



CIGNA MEDICAL COVERAGE POLICY

The following Coverage Policy applies to all plans administered by CIGNA Companies including plans administered by Great-West Healthcare, which is now a part of CIGNA.

Effective Date 6/15/2009
Next Review Date 5/15/2010
Coverage Policy Number 0051

Subject **Bariatric Surgery**

Table of Contents

Coverage Policy	1
General Background	3
Coding/Billing Information	29
References	31
Policy History	31

Hyperlink to Related Coverage Policies

Abdominoplasty and Panniculectomy
 Gastric Pacing/Gastric Electrical Stimulation (GES)
 Nutritional Counseling
 Obstructive Sleep Apnea Diagnosis and Treatment Services
 Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

Coverage Policies are intended to provide guidance in interpreting certain **standard** CIGNA HealthCare benefit plans as well as benefit plans formerly administered by Great-West Healthcare. Please note, the terms of a participant's particular benefit plan document [Group Service Agreement (GSA), Evidence of Coverage, Certificate of Coverage, Summary Plan Description (SPD) or similar plan document] may differ significantly from the standard benefit plans upon which these Coverage Policies are based. For example, a participant's benefit plan document may contain a specific exclusion related to a topic addressed in a Coverage Policy. In the event of a conflict, a participant's benefit plan document **always supercedes** the information in the Coverage Policies. In the absence of a controlling federal or state coverage mandate, benefits are ultimately determined by the terms of the applicable benefit plan document. Coverage determinations in each specific instance require consideration of 1) the terms of the applicable group benefit plan document in effect on the date of service; 2) any applicable laws/regulations; 3) any relevant collateral source materials including Coverage Policies and; 4) the specific facts of the particular situation. Coverage Policies relate exclusively to the administration of health benefit plans. Coverage Policies are not recommendations for treatment and should never be used as treatment guidelines. Proprietary information of CIGNA. Copyright ©2009 CIGNA

Coverage Policy

Bariatric surgery is specifically excluded under many benefit plans and may be governed by state and/or federal mandates. Please refer to the applicable benefit plan document to determine benefit availability and the terms and conditions of coverage.

Unless excluded from the benefit plan, this service is covered when the following medical necessity criteria are met.

CIGNA covers bariatric surgery using a covered procedure outlined below as medically necessary when ALL of the following criteria are met:

- The individual is ≥ 18 years of age or has reached full expected skeletal growth **AND** has evidence of **EITHER** of the following:
 - a BMI (Body Mass Index) ≥ 40
 - a BMI (Body Mass Index) 35–39.9 with at least one clinically significant comorbidity, including but not limited to, cardiovascular disease, Type 2 diabetes, hypertension, coronary artery disease, or pulmonary hypertension
- Failure of medical management including evidence of active participation within the last two years in a weight-management program that is supervised either by a physician or a registered dietician for a

minimum of six months without significant gaps. The weight-management program must include monthly documentation of **ALL** of the following components:

- weight
- current dietary program
- physical activity (e.g., exercise program)

Programs such as Weight Watchers[®], Jenny Craig[®] and Optifast[®] are acceptable alternatives if done in conjunction with the supervision of a physician or registered dietician and detailed documentation of participation is available for review. For individuals with long-standing, morbid obesity, participation in a program within the last five years is sufficient if reasonable attendance in the weight-management program over an extended period of time of at least six months can be demonstrated. However, physician-supervised programs consisting exclusively of pharmacological management are not sufficient to meet this requirement.

- A thorough multidisciplinary evaluation within the previous 12 months which includes the following:
 - an evaluation by a bariatric surgeon recommending surgical treatment, including a description of the proposed procedure(s) and all of the associated current CPT codes
 - a separate medical evaluation from a physician other than the surgeon recommending surgery, that includes a medical clearance for bariatric surgery
 - unequivocal clearance for bariatric surgery by a mental health provider
 - a nutritional evaluation by a physician or registered dietician

Bariatric Surgery Procedures:

When the specific medical necessity criteria noted above for bariatric surgery have been met, CIGNA covers ANY of the following open or laparoscopic bariatric surgery procedures:

- Roux-en-Y gastric bypass
- laparoscopic adjustable silicone gastric banding (e.g., LAP-BAND®, REALIZE™)
- biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch (BPD/DS) for individuals with a BMI (Body Mass Index) > 50
- vertical banded gastroplasty

CIGNA covers adjustment of a silicone gastric banding as medically necessary to control the rate of weight loss and/or treat symptoms secondary to gastric restriction following a medically necessary adjustable silicone gastric banding procedure.

