

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Applies to all products administered or underwritten by Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and its subsidiary, HMO Louisiana, Inc. (collectively referred to as the "Company"), unless otherwise provided in the applicable contract. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Medical Policy periodically.

Investigational or experimental services are not covered. This includes any drug, device, procedure, or service provided under the investigational arm of a clinical trial or clinical study. These services are excluded from coverage under benefits.

When Services May Be Eligible for Coverage

Coverage for eligible medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products may be provided only if:

- *Benefits are available in the member's contract/certificate, and*
- *Medical necessity criteria and guidelines are met.*

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved sublingual immunotherapy (SLIT) products Ragwitek[®]†, Grastek[®]†, Oralair[®]†, and Odactra[™]† for the treatment of allergen induced allergic rhinitis to be **eligible for coverage.****

Ragwitek

Patient Selection Criteria

Coverage eligibility for the use of Ragwitek will be considered when the following patient selection criteria are met:

- Patient is 5-65 years of age; AND
- Ragwitek therapy is initiated 12 weeks prior to the expected onset of the short ragweed pollen season; AND
- The diagnosis of short ragweed pollen-induced allergic rhinitis is confirmed by meeting ONE of the following conditions:
 - Patient has a positive skin test response to short ragweed pollen; OR
 - Patient has a positive in vitro test (i.e., a blood test for allergen-specific immunoglobulin E [IgE] antibodies) for short ragweed pollen; AND
- Patient is NOT currently receiving subcutaneous allergen immunotherapy; AND
- Patient must have been unable to achieve adequate symptom control with TWO products (from different classes) from the following drug classes (over the counter products are acceptable within the drug classes when taken at prescription strength doses):
 - Intranasal corticosteroids
 - Oral antihistamines

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

- Intranasal antihistamines
- Leukotriene inhibitors

*(Note: This specific patient selection criterion is an additional Company requirement for coverage eligibility and will be denied as not medically necessary** if not met.)*

Grastek

Patient Selection Criteria

Coverage eligibility for the use of Grastek will be considered when the following patient selection criteria are met:

- Patient is 5-65 years of age; AND
- Grastek therapy is initiated 12 weeks prior to the expected onset of the grass pollen season; AND
- The diagnosis of grass pollen-induced allergic rhinitis is confirmed by meeting ONE of the following:
 - Patient has a positive skin test response to a grass pollen from the Pooideae subfamily of grasses (this includes, but is not limited to sweet vernal, Kentucky blue grass, Timothy grass, orchard, or perennial rye grass); OR
 - Patient has a positive in vitro test (i.e., a blood test for allergen-specific IgE antibodies) for a grass in the Pooideae subfamily of grasses (see examples above); AND
- Patient is NOT currently receiving subcutaneous allergen immunotherapy; AND
- Patient must have been unable to achieve adequate symptom control with TWO products (from different classes) from the following drug classes (over the counter products are acceptable within the drug classes when taken at prescription strength doses):
 - Intranasal corticosteroids
 - Oral antihistamines
 - Intranasal antihistamines
 - Leukotriene inhibitors

*(Note: This specific patient selection criterion is an additional Company requirement for coverage eligibility and will be denied as not medically necessary** if not met.)*

Oralair

Patient Selection Criteria

Coverage eligibility for the use of Oralair will be considered when the following patient selection criteria are met:

- Patient is 5-65 years of age; AND
- Oralair therapy is initiated 16 weeks prior to the expected onset of the grass pollen season; AND
- The diagnosis of grass pollen-induced allergic rhinitis is confirmed by meeting ONE of the following:
 - Patient has a positive skin test response to a grass pollen from the Pooideae subfamily of grasses (this includes, but is not limited to sweet vernal, Kentucky blue grass, Timothy grass, orchard, or perennial rye grass); OR

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

- Patient has a positive in vitro test (i.e., a blood test for allergen-specific IgE antibodies) for a grass in the Pooideae subfamily of grasses (see examples above); AND
 - Patient is NOT currently receiving subcutaneous allergen immunotherapy; AND
 - Patient must have been unable to achieve adequate symptom control with TWO products (from different classes) from the following drug classes (over the counter products are acceptable within the drug classes when taken at prescription strength doses):
 - Intranasal corticosteroids
 - Oral antihistamines
 - Intranasal antihistamines
 - Leukotriene inhibitors
- (Note: This specific patient selection criterion is an additional Company requirement for coverage eligibility and will be denied as not medically necessary** if not met.)*

Odactra

Patient Selection Criteria

Coverage eligibility for the use of Odactra will be considered when the following patient selection criteria are met:

- Patient is 5-65 years of age; AND
- The diagnosis of house dust mite induced allergic rhinitis is confirmed by ONE of the following:
 - Patient has a positive skin test response to licensed house dust mite allergen extracts; OR
 - Patient has a positive in vitro test (i.e., a blood test for allergen-specific IgE antibodies) to *Dermatophagoides farinae* or *Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus*; AND
- Patient is NOT currently receiving subcutaneous allergen immunotherapy; AND
- Patient must have been unable to achieve adequate symptom control with TWO products (from different classes) from the following drug classes (over the counter products are acceptable within the drug classes when taken at prescription strength doses):
 - Intranasal corticosteroids
 - Oral antihistamines
 - Intranasal antihistamines
 - Leukotriene inhibitors

*(Note: This specific patient selection criterion is an additional Company requirement for coverage eligibility and will be denied as not medically necessary** if not met.)*

When Services Are Considered Not Medically Necessary

Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of Ragwitek, Grastek, Oralair, or Odactra without first attempting symptom control of allergic rhinitis with at least TWO products from the intranasal corticosteroids, oral or intranasal antihistamines, or leukotriene inhibitors (each product coming from a different class) to be **not medically necessary**.**

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

When Services Are Considered Investigational

Coverage is not available for investigational medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products.

Based on review of available data, the Company considers FDA approved SLIT as a technique of allergy immunotherapy for all other uses not mentioned in the specific drug's patient selection criteria to be **investigational**.*

Based on review of available data, the Company considers non-FDA approved SLIT to be **investigational**.*

Background/Overview

SLIT is a potential alternative to subcutaneous immunotherapy (SCIT) for providing allergen-specific therapy. It is proposed as a more convenient alternative delivery route for treating a variety of allergic disorders. There are now four FDA approved SLITs available. These include Ragwitek, Grastek, Oralair, and Odactra. Ragwitek is approved for the treatment of short ragweed pollen-induced allergic rhinitis in adults 5-65 years of age. It is dosed as one 12 Amb a 1-Unit sublingual tablet daily. Ragwitek should be initiated at least 12 weeks before the expected onset of the ragweed pollen season. Grastek is approved for the treatment of grass pollen induced allergic rhinitis in persons 5-65 years of age. Grastek is dosed as one 2800 bioequivalent allergy unit (BAU) sublingual tablet daily and should be initiated at least 12 weeks prior to the start of each grass pollen season. Oralair is approved for the treatment of grass pollen induced allergic rhinitis. It has age based dosing. For those individuals aged 5-17, the dosing is 100 IR (index of reactivity) the first day, 200 IR the second day, and 300 IR daily thereafter. Oralair is available in 100 IR and 300 IR sublingual tablets. For those individuals 18-65, Oralair is dosed at 300 IR daily. Odactra is approved in persons 5-65 years of age for the treatment of house dust mite induced allergic rhinitis. The dosage of Odactra is one tablet (12 SQ-HDM) daily.

Allergen-specific immunotherapy involves administering well-characterized allergen extracts, the potencies of which are measured and compared with a reference standard. An initial induction or build-up phase progressively increases the allergen dose; this is followed by multiple years of maintenance injections at the highest dose. Allergen-specific immunotherapy has been used to treat a variety of conditions including insect allergy, allergic rhinitis, and asthma. Subcutaneous injection of allergen-specific immunotherapy is the standard approach. Due to the inconvenience of multiple injections, particularly in children, alternative delivery routes have been investigated; of these, SLIT is the most prominent. SLIT targets absorption to the sublingual and buccal mucosa. Allergen preparations used for SLIT are held under the tongue for one to several minutes and then swallowed or spit out.

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Pharmacotherapy of Pollen-Induced Allergic Rhinitis

Several clinical practice guidelines describe pharmacologic treatments of pollen-induced allergic rhinitis/rhinoconjunctivitis. There is general agreement that:

- Treatment should be individualized based on symptom severity and duration, comorbidities, and patient age, preference (e.g., route of administration, tolerance for adverse effects), and previous treatment history.
- Measures to increase treatment adherence (e.g., shared decision making, consideration of the patient's school or work schedule, use of a medication calendar or check-off list) are encouraged.
- Goals of treatment are symptom reduction and improvements in functional capacity and quality of life.
- A “step-up” (if treatment is inadequate)/“step-down” (if symptom relief is achieved with other interventions, e.g., avoidance) approach to treatment is recommended.
- Allergen avoidance is the first step of treatment but may be unrealistic for some patients.

Various medication classes are used to treat allergic rhinitis including antihistamines (oral and intranasal), intranasal corticosteroids, and leukotriene receptor antagonists. For patients with persistent or moderate to severe symptoms, intranasal glucocorticoids (e.g., fluticasone, mometasone) show good efficacy. If the nasal glucocorticoids aren't desirable, then other products demonstrating efficacy in this group of patients are antihistamine sprays (e.g., azelastine) and leukotriene inhibitors (e.g., montelukast). It is recommended that if single therapy isn't adequate, combination therapy should be utilized.

FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

Various products were approved for allergic rhinitis:

- On April 1, 2014, FDA approved Oralair allergen extract (Stallergenes S.A., Antony, France) for patients 10 to 65 years of age. Oralair contains freeze-dried pollen allergen extracts of 5 grasses: Kentucky Blue Grass, Orchard, Perennial Rye, Sweet Vernal, and Timothy. In November of 2018, Oralair's age was extended to 5 years of age.
- On April 11, 2014, FDA approved Grastek (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) Timothy grass pollen (Phleum pratense) allergen extract for patients 5 to 65 years of age. Grastek is marketed in Europe as Grazax.
- On April 17, 2014, FDA approved Ragwitek (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) short ragweed pollen allergen extract for patients 18 to 65 years of age. In April of 2021, the age was expanded to include ages 5 years to 65 years of age.
- On March 1, 2017, FDA approved Odactra (Merck, Catalent Pharma Solutions, United Kingdom) house dust mite allergen extract for patients 18 to 65 years of age. In January 2023, the age approval was expanded to include patients 12 years to 65 years of age. In February 2025, the age approval was further expanded to include patients 5 to 65 years of age.

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Rationale/Source

This medical policy was developed through consideration of peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval status, nationally accepted standards of medical practice and accepted standards of medical practice in this community, technology evaluation centers, reference to regulations, other plan medical policies, and accredited national guidelines.

Allergic Rhinitis

Systematic Reviews

A meta-analysis by Meltzer et al (2021) evaluated SLIT tablets and pharmacotherapy for allergic rhinitis in pediatric and adult patients. Patients receiving SLIT were allowed rescue symptom-relieving pharmacotherapy in all trials. In adults and adolescents, the mean difference in total nasal symptom score (TNSS) between SLIT tablets and placebo was 0.57 (95% confidence interval [CI], 0.41 to 0.73) for patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (n = 4 trials) and 0.65 (95% CI, 0.42 to 0.88) for patients with perennial allergic rhinitis (n = 3 trials). No trials for perennial allergic rhinitis in pediatric patients were found, but 2 trials in pediatric patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis found improved TNSS scores with SLIT tablets compared with placebo (mean difference, 0.53; 95% CI, 0.19 to 0.87). Although not directly compared, the percentage improvement with SLIT was similar to that of intranasal corticosteroids.

The meta-analysis by Yang et al (2018) evaluated the use of SLIT to treat allergic conjunctivitis (AC) or allergic rhinoconjunctivitis (ARC) in patients aged 3 to 18 years, specifically looking for SLIT's effectiveness for relieving eye symptoms. Thirteen randomized clinical trials were identified, which included a total of 1,592 pediatric patients. Overall, the trials showed that AC symptoms were significantly reduced by SLIT (standardized mean difference [SMD] = -0.21; 95% CI, -0.41 to -0.01; p = 0.04; I² = 55%). However, on a subgroup analysis of the different SLIT modalities, ocular symptoms improved with tablets (p < 0.001) but not drops (p = 0.47); in addition, SLIT significantly reduced pollen-induced AC (p < 0.001) but not mite-induced (p = 0.34). The investigators stated that the meta-analysis was limited by variations in the baseline severity of patients' AC or ARC, the ocular scoring systems used, and in the SLIT therapeutic regimens, as well as the small sample sizes (n < 30) of 46% of the studies. However, their results showed that SLIT effectively reduced conjunctivitis symptoms in pediatric patients with AC and ARC.

In 2014, FDA approved 3 sublingual allergen products for the treatment of allergic rhinitis or rhinoconjunctivitis. As part of a 2015 systematic review, Di Bona et al conducted a meta-analysis of studies on FDA-approved grass pollen SLIT tablets. Thirteen studies met reviewers' inclusion criteria, which were placebo-controlled randomized trials on grass pollen SLIT in patients with a clinical history of seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis and data on symptom scores or medication scores. Most studies reported the same symptom score, which ranged from 0 to 18 points (higher scores indicating greater disease severity). In a pooled analysis, SLIT was more effective than placebo. The standardized mean difference (SMD) for the treatment effect was -0.28 (95% confidence interval [CI], -0.37 to -0.19; p < 0.001). Findings were similar in an analysis that excluded the 5 studies at high or moderate risk of bias.

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Samajdar et al (2025) published a systematic review and meta-analysis that compared SLIT and SCIT for seasonal allergic rhinitis. The analysis included 15 studies (N = 780). The primary outcome was symptom score; secondary outcomes included medication score, symptom-medication score, local reactions, systemic reactions (all grades), and systemic reactions (grades 3 and 4). Four studies showed SCIT was associated with a significantly lower symptom score than SLIT (SMD, -0.52; 95% CI, -0.60 to -0.03). No significant differences were found for medication score (SMD, 0.13; 95% CI, -2.05 to 2.30) or symptom-medication score (SMD, 0.09; 95% CI, -1.36 to 1.54). Local reactions (SMD, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.26 to 2.57) and systemic reactions (SMD, 1.18; 95% CI, 0.89 to 1.56) were also not significantly different between treatments. However, SCIT was associated with significantly fewer grade 3 and 4 systemic reactions (SMD, 6.27; 95% CI, 1.47 to 26.73).

Dretzke et al (2013) published a systematic review that included an indirect comparison of SLIT and SCIT for seasonal allergic rhinitis, using data from placebo-controlled trials. Several outcomes were examined. For symptom score, the overall standardized score difference (SSD) was 0.35 (95% CI, 0.13 to 0.59), a statistically significant result that favored SCIT. The overall SSD for medication score was 0.27 (95% CI, 0.03 to 0.53), which was statistically significant in favor of SCIT. Reviewers noted that heterogeneity among trials was substantial and that any conclusions about the clinical significance of the differences in outcomes between SCIT and SLIT would be tentative. An updated systematic review of 7 RCTs in patients with allergic rhinitis by Tie et al (2022) failed to find a difference between SLIT or SCIT. The authors also conducted an indirect comparison of trials evaluating SCIT versus placebo (n = 13) or SLIT versus placebo (n = 33) and found no significant differences between SCIT and SLIT.

Two indirect comparative effectiveness analyses, Nelson et al (2015) and Dranitsaris et al (2014), reached similar conclusions on the relative efficacy of SLIT and SCIT for grass pollen allergies. Both studies showed comparable reductions in allergic rhinitis symptoms with SLIT and SCIT, and 1 showed comparable reductions in medication use. Both reviews found evidence of publication bias.

Randomized Controlled Trials

The key RCTs performed as part of the FDA approval process for specific SLIT products are reviewed next, followed by recent RCTs and meta-analyses.

Information about 3 SLIT products approved by FDA for the treatment of pollen-induced (i.e., seasonal) allergic rhinitis with or without conjunctivitis was obtained from FDA documentation and prescribing information. Published RCTs are cited when identified. All RCTs were placebo-controlled and double-blinded. Patients had had a minimum 2-year history of allergic rhinitis or rhinoconjunctivitis and received treatment for their symptoms during the previous pollen season. Patients with mild intermittent asthma were included ($\approx 16\%$ across all trials); all other patients with asthma were excluded. Polysensitized people were included in some trials. Preseasonal dosing, i.e., commencing before the start of the allergen pollen season and continuing throughout the season, was used in all trials. The primary efficacy end point was the combined score, defined as the mean of the Rhinoconjunctivitis Total Symptom Score (RTSS) and the Rescue Medication Score (RMS).

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

- RTSS is the sum of 6 symptom scores: sneezing, rhinorrhea, nasal itching, nasal congestion, itchy eyes, and watery eyes, each scored on a 0 (absent) to 3 (severe) scale (range, 0-18).
- RMS measures the potency of rescue medications used. For Oralair (and for Grastek and presumably Ragwitek), 1 point (6 points) was assigned to antihistamine, 2 points (8 points) to intranasal corticosteroid, 3 points (16 points) to oral corticosteroid, and 0 points (0 points) when no rescue medication was used. The maximum score was 3 for Oralair and 36 for Grastek (and presumably Ragwitek).
- The combined score was calculated by combining RTSS and RMS. For Oralair, RTSS was divided by 6 and averaged with RMS (range, 0-3). For Grastek and Ragwitek, RTSS and RMS were summed (range, 0-54).

Although the combined score is not validated, minimum clinically meaningful relative differences were prespecified. The relative difference (expressed as a percentage) was calculated by dividing the least squares mean difference by the within-group least squares mean of the placebo group. For Oralair (as well as for Grastek and Ragwitek), a minimum 15 (20) percentage-point relative difference favoring the active agent, with a minimum 10 (10) percentage-point lower bound of the 95% CI, was required to demonstrate clinical efficacy. Analyses were intention-to-treat (ITT).

Oralair

Five pivotal trials were submitted to FDA in support of the biologics license application for Oralair; four were natural field trials (three European, one United States) and one was an environmental exposure chamber trial (Europe). Trial participants had a history of seasonal rhinoconjunctivitis for at least 2 grass pollen seasons. Patients in European trials also had a positive skin prick test to 5-grass pollen extract and positive serum IgE to Timothy grass; patients in U.S. trials had a positive skin prick test to Timothy grass pollen extract. Polysensitive people exposed to additional allergens during grass pollen season (e.g., who lived in areas where grass pollen season overlapped with tree or ragweed pollen season) were excluded. The pregrass pollen season treatment duration was 4 months in most trials. All studies satisfied the FDA requirement for efficacy. A sixth pivotal trial used a 2-month preseason treatment period and did not meet FDA criteria for efficacy. Results are as follows:

Trial	N	Relative Difference in Combined Score % (95% CI)
Trial 1: Phase 3, multicenter, U.S.	473	28 (13 to 43)
Trial 2: European dose-finding trial	284	30 (16 to 43)
Trial 3: Phase 3, 3-year European trial	426	38 (22 to 55)
Trial 4: Phase 3, European pediatric trial	278	30 (13 to 47)
Trial 5: European environmental exposure chamber trial	89	29 (14 to 44)

Grastek

Six phase 3 pivotal trials were submitted to FDA in support of the biologics license application for Grastek. All were natural field trials; four were conducted in North America and two in Europe.

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Trial participants had a history of grass pollen-induced rhinitis with or without conjunctivitis, positive serum IgE to Timothy grass pollen, and baseline forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV₁) greater than 70% of predicted value. Polysensitized patients who required treatment for nongrass pollen allergies during grass pollen season were excluded. Patients were randomized 1:1 to daily Grastek 2,800 BAU or placebo. In 1 trial (trial 3), patients continued dosing for 3 years continuously. Three (trials 1-3) of 6 studies (2,480/3,501 [71%] of total patients) met the FDA criteria for efficacy. However, in trial 3, for the 241 (38%) of 634 patients who remained on-study for 2 years after discontinuing Grastek, the relative difference in the combined score was 23% (95% CI, 6% to 37%), which no longer met the FDA criteria for efficacy. Results are as follows:

Trial	N	Relative Difference in Combined Score % (95% CI)
Trial 1: U.S. and Canada adult and pediatric trial	1,501	23 (13 to 36)
Trial 2: U.S. and Canada pediatric trial	345	26 (10 to 38)
Trial 3: European sustained effect trial	634	34 (26 to 42)
Trial 4: German pediatric trial	253	24 (5 to 41)
Trial 5: U.S. adult trial	329	10 (4 to 24)
Trial 6: U.S. and Canada adult trial	439	21 (6 to 33)
Pooled Analysis	3,094	20 (16 to 24)

Ragwitek

Two pivotal trials on Ragwitek are included in the prescribing information. Both were natural field trials that enrolled adults ages 18 to 50 years who had ragweed pollen-induced allergic rhinitis with or without conjunctivitis, positive serum IgE to ragweed pollen, and baseline FEV₁ of at least 70% of predicted. Both trials met FDA criteria for efficacy. Results are as follows:

Trial	N	Relative Difference in Combined Score % (95% CI)
Trial 1: Phase 2/3 U.S. and Canada dose-finding trial	375	26 (14 to 38)
Trial 2: Phase 3 U.S., Canada, and Eastern Europe dose-finding trial	394	27 (14 to 39)

A separate trial comparing Ragwitek with placebo was conducted by Nolte et al (2020) in 1025 children age 5 to 18 years with ragweed allergic rhinitis, with or without conjunctivitis. Additional inclusion criteria were positive serum IgE to ragweed pollen, and baseline forced expiratory volume in 1 second of at least 80% of predicted. The mean age of trial participants was 12 years, and about half (43%) had concomitant asthma. The study found significant differences favoring Ragwitek over placebo in daily symptom score, daily medication score and total combined score over the course of ragweed pollen season. Results were consistent across the 3 pollen seasons included in the trial and among patients with comorbid asthma. No study relevance or design and conduct limitations were noted.

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Summary

Three sublingual pollen extracts (one multiple-allergen product [Oralair], two single-allergen products [Grastek and Ragwitek]) have been FDA-approved for treatment of pollen-induced allergic rhinitis with or without conjunctivitis. Large, well-designed, RCTs supporting the marketing applications for these products have provided consistent evidence of efficacy and safety. Although trials were placebo-controlled, rather than SCIT-controlled, minimum clinically important criteria for demonstrating efficacy were prespecified and met in most studies. Moreover, a 2015 meta-analysis of the placebo-controlled trials on FDA-approved grass pollen SLIT tablets found significantly greater efficacy in the treatment vs the control group. Notably, the largest pediatric trial to date found SLIT to have a positive, long-term impact on allergic rhinoconjunctivitis symptoms and medication use relative to placebo, but did not reduce time to asthma onset. A recent placebo-controlled, double-blinded randomized trial of adults, however, found no significant difference between SLIT and placebo in the improvement of allergic rhinoconjunctivitis symptoms at 3-year follow-up, 1 year following discontinuation of treatment. Additionally, subgroup analysis from a 2017 meta-analysis of placebo-controlled randomized trials evaluating SLIT in children found the intervention to be effective for allergic rhinitis but not medication use.

House Dust Mite-Specific Allergy

Systematic Reviews

See the systematic review by Yang et al (2018) summarized in Indication 1 for their assessment of SLIT for relief of AC or ARC in patients aged 3 to 18 years. They found that SLIT significantly reduced pollen-induced AC ($p < 0.001$) but not house dust mite-induced AC ($p = 0.34$).

Feng et al (2017) conducted a meta-analysis of 25 placebo-controlled randomized trials (published from 1990 to 2016) on the efficacy of SLIT for house dust mite-induced allergic rhinitis in adults and children. Most trials were double-blinded, deemed to be of high quality, and included 2 phase 3 trials. All studies compared the intervention with a placebo for a period of 6 to 36 months. In total, there were 3,674 randomized patients, and the largest trial included 992 participants. There were 12 pediatric trials, with ages ranging from 3 to 18 years. Of 23 studies that reported discontinuation rates, 539 (14.6%) participants dropped out due to the following: adverse events (3.0%; most commonly oral pruritis), loss to follow-up (2.0%), noncompliance (1.9%), and poor efficacy (0.9%). Primary endpoints were symptom scores and medication use. Symptom scores varied by type, including rhinitis symptoms only, rhinoconjunctivitis symptoms, or rhinoconjunctivitis and asthma symptoms. Overall, there was a significant reduction in symptoms in the SLIT group relative to placebo (SMD = 1.23; 95% CI, 1.74 to 0.73; $p < 0.001$). A subgroup analysis of trials using different modalities (drops, $n = 19$; tablets, $n = 6$) found a significant reduction in symptom scores with the use of tablets (SMD = -1.81; 95% CI, -2.94 to -0.68; $p = 0.002$) relative to drops (SMD = -1.06; 95% CI, -1.67 to -0.44; $p < 0.001$).

Medication type also varied, including systemic and topical antihistamines, decongestants, and both systemic and topical nasal corticosteroids. Data on medication use were available in 18 RCTs, but the final analysis included only 15 RCTs due to substantial differences in how data were evaluated.

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Overall, there was a significant reduction in medication use in the SLIT group relative to the placebo group (SMD = -1.39; 95% CI, -1.90 to -0.88; $p < 0.001$). Additionally, the significant reductions in medication use found among adults were not found in children ($p = 0.060$), possibly due to dosage, lack of compliance, or small sample size.

Reviewers pointed out several important limitations to the meta-analysis, including significant heterogeneity among studies, inadequate reporting of blinding procedures, potential publication bias, small sample sizes, and variations in assessment scores, study protocols, pharmaceutical preparations, baseline symptom severity, and the prevalence of respiratory allergic complications among patients. An SMD measure, a random-effects model, and sensitivity analysis were used to mitigate these limitations.

A second systematic review assessing the effect of SLIT on house dust mite-induced allergic rhinitis only included studies conducted in children aged 4 to 18 years. The review included 16 placebo-controlled trials ($N = 1,929$) of SLIT drops or tablets for 6 to 24 months. Pooled outcomes included nasal symptom, medication, and ocular symptom scores. The review did not report discontinuation rates. Nasal symptom scores, reported in 16 studies, were significantly lower with SLIT versus placebo (SMD -1.73, 95% CI -2.62 to -0.84), but heterogeneity was very high ($I^2 = 98\%$). Total medication scores were also significantly lower with SLIT versus placebo based on evidence from 11 studies (SMD -1.21, 95% CI -1.75 to -0.67), but again heterogeneity was high ($I^2 = 94\%$). For both outcomes, the review found evidence of publication bias, but even after adjustment for bias, SLIT was more effective than placebo for both outcomes, $p = 0.02$ and < 0.0001 , respectively. Ocular symptom scores were only reported in 6 of the studies. When pooled there was no clear difference between SLIT and placebo ($p = 0.31$), however subgroup analysis found SLIT tablets (SMD -0.28, 95% CI -0.42 to -0.14) more effective than SLIT drops (SMD 0.13, 95% CI -0.20 to 0.60), relative to placebo.

Liao et al (2015) published a meta-analysis of studies on dust mite SLIT for treating children with asthma. Reviewers identified 11 RCTs and prospective controlled studies evaluating SLIT in children (i.e., < 18 years old) with asthma and reporting clinical outcomes. Studies compared SLIT with placebo and/or pharmacotherapy. Findings of the meta-analysis were mixed. A pooled analysis of 8 studies found that an asthma symptom score decreased significantly more in the SLIT groups than in the control groups (SSD = -1.20; 95% CI, -2.07 to -0.33; $p = 0.007$). A pooled analysis of 3 studies did not find significant differences between groups in change in medication usage (SSD = -0.52; 95% CI, -1.753 to 0.713; $p = 0.408$). Groups also did not differ significantly in an analysis of change in specific *Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus* IgE levels before and after treatment (SSD = 0.430; 95% CI, -0.045 to 0.905; $p = 0.076$). In all analyses, there were high levels of heterogeneity among studies.

Gendelman and Lang (2015) published a systematic review of house dust mite SLIT in atopic dermatitis. Five studies (total $n = 344$ patients) were identified but low methodologic quality limited conclusions that could be drawn. Bae et al (2013) also published a systematic review and meta-analysis of immunotherapy for children and adults with house dust mite-induced atopic dermatitis. Literature was searched through November 2012, and 8 placebo-controlled randomized trials were

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

included (6 SCIT [n = 307], 2 SLIT [n = 90]). Using a dichotomous variable for treatment success, defined as the proportion of patients whose condition improved as assessed by investigators or patients, regardless of evaluation method used, the odds ratio was 5.35 (95% CI, 1.61 to 17.77). The significance of this finding is uncertain given the heterogeneity of treatments administered and the use of a nonstandard outcome measure.

Kim et al (2021) published a network meta-analysis comparing SCIT with SLIT in patients with a house dust mite allergy. A total of 26 RCTs (N = 6743) were included. Ten studies (n = 5744) with SLIT tablets found significant improvement in symptom scores with SLIT compared with placebo (SMD, -0.329; 95% CI, -0.426 to -0.231; $p < 0.01$) while 9 studies (n = 5725) found improvement in medication score (SMD, -0.227; 95% CI, -0.371 to -0.083; $p < 0.01$). The SCIT group had greater efficacy in the symptom score compared with SLIT tablets in network meta-analysis (SMD, -0.819; 95% CI, -1.242 to -0.397). Medication scores were also improved with SCIT (SMD, -0.517; 95% CI, -0.914 to -0.121). The analysis is limited by high levels of heterogeneity in the SLIT studies.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Included in the Feng et al (2017) meta-analysis was a phase 3 double-blind RCT by Demoly et al (2016) of Odactra as a treatment for moderate-to-severe house dust mite-induced allergic rhinitis despite pharmacotherapy. Adults were randomized to daily Odactra 6 SQ-house dust mite (HDM) (n = 336), Odactra 12 SQ-HDM (n = 318), or placebo (n = 338) for 52 weeks. Total Combined Rhinitis Score (TCRS), which integrated patient-reported symptoms of rhinitis or conjunctivitis and use of pharmacotherapy, met the prespecified threshold of clinical relevance ($\text{TCRS} > 1$) after 14 weeks of treatment and at all subsequent time points, for both dosages of Odactra. The primary endpoint of TCRS in the efficacy period (8 weeks after completing 52 weeks of treatment) showed an absolute reduction from placebo for both 6 SQ-HDM (1.18; $p = 0.002$) and 12 SQ-HDM (1.22; $p = 0.001$). The most common adverse events were oral pruritus, throat irritation, and mouth edema. Serious adverse events were noted in the placebo (n = 8) and 6 SQ-HDM (n = 4) treatment groups; none were deemed to be related to treatment. One patient required adrenaline on the first dose of 12 SQ-HDM Odactra to treat laryngeal edema.

Nolte et al (2016) published a phase 3 double-blind, RCT evaluating Odactra (12 SQ-HDM) and placebo for treatment of house dust mite-induced allergic rhinitis, with or without conjunctivitis, and with or without asthma. Patients ages 12 years and older (n = 1,482) were randomized to Odactra or placebo once daily for 52 weeks. Improvement in the average TCRS after treatment, compared with placebo, was 17% (95% CI, 10% to 25%). This primary efficacy endpoint, which integrated symptoms and medication use, met prespecified targets for clinical significance. Patients also demonstrated improvement in average conjunctivitis scores, with improvement over placebo of 33% (95% CI, 19% to 47%). Seven patients were treated with epinephrine for adverse events; 1 patient experienced severe “throat tightness” after the first dose. Adverse events were typically mild to moderate in severity, with most events consisting of throat irritation, oral pruritus, and ear pruritus. No treatment-related serious adverse events were reported.

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Summary

A number of RCTs have evaluated SLIT for patients with dust mite allergies, mainly placebo-controlled trials. Meta-analyses found high levels of heterogeneity among studies. A meta-analysis published in 2015 had mixed findings; some outcomes but not others favored SLIT over placebo or pharmacologic treatment. A 2017 meta-analysis found SLIT to be associated with a significant reduction in house dust mite-induced allergic rhinitis symptoms and medication use relative to placebo in adults but found no statistically significant reduction for children. However, a 2020 systematic review of studies conducted in children found SLIT associated with significantly lower nasal symptom and medication use scores. Finally, a 2021 meta-analysis found improved outcomes with SLIT compared with placebo, but SCIT was superior to SLIT. More recent large, well-designed RCTs supporting the marketing applications for these products have provided consistent evidence of efficacy and safety. Although these trials were also placebo-controlled, rather than SCIT-controlled, minimum clinically important criteria for demonstrating efficacy were prespecified and met in the largest studies.

Supplemental Information

American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery Foundation

In 2024, the American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery Foundation (AAO-HNSF) published clinical practice guidelines on allergen immunotherapy in patients with inhalant allergy. They issued a strong recommendation for offering immunotherapy to patients with allergic rhinitis with or without allergic asthma if symptoms are inadequately controlled with medical therapy, allergen avoidance, or both, or have a preference for immunomodulation. A minimum treatment duration of 3 years is recommended for patients who respond. The guidelines recommended patient education on the differences between subcutaneous immunotherapy (SCIT) and sublingual immunotherapy (SLIT) but did not state a preference for a particular administration route.

In 2015, the AAO-HNSF published clinical practice guidelines on allergic rhinitis that contained the following statement:

“Clinicians should offer, or refer to a clinician who can offer, immunotherapy (sublingual or subcutaneous) for patients with AR [allergic rhinitis] who have inadequate response to symptoms with pharmacologic therapy with or without environmental controls. Recommendation based on RCTs [randomized controlled trials] and systematic reviews, with a preponderance of benefit over harm.”

American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology et al

In 2020, the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology (AAAAI) and the American College of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology (ACAAI) recommended allergen immunotherapy (either SCIT or SLIT) be offered to patients with moderate or severe allergic rhinitis who are not controlled with allergen avoidance or pharmacotherapy; prefer immunotherapy; or those who may benefit due to comorbid conditions such as asthma.

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

In 2017, the AAAAI and the ACAAI jointly published updated practice parameters on SLIT. These recommendations apply to the use of SLIT agents approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration at time of publication: 5-grass (Oralair), Timothy grass (Grastek), and ragweed (Ragwitek).

References

1. Meltzer EO, Wallace D, Friedman HS, et al. Meta-analyses of the efficacy of pharmacotherapies and sublingual allergy immunotherapy tablets for allergic rhinitis in adults and children. *Rhinology*. Oct 01 2021; 59(5): 422-432. PMID 34463311
2. Yang J, Zhang L, Zhao Z, et al. Sublingual immunotherapy for pediatric allergic conjunctivitis: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol*. Nov 2018; 8(11): 1253-1259. PMID 29782067
3. Di Bona D, Plaia A, Leto-Barone MS, et al. Efficacy of grass pollen allergen sublingual immunotherapy tablets for seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern Med*. Aug 2015; 175(8): 1301-1309. PMID 26120825.
4. Samajdar SS, Moitra S, Sarkar S, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Subcutaneous vs. Sublingual Immunotherapy in Allergic Rhinitis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Clin Exp Allergy*. Feb 2025; 55(2): 199-201. PMID 39343422
5. Dretzke J, Meadows A, Novielli N, et al. Subcutaneous and sublingual immunotherapy for seasonal allergic rhinitis: a systematic review and indirect comparison. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. May 2013; 131(5): 1361-6. PMID 23557834
6. Tie K, Miller C, Zanation AM, et al. Subcutaneous Versus Sublingual Immunotherapy for Adults with Allergic Rhinitis: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analyses. *Laryngoscope*. Mar 2022; 132(3): 499-508. PMID 33929726
7. Nelson H, Cartier S, Allen-Ramey F, et al. Network meta-analysis shows commercialized subcutaneous and sublingual grass products have comparable efficacy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. Mar-Apr 2015; 3(2): 256-266.e3. PMID 25609326
8. Dranitsaris G, Ellis AK. Sublingual or subcutaneous immunotherapy for seasonal allergic rhinitis: an indirect analysis of efficacy, safety and cost. *J Eval Clin Pract*. Jun 2014; 20(3): 225-38. PMID 24444390
9. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Center for Drug Evaluation and Research. Statistical Review: Oralair, April 7, 2014. <https://www.fda.gov/media/88419/download>. Accessed August 12, 2024.
10. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Statistical review: Grastek. 2014; <http://wayback.archive-it.org/7993/20170722072840/https://www.fda.gov/downloads/BiologicsBloodVaccines/Allergens/UCM394338.pdf>. Accessed August 9, 2024.
11. ALK-Abell. Highlights of Prescribing Information: Ragwitek (short ragweed pollen allergen extract). 2022. <https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/drugInfo.cfm?setid=70216cba-11b5-40fd-8656-9f27b24f7b60>. Accessed August 12, 2024.
12. Nolte H, Bernstein DI, Nelson HS, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Ragweed SLIT-Tablet in Children with Allergic Rhinoconjunctivitis in a Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2020; 8(7): 2322-2331.e5. PMID 32304832

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

13. Feng B, Xiang H, Jin H, et al. Efficacy of Sublingual Immunotherapy for House Dust Mite-Induced Allergic Rhinitis: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Allergy Asthma Immunol Res.* May 2017; 9(3): 220-228. PMID 28293928
14. Chen L, Lei L, Cai Y, et al. Specific sublingual immunotherapy in children with perennial rhinitis: a systemic review and meta-analysis. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol.* Apr 23 2020. PMID 32329187
15. Liao W, Hu Q, Shen LL, et al. Sublingual Immunotherapy for Asthmatic Children Sensitized to House Dust Mite: A Meta-Analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore).* Jun 2015; 94(24): e701. PMID 26091451
16. Gendelman SR, Lang DM. Sublingual immunotherapy in the treatment of atopic dermatitis: a systematic review using the GRADE system. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep.* Feb 2015; 15(2): 498. PMID 25504262
17. Bae JM, Choi YY, Park CO, et al. Efficacy of allergen-specific immunotherapy for atopic dermatitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* Jul 2013; 132(1): 110-7. PMID 23647790
18. Kim JY, Jang MJ, Kim DY, et al. Efficacy of Subcutaneous and Sublingual Immunotherapy for House Dust Mite Allergy: A Network Meta-Analysis-Based Comparison. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract.* Dec 2021; 9(12): 4450-4458.e6. PMID 34464748
19. Demoly P, Emminger W, Rehm D, et al. Effective treatment of house dust mite-induced allergic rhinitis with 2 doses of the SQ HDM SLIT-tablet: Results from a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III trial. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* Feb 2016; 137(2): 444-451.e8. PMID 26292778
20. Nolte H, Bernstein DI, Nelson HS, et al. Efficacy of house dust mite sublingual immunotherapy tablet in North American adolescents and adults in a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* Dec 2016; 138(6): 1631-1638. PMID 27521719
21. Odactra. [package insert]. Catalent Pharma Solutions. United Kingdom. Updated February 2025.
22. Gurgel RK, Baroody FM, Damask CC, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline: Immunotherapy for Inhalant Allergy. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Mar 2024; 170 Suppl1(Suppl 1): S1-S42. PMID 38408152
23. Seidman MD, Gurgel RK, Lin SY, et al. Clinical practice guideline: Allergic rhinitis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Feb 2015; 152(1 Suppl): S1-43. PMID 25644617
24. Dykewicz MS, Wallace DV, Amrol DJ, et al. Rhinitis 2020: A practice parameter update. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* Oct 2020; 146(4): 721-767. PMID 32707227
25. Greenhawt M, Oppenheimer J, Nelson M, et al. Sublingual immunotherapy: A focused allergen immunotherapy practice parameter update. *Ann Allergy AsthmaImmunol.* Mar 2017; 118(3): 276-282.e2. PMID 28284533

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Policy History

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

Medical Policy Committee approval

06/16/2010 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. New policy.

05/05/2011 Medical Policy Committee review

05/18/2011 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.

05/03/2012 Medical Policy Committee review

05/16/2012 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.

05/02/2013 Medical Policy Committee review

05/22/2013 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.

05/01/2014 Medical Policy Committee review

05/21/2014 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.

10/02/2014 Medical Policy Committee review

10/15/2014 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Policy coverage and body extensively revised to meet Pharmacy Department requirements.

08/03/2015 Coding update: ICD10 Diagnosis code section added; ICD9 Procedure code section removed.

10/08/2015 Medical Policy Committee review

10/21/2015 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Updated rationale section (systematic reviews, house dust mite specific allergy, food allergy, SLIT vs. SCIT). No coverage changes.

10/06/2016 Medical Policy Committee review

10/19/2016 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.

01/01/2017 Coding update: Removing ICD-9 Diagnosis Codes

10/05/2017 Medical Policy Committee review

10/18/2017 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.

02/01/2018 Medical Policy Committee review

02/21/2018 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Added new FDA approved drug, Odactra, and associated evidence. Also updated information throughout background from Association update.

02/07/2019 Medical Policy Committee review

02/20/2019 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.

02/06/2020 Medical Policy Committee review

02/12/2020 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

02/04/2021	Medical Policy Committee review
02/10/2021	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Updated lower age of Oralair from 10 to 5 years in accordance with the FDA label. Updated background/rationale with the most recent and relevant information.
02/03/2022	Medical Policy Committee review
02/09/2022	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Updated the lower age for Ragwitek from 18 years of age to 5 years of age based on the FDA package insert update.
02/02/2023	Medical Policy Committee review
02/08/2023	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged. Updated literature review through August 2022.
02/01/2024	Medical Policy Committee approval
02/14/2024	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
02/06/2025	Medical Policy Committee review
02/12/2025	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Updated criteria for Odactra to reflect expanded age approval to now include patients 12-65 years of age. Literature review updated through August 2024.
02/05/2026	Medical Policy Committee review
02/11/2026	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Updated criteria for Odactra to reflect expanded age approval to now include patients 5-65 years of age. Literature review updated through August 2025.

Next Scheduled Review Date: 02/2027

*Investigational – A medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational if the effectiveness has not been clearly tested and it has not been incorporated into standard medical practice. Any determination we make that a medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational will be based on a consideration of the following:

- A. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product can be lawfully marketed without approval of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and whether such approval has been granted at the time the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is sought to be furnished; or
- B. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product requires further studies or clinical trials to determine its maximum tolerated dose, toxicity, safety, effectiveness, or effectiveness as compared with the standard means of treatment or diagnosis, must improve health outcomes, according to the consensus of opinion among experts as shown by reliable evidence, including:
 1. Consultation with technology evaluation center(s);
 2. Credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community; or
 3. Reference to federal regulations.

Sublingual Immunotherapy as a Technique of Allergen-Specific Therapy

Policy # 00263

Original Effective Date: 06/16/2010

Current Effective Date: 03/01/2026

****Medically Necessary (or “Medical Necessity”)** - Health care services, treatment, procedures, equipment, drugs, devices, items or supplies that a Provider, exercising prudent clinical judgment, would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury, disease or its symptoms, and that are:

- A. In accordance with nationally accepted standards of medical practice;
- B. Clinically appropriate, in terms of type, frequency, extent, level of care, site and duration, and considered effective for the patient's illness, injury or disease; and
- C. Not primarily for the personal comfort or convenience of the patient, physician or other health care provider, and not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of that patient's illness, injury or disease.

For these purposes, “nationally accepted standards of medical practice” means standards that are based on credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, Physician Specialty Society recommendations and the views of Physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas and any other relevant factors.

‡ Indicated trademarks are the registered trademarks of their respective owners.

NOTICE: If the Patient’s health insurance contract contains language that differs from the BCBSLA Medical Policy definition noted above, the definition in the health insurance contract will be relied upon for specific coverage determinations.

NOTICE: Medical Policies are scientific based opinions, provided solely for coverage and informational purposes. Medical Policies should not be construed to suggest that the Company recommends, advocates, requires, encourages, or discourages any particular treatment, procedure, or service, or any particular course of treatment, procedure, or service.

NOTICE: Federal and State law, as well as contract language, including definitions and specific contract provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage.

NOTICE: If an authorization for an ongoing course of treatment has been provided to a member and the member changes from one health plan to another health plan (e.g., a member moves from carrier A to Louisiana Blue), Louisiana Blue may honor the previous health plan’s authorization for the same service under the same type of in-network benefit for a 90-day transition period. Documentation of the authorization for the ongoing course of treatment from the previous health plan must be provided to us by the member or their provider and the services provided for the course of treatment must otherwise be a covered service under the Louisiana Blue health plan. This provision does not apply to medications covered under the plan’s pharmacy benefit.