Sawa A, Yagi T, et al. Improving nasal airflow with a novel nasal breathing stent. *Dent J (Basel)*. 2022 May 11;10(5):81.

Tan SK, Leung WK, Tang ATH, et al. How does mandibular advancement with or without maxillary procedures affect pharyngeal airways? An overview of systematic reviews. *PLoS One*. 2017 Jul 27;12(7):e0181146.

Terris DJ, Coker JF, Thomas AJ, et al. Preliminary findings from a prospective, randomized trial of two palatal operations for sleep-disordered breathing. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2002;127(4):315-323.

Tsou YA, Chang WD. Comparison of transoral robotic surgery with other surgeries for obstructive sleep apnea. *Sci Rep*. 2020 Oct 23;10(1):18163.

Vicini C, Dallan I, Canzi P, et al. Transoral robotic tongue base resection in obstructive sleep apnoea-hypopnoea syndrome: a preliminary report. *ORL J Otorhinolaryngol Relat Spec*. 2010;72(1):22-7.

Voigt J, Emani S, Gupta S, et al. Meta-analysis comparing outcomes of therapies for patients with central sleep apnea and heart failure with reduced ejection fraction. *Am J Cardiol*. 2020 Jul 15;127:73-83.

Walker RP, Levine HL, Hopp ML, et al. Palatal implants: a new approach for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2006;135(4):549-554.

Walsh JK, Griffin KS, Forst EH, et al. A convenient expiratory positive airway pressure nasal device for the treatment of sleep apnea in patient's non-adherent with continuous positive airway pressure. *Sleep Med*. 2011 Feb;12(2):147-52.

Woodson BT, Derowe A, Hawke M, et al. Pharyngeal suspension suture with repose bone screw for obstructive sleep apnea. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2000;122(3):395-401.

Woodson BT, Soose RJ, Gillespie MB, et al. STAR Trial Investigators. Three-year outcomes of cranial nerve stimulation for obstructive sleep apnea: the STAR trial. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2016 Jan;154(1):181-8.

Woodson BT, Gillespie MB, Soose RJ, et al. STAR Trial Investigators. Randomized controlled withdrawal study of upper airway stimulation on OSA: short- and long-term effect. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2014 Nov;151(5):880-7.

Woodson BT, Nelson L, Mickelson S, et al. A multi-institutional study of radiofrequency volumetric tissue reduction for OSAS. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2001;125(4):303-311.

Woodson BT, Steward DL, Mickelson S, et al. Multicenter study of a novel adjustable tongue-advancement device for obstructive sleep apnea. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2010 Oct;143(4):585-90.

Woodson BT, Steward DL, Weaver EM, et al. A randomized trial of temperature-controlled radiofrequency, continuous positive airway pressure, and placebo for obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2003;128(6):848-861.

Yaremchuk K, Tacia B, Peterson E, et al. Change in Epworth Sleepiness Scale after surgical treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. *Laryngoscope*. 2011 Jul;121(7):1590-3.

Yoon A, Guilleminault C, Zaghi S, et al. Distraction Osteogenesis Maxillary Expansion (DOME) for adult obstructive sleep apnea patients with narrow maxilla and nasal floor. *Sleep Med*. 2020 Jan;65:172-176.

Zaghi S, Holty JE, Certal V, et al. Maxillomandibular advancement for treatment of obstructive sleep apnea: a meta-analysis. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2016 Jan;142(1):58-66.

Zhou A, Li H, Wang X, et al. Preliminary comparison of the efficacy of several surgical treatments based on maxillomandibular advancement procedures in adult patients with obstructive sleep apnoea: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2021 Feb;278(2):543-555.

Policy History/Revision Information

Date	Summary of Changes
03/01/2024	<p>Coverage Rationale</p> <p>Non-Surgical Treatment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revised list of unproven and not medically necessary devices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Added “epigenetic appliances [e.g., Homeoblock™, DNA (Daytime/Nighttime Appliance)®]” ○ Replaced “mandibular repositioning devices (e.g., Slow Wave)” with “mandibular <i>vertical</i> repositioning devices (e.g., Slow Wave)” <p>Surgical Treatment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revised coverage criteria for implantable hypoglossal nerve stimulation with an FDA approved device in an adult patient with moderate to severe Obstructive Sleep Apnea (OSA):

Date	Summary of Changes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Added criterion requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Failure of adequate trial of continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) therapy ▪ Failure of adequate trial of oral appliance therapy ▪ Used in accordance with FDA guidelines ○ Removed criterion requiring failure or intolerance of positive airway pressure (PAP) treatments (such as CPAP or bi-level positive airway pressure [BPAP] machines) ○ Replaced criterion requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Body Mass Index of (BMI) less than or equal to 32kg/m²” with “Body Mass Index of (BMI) less than or equal to 40kg/m²” ▪ “AHI of ≥ 20 and ≤ 65 as determined with Polysomnography (Attended)” with “AHI of ≥ 20 and ≤ 100 as determined with Polysomnography (Attended)” ● Added language to indicate implantable hypoglossal nerve stimulation with an FDA approved device is proven and medically necessary in adolescents aged 10-18 years with Down Syndrome when all the following criteria are met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Diagnosis of severe OSA (as determined by a polysomnogram within 24 months and an AHI ≥10 and RDI ≤ 50 events per hour) ○ BMI < 95th percentile for age ○ Total AHI < 25% for central + mixed apneas ○ Contraindication for or not effectively treated with a prior adenotonsillectomy ○ If patient refuses CPAP therapy, documentation of the refusal must be supplied ○ Absence of tracheostomy use during sleep ○ Absence of a complete blockage or concentric collapse of the soft palate confirmed by a medication induced sleep endoscopy test ○ Individual and caregiver refusal of an MMA procedure for non-concentric palatal collapse ○ Used in accordance with FDA guidelines ● Revised list of unproven and not medically necessary surgical procedures; added: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Isolated Hyoid Myotomy ○ Stand-alone uvulectomy ● Added notation to clarify the list of unproven and not medically surgical procedures is not all inclusive <p>Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Added definition of “Body Mass Index (BMI)” ● Updated definition of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Apnea ○ Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS) <p>Applicable Codes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Updated list of applicable CPT/HCPCS codes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Added 33276*, 33277*, 33278*, 33279*, 33280*, 33281*, 33287*, 33288*, 42140, 93150*, 93151*, 93152*, 93153*, E0492*, E0493*, and E0530* ○ Removed 0424T*, 0425T*, 0426T*, 0427T*, 0428T*, 0429T*, 0430T*, 0431T*, 0432T*, 0433T*, 0434T*, 0435T*, 0436T*, 64553, 64568, 64569, K1001*, K1028*, and K1029* (*annual edit) <p>Supporting Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Updated <i>Description of Services</i>, <i>Clinical Evidence</i>, <i>FDA</i>, and <i>References</i> sections to reflect the most current information ● Archived previous policy version CS116PA.AG

Instructions for Use

This Medical Policy provides assistance in interpreting UnitedHealthcare standard benefit plans. When deciding coverage, the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage must be referenced as the terms of the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage may differ from the standard benefit plan. In the event of a conflict, the

federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage govern. Before using this policy, please check the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage. UnitedHealthcare reserves the right to modify its Policies and Guidelines as necessary. This Medical Policy is provided for informational purposes. It does not constitute medical advice.

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