CIGNA does not cover the following bariatric surgery procedures, because each is considered experimental, investigational or unproven (this list may not be all-inclusive):

- Roux-en-Y gastric bypass combined with simultaneous gastric banding
- biliopancreatic diversion (BPD) without duodenal switch (DS)
- Fobi-Pouch (limiting proximal gastric pouch)
- gastric electrical stimulation (GES) or gastric pacing (e.g., Enterra™ Therapy)
- gastroplasty (stomach stapling)
- intestinal bypass (jejunoileal bypass)
- intragastric balloon
- loop gastric bypass
- mini-gastric bypass
- Natural Orifice Transluminal Endoscopic Surgery™ (NOTES™) (e.g., StomaphyX™)/endoscopic oral-assisted procedures
- sleeve gastrectomy (SG) — including CPT code 43843 (gastric restrictive procedure, without gastric bypass for morbid obesity other than vertical banded gastroplasty)
- vagus nerve blocking
- vagus nerve stimulation

Reoperation and Repeat Bariatric Surgery:

CIGNA covers surgical reversal (i.e., takedown) of bariatric surgery as medically necessary when the individual develops complications from the original surgery such as stricture or obstruction.

CIGNA covers revision of a previous bariatric surgical procedure or conversion to another medically necessary procedure due to inadequate weight loss as medically necessary when ALL of the following are met:

- Coverage for bariatric surgery is available under the individual's current health benefit plan.
- There is evidence of full compliance with the previously prescribed postoperative dietary and exercise program.
- Due to a technical failure of the original bariatric surgical procedure (e.g., pouch dilatation) documented on either upper gastrointestinal (UGI) series or esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD), the individual has failed to achieve adequate weight loss, which is defined as failure to lose at least 50% of excess body weight or failure to achieve body weight to within 30% of ideal body weight at least two years following the original surgery.
- The requested procedure is a regularly covered bariatric surgery (see above for specific procedures).

NOTE: Inadequate weight loss due to individual noncompliance with postoperative nutrition and exercise recommendations is not a medically necessary indication for revision or conversion surgery and is not covered by CIGNA.

Cholecystectomy, Liver Biopsy, Upper Endoscopy, or Prophylactic Vena Cava Filter Placement:

CIGNA covers prophylactic vena cava filter placement at the time of bariatric surgery as medically necessary for individuals who are considered to be high risk for venous thromboembolism (VTE) due to a history of ANY of the following conditions:

- deep vein thrombosis (DVT)
- hypercoagulable state
- increased right-sided heart pressures
- pulmonary embolus (PE)

CIGNA does not cover ANY of the following performed in conjunction with a bariatric surgery because each is considered not medically necessary:

- cholecystectomy in the absence of signs or symptoms of gallbladder disease
- liver biopsy in the absence of signs or symptoms of liver disease (e.g., elevated liver enzymes, enlarged liver)
- routine vena cava filter placement for individuals not at high risk for venous thromboembolism (VTE)

CIGNA considers upper gastrointestinal endoscopy performed in conjunction with a bariatric surgery procedure to confirm a surgical anastomosis or to establish anatomical landmarks to be an integral part of the more comprehensive surgical procedure and not separately reimbursable.

General Background

Obesity and overweight are defined clinically using the body mass index (BMI). BMI is an objective measurement and is currently considered the most reproducible measurement of total body fat. In adults, excess body weight (EBW) is defined as having a BMI ≥ 25 kg/m² (World Health Organization [WHO], 2000).

The National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI) (1998) defines the following classifications based on BMI. The NHLBI recommends that the BMI should be used to classify overweight and obesity and to estimate relative risk for disease compared to normal weight:

Classification	BMI
Underweight	< 18.5 kg/m ²
Normal weight	18.5–24.9 kg/m ²
Overweight	25–29.9 kg/m ²
Obesity (Class 1)	30–34.9 kg/m ²
Obesity (Class 2)	35–39.9 kg/m ²
Extreme Obesity (Class 3)	≥ 40 kg/m ²

BMI is a direct calculation based on height and weight, regardless of gender:

$$\text{BMI} = \frac{\text{weight (kg)}}{\text{height (m}^2\text{)}} \text{ OR } \left[\frac{\text{weight (lb)}}{\text{height (in)}^2} \right] \times 703$$

Clinically severe or morbid obesity is defined as a BMI greater than or equal to 40 or a BMI 35–39.9 with comorbid conditions. Comorbidities of morbid obesity that need to be considered include any of the following:

- mechanical arthropathy (weight-related degenerative joint disease)
- type 2 diabetes
- clinically unmanageable hypertension (systolic blood pressure at least 140 mm Hg or diastolic blood pressure 90 mm Hg or greater, or if individual is taking antihypertensive agents)
- hyperlipidemia
- coronary artery disease
- lower extremity lymphatic or venous obstruction
- severe obstructive sleep apnea
- obesity-related pulmonary hypertension

Another group of individuals who have been identified are the super-obese. Super-obesity has recently been defined in the literature as a BMI greater than 50.

Treatment of obesity is generally described as a two-part process:

1. assessment, including BMI measurement and risk factor identification; and
2. treatment/management

Obesity management includes primary weight loss, prevention of weight regain and the management of associated risk. During the assessment phase, the individual needs to be prepared for the comprehensive nature of the program, including realistic timelines and goals.

Goals for Weight Loss

According to the NHLBI Clinical Guidelines on the Identification, Evaluation, and Treatment of Overweight and Obesity in Adults (1998), the initial goal of weight-loss therapy should be to reduce body weight by approximately 10% from baseline. With success, further weight loss can be attempted, if indicated, through additional assessment. The NHLBI guidelines further state that, optimally, dietary therapy should last at least six months. The rationale for this initial goal is that even moderate weight loss (i.e., 10% of initial body weight) can significantly decrease the severity of obesity-associated risk factors. It can also set the stage for further weight loss, if indicated. Other interventions in obesity management include exercise/physical activity, behavior modification/therapy, pharmacotherapy and, in select individuals, bariatric surgery.

Strategies for Weight Loss

General recommendations for an overall weight-loss strategy include the following (Gorroll and Mulley, 2009):

- For overweight or obese patients not ready to lose weight, the best approach is to educate them about health risks, address other cardiovascular risk factors, and encourage the maintenance of their current weight.
- For motivated persons who are overweight (BMI 25 to 29.9 kg/m²) and have two or more obesity-related medical conditions or are frankly obese (BMI >30 kg/m²), a six-month goal of a 10% weight loss can be set (1 to 2 lb/wk) and a program of diet, exercise, and behavioral therapy prescribed. If, after six months, the target weight is not achieved, one can consider adding pharmacologic therapy for those at greatest risk (BMI >27 kg/m² plus two or more cardiovascular risk factors, or BMI >30 kg/m²).
- For markedly obese persons at greatest risk (BMI >35 kg/m² with two or more obesity-related medical conditions or BMI >40 kg/m²), consider a surgical approach if serious and repeated attempts using the foregoing measures have been unsuccessful.

The NHLBI guidelines (1998) make the following recommendations regarding nonsurgical strategies for achieving weight loss and weight maintenance:

- Dietary Therapy:
 - Low-calorie diets are recommended for weight loss in overweight and obese persons. Reducing fat as part of a low-calorie diet is a practical way to reduce calories.
 - Optimally, dietary therapy should last at least six months, as many studies suggest that the rate of weight loss decreases after about six months. Shorter periods of dietary therapy typically result in lesser weight reductions.
 - The literature suggests that weight-loss and weight-maintenance therapies that provide a greater frequency of contacts between the individual and the practitioner and are provided over the long term should be put in place. This can lead to more successful weight loss and weight maintenance.
- Increased Physical Activity/Exercise is recommended as part of a comprehensive, weight-loss therapy and weight-maintenance program because it:
 - modestly contributes to weight loss in overweight and obese adults
 - may decrease abdominal fat
 - increases cardiorespiratory fitness
 - may help with maintenance of weight loss
- Combined Therapy: The combination of a reduced-calorie diet and increased physical activity is recommended, since it produces weight loss, decreases abdominal fat and increases cardiorespiratory fitness.
- Behavior Therapy: Is a useful adjunct when incorporated into treatment for weight loss and weight maintenance.

In addition, the NHLBI recommends that weight-loss drugs approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) only be used as part of a comprehensive weight-loss program, including diet and physical activity for individuals with a BMI greater than or equal to 30 with no concomitant obesity-related risk factors or diseases, or for individuals with a BMI greater than or equal to 27 with concomitant obesity-related risk factors or diseases.

Clinical supervision is an essential component of dietary management. According to the NHLBI, "frequent clinical encounters during the initial six months of weight reduction appear to facilitate reaching the goals of therapy. During the period of active weight loss, regular visits of at least once per month and preferably more often with a health professional for the purposes of reinforcement, encouragement, and monitoring will facilitate weight reduction" (NHLBI, 1998). Physicians can also provide clinical oversight and monitoring of what are often complex comorbid conditions and can select the optimal and most medically appropriate weight management, nutritional and exercise strategies. Some commercially available diet programs do not consistently provide counselors who are trained and certified as registered dietitians or with other equivalent clinical training. However, diet programs/plans, such as Weight Watchers[®], Jenny Craig[®] or similar plans are acceptable methods of dietary management if there is concurrent documentation of at least monthly clinical encounters with a physician.

Surgical Intervention

The NHLBI recommends weight-loss surgery as an option for carefully-selected adult patients with clinically severe obesity (BMI of 40 or greater; or BMI of 35 or greater with serious comorbid conditions) when less-invasive methods of weight loss have failed and the patient is at high risk for obesity-associated morbidity or mortality. Bariatric surgery in patients under 18 years of age or in those who have not reached full expected skeletal growth has not been well-studied; therefore, its safety and efficacy have not yet been established in this population. Surgical therapy for morbid obesity is not only effective in producing weight loss but is also effective in improving several significant complications of obesity, including diabetes, hypertension, dyslipidemia, and sleep apnea. The degree of benefit and the rates of morbidity and mortality of the various surgical procedures vary according to the procedure (Bouldin, et al., 2006). Bariatric surgery is not considered a first-line treatment. Even the most severely obese individuals (i.e., super-obese with BMI over 50) can be helped by a preoperative weight loss through a program of reduced-calorie diet and exercise therapy.

A study by Jamal et al. (2006) compared outcomes of gastric bypass patients undergoing a mandatory 13 weeks of preoperative dietary counseling (n=72) to a group of patients without this requirement (n=252). The PDC group had a higher incidence of obstructive sleep apnea compared to the no-preoperative dietary counseling group (p< 0.04). The two groups had similar incidences of obesity-related comorbidities. The dropout rate prior to surgery was reported to be 50% higher in the PDC group than in the no-preoperative dietary counseling group (p<0.05). The no-preoperative dietary counseling patients had a statistically greater percentage of excess weight loss (p<0.0001), lower BMI (p<0.015), and lower body weight (p<0.01) at one-year follow-up. Resolution of major comorbidities, complication rates, 30-day postoperative mortality, and postoperative compliance with follow-up were similar in the two groups (Jamal, et al., 2006). Limitations to this study include its lack of randomization and the relatively short-term follow-up of one year which may not have been long enough to demonstrate differences in outcomes.

Ali et al. (2007) reported on a series of 351 patients who had undergone LRYGB. The investigators hypothesized that weight loss prior to laparoscopic Roux-en-y gastric bypass is feasible, would not decrease the expected postoperative weight loss, and might enhance overall weight loss and maintenance. Patients were divided into four groups depending on the percentage of body weight loss achieved before surgery: group 1, none or gain; group 2, <5%; group 3, 5-10%; and group 4, >10%. Data were collected regarding the demographics, body mass index (BMI) change, and excess weight loss. The maximum follow-up was 36 months. Of the 351 patients enrolled in the study, follow-up data was available for 302 at six months, 246 at 12 months, 167 at 24 months and 71 at 36 months. Groups 3 and 4 had significantly greater initial excess weight and BMI (p<0.05) but these became similar after the preoperative weight loss. Most patients (74%) were able to lose weight before surgery, with 36% losing >5% body weight. Patients who lost weight preoperatively demonstrated more excess weight loss and BMI change from baseline that reached statistical significance at several points during follow-up (p<0.05). This study is limited by its retrospective design and loss to follow-up.

Alami et al. (2007) performed a prospective randomized trial to determine whether preoperative weight loss results in better outcomes after laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. A total of 61 patients undergoing laparoscopic gastric bypass surgery were assigned preoperatively to either a weight loss group (n=26) with a 10% weight loss requirement or a group that had no weight loss requirements (n=35). The two groups were identical in terms of initial weight, BMI, and incidence of comorbidities. Perioperative complications, operative time, postoperative weight loss, and resolution of co-morbidities were analyzed. Of the 61 patients, data was available for 12 at one-year follow-up. Preoperative weight loss before laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass was found to be associated with a decrease in the operating room time (p=0.0084) and an improved percentage of excess weight loss in the short term (p=0.0267). Complication rates were similar in both groups. Preoperative weight loss was also not shown to have a statistically significant impact on the resolution of comorbidities. Study limitations include small sample size and loss to follow-up.

Harnisch et al (2008) performed a retrospective analysis of 1629 consecutive patients undergoing laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass and compared patients with a preoperative weight gain (n=115) to those with a preoperative loss (n=88) of ≥ 10 lbs. No difference was found in the % excess weight loss at 12 months. If the %EWL was calculated using the initial program-entry weight, the preoperative weight loss was found to have a transient postoperative weight loss advantage; however, this did not persist beyond 24 months postoperatively. At 12 and 24 months of follow-up there was no significant difference in the resolution rates of diabetes,

hypertension, and continuous positive airway pressure discontinuation. No differences in perioperative complications or conversion rates were detected.

Solomon and colleagues (2008) conducted a prospective randomized trial of 100 patients planning to have gastric bypass. A total of 61 patients eventually underwent laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (LRYGB) after being randomized to either the nonweight-loss group (n=35) or the weight-loss group (n=26). Patients who were randomized to the weight-loss group were requested to lose 10% or more of their excess body weight before undergoing LRYGB. They were encouraged to follow any of their previous diet plans with good results for the required preoperative weight loss. One-year follow-up data were available for 26 patients in the weight-loss group and 18 in the nonweight-loss group. The patients in the weight-loss group had a better weight loss profile in all categories, however there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups when patient weight, BMI, amount of excess weight-loss, change in BMI, and resolution of comorbidities were compared. The data were then re-analyzed in terms of patients who had lost a minimum of 5% of their excess weight preoperatively (> 5% excess weight loss [EWL]; n=19) compared with those who had lost < 5% or no weight at all (< 5% EWL; n=26). The preoperative BMI was lower for the < 5% EWL group (p=0.01) as a result of an average excess weight loss of 17.1%. At one-year follow-up, the < 5% EWL group had a markedly lower weight and BMI and higher percentage of BMI change and excess body weight loss. There was still no significant difference found between the two groups in the resolution of comorbidities.

The role of preoperative weight loss remains controversial. However, some bariatric surgeons and centers have advocated for preoperative weight loss, as it is believed that patients who are able to achieve this weight loss are most likely to have successful outcomes after surgery. The benefits of a preoperative weight-loss program include all of the following:

- identification of those individuals who will be committed to and compliant with the short-term, long-term and lifelong medical management follow-up, behavioral changes, lifestyle changes, and diet and physical exercise regimen required to ensure the long-term success of this surgery
- reduction of operative morbidity and surgical risk
- improvement in surgical access with weight loss
- reduction of the severity of obesity-associated risk factors, such as blood pressure, glucose intolerance, cardiorespiratory function and pulmonary function

According to the guidelines for bariatric surgery from the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists (AACE), The Obesity Society (TOS), and the American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery (ASMBS), all patients seeking bariatric surgery should have a comprehensive preoperative evaluation. This assessment is to include an obesity-focused history, physical examination, and pertinent laboratory and diagnostic testing. A detailed weight history should be documented, including a description of the onset and duration of obesity, the severity, and recent trends in weight. Causative factors to note include a family history of obesity, use of weight-gaining medications, and dietary and physical activity patterns. A brief summary of personal weight loss attempts, commercial plans, and physician-supervised programs should be reviewed and documented, along with the greatest duration of weight loss and maintenance. This information is useful in substantiating that the patient has made reasonable attempts to control weight before considering obesity surgery. The guidelines state that preoperative weight loss should be considered for patients in whom reduced liver volume can improve the technical aspects of surgery (Mechanick, et al., 2008).

Access to a multidisciplinary team approach, involving a physician with a special interest in obesity; a surgeon with extensive experience in bariatric procedures, a dietitian or nutritionist; and a psychologist, psychiatrist or licensed mental health care provider interested in behavior modification and eating disorders, is optimal. A mental health evaluation should specifically address any mental health or substance abuse diagnoses, the emotional readiness and ability of the patient to make and sustain lifestyle changes, and the adequacy of their support system. Realistic expectations about the degree of weight loss, the compromises required by the patient and the positive effect on associated weight-related comorbidities and quality of life should be discussed and contrasted with the potential morbidity and operative mortality of bariatric surgery.

With current state-of-the-art bariatric surgery procedures, patients lose an average of 50–60% of excess body weight and have a decrease in BMI of about 10kg/m² during the first 12–24 postoperative months. Most long-

term studies show a tendency for a modest weight gain (5–7 kg) after the initial postoperative years; long-term maintenance of an overall mean weight loss of about 50% of excess body weight can be expected.

Types of Bariatric Surgery

Bariatric surgery for morbid obesity involves reducing the size of the gastric reservoir, contributing to the establishment of an energy deficit by restricting caloric intake. The goal of bariatric surgery is to induce and maintain permanent loss of at least half of the preoperative, excess body weight. This amount of weight loss should bring the patient to a weight at which many or most weight-related comorbidities are reverted or markedly ameliorated. The NHLBI report (1998) has recognized two types of operations that have proven to be effective: restrictive procedures that limit gastric volume and malabsorptive procedures which in addition to limiting food intake also alter digestion.

Gastroplasty: Gastroplasty, also referred to as stomach stapling, is the prototypical restrictive procedure. A simple gastroplasty involves the stapling of the upper portion of the stomach horizontally. A small opening is left for food to pass through to the lower portion. The outlet of the pouch is restricted by a band, which slows emptying, allowing the person to feel full after only a few bites of food. It has been reported in the literature that those who have undergone this procedure seldom experience any satisfaction from eating, and tend to eat more, causing vomiting and tearing of the staple line. The available literature also reports that horizontal stapling alone has led to poor long-term weight loss. Because many simple gastroplasty patients have eventually required some type of revision operation in order to achieve successful weight loss, this procedure has largely been abandoned.

Vertical Banded Gastroplasty (VBG): This restrictive procedure uses both a band and staples to create a small stomach pouch. The pouch limits the amount of food that can be eaten at one time and slows passage of the food into the remainder of the stomach and gastrointestinal tract. VBG may be performed using an open or laparoscopic approach. Complications of VBG include esophageal reflux, leaking or rupture along the staple line, stretching of the stomach pouch from overeating.

VBG Literature Review: Morino et al. (2003) conducted a prospective RCT to compare laparoscopic adjustable silicone gastric banding (LASGB) to laparoscopic vertical banded gastroplasty (LVBG) in 100 morbidly obese patients. Patients with a BMI range of 40–50 kg/m², without compulsive eating, were randomized to either LASGB (n=49) or LVBG (n=51). The minimum follow-up was two years (mean 33.1 months). The mean operative time was significantly longer for LVBG than for LASGB ($p < 0.05$). Early morbidity rate was lower for LASGB patients (6.1%) than for LVBG patients (9.8%) ($p = 0.754$). The late complication rate in the LVBG group was 14% and 32.7% in LASGB group ($p < 0.05$), with the most frequent complication being band slippage (18%). The late reoperation rate was 24.5% (12 of 49) in the LASGB group and 0% in LVBG group ($p < 0.001$). There were no deaths or conversions in either group. The excess weight loss at two and three years for patients who underwent LVBG was 63.5% and 58.9%, respectively. At the same follow-up interval, the mean BMI for these patients was 29.7 kg/m² and 30.7 kg/m², respectively. Patients who received LASGB had a 41.4% excess weight loss with a BMI of 34.8 kg/m² at two years and 39% excess weight loss with a BMI of 35.7 kg/m² at three years.

Lee et al. (2004) conducted a prospective randomized controlled trial of 80 patients with morbid obesity (mean BMI 43.2 kg/m², range 36–59.8) who were assigned to undergo either laparoscopic vertical banded gastroplasty (LVBG) or laparoscopic gastric bypass (LGBP). Changes in quality of life were assessed using the Gastro-Intestinal Quality of Life Index (GIQLI). Surgical time was significantly longer for LGBP ($p < 0.001$). The early complication rate was higher in the LGBP group (17.8% versus 2.5%, $p < 0.001$). Major complications that occurred in the LGBP group included anastomotic leakage (n=2) and abdominal abscess (n=1). Late complications such as upper gastrointestinal bleeding, anastomotic stenosis and reflux esophagitis were observed in four LGBP patients (10%) and two LVBG patients (5%). The conversion rate was 0% for LVBG and 2.5% (1/40) for LGBP. At a mean follow-up of 20 months, BMI decreased significantly in both groups, with significant improvement of obesity-related co-morbidities. Excess weight loss was 62.9% at one year and 71.4% at two years for LGBP patients versus 55.4% at one year and 53.1% at two years for LVBG patients. BMI was also lower for LGBP patients than LVBG patients (29.6 versus 31.1 at one year; 28.5 versus 31.9 at two years). Preoperative Gastro-Intestinal Quality of Life scores were similar between the groups, but at one year, LGBP patients had better GIQLI scores than LVBG patients ($p < 0.01$).

Olbers et al. (2005) conducted a randomized controlled trial of 83 patients who underwent laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (LRYGB) (n=37) and laparoscopic vertical banded gastroplasty (LVBG) (n=46). Patients were followed for two years after surgery with regard to weight change and the need for remedial surgery. There were no conversions to open surgery. The mean operating time was longer for LRYGB than LVGB (138 versus 105 minutes). Early reoperations were performed in five LRYGB patients due to hemorrhage (n=3), ileus (n=1) and suspected leak (n=1) and one LVGB patient because of a suspected leak. There were no differences in postoperative respiratory function or mobilization. Weight reduction was greater after LRYGB at both one-year (p=0.009) and two-year (p<0.001) follow-up. Conversion to RYGB was required in eight LVGB patients. No remedial surgical intervention was required for the LRYGB group).

Nocca et al. (2007) conducted a multicenter prospective study (n=200) to assess the efficacy of LVGB in terms of weight loss and complication rates for morbidly obese patients who had indications for a restrictive procedure. The mean BMI of these patients was 43.2 kg/m². The median follow-up period was 30 months (range, 1–72 months). Gastric perforation occurred in one case requiring conversion to open surgery. There was one death secondary to peritonitis of unknown etiology. The morbidity rate was 24% and included the following complications: gastric outlet stenosis (8%); staple line leak (2.5%); food trapping (1.5%); peritonitis (1%); thrombophlebitis (1.5%); pulmonary embolism (0.5%); and gastroesophageal reflux (9%). The excess weight loss (EWL) achieved was 56.7% at one year, 68.3% at two years, and 65.1% at three years.

In a prospective nonrandomized comparative trial, Miller et al. (2007) reported long term outcomes of 563 vertical banded gastroplasty (VBG) and 554 AGB procedures performed by two surgeons. The mean BMI was 46.9 +/- 09.9 kg/m² for VBG patients and 46.7 +/- 07.8 kg/m² for AGB patients. VBG was performed by laparotomy and AGB using laparoscopy. The Bariatric Analysis and Reporting Outcome System (BAROS) was used to evaluate postoperative health status and quality of life. The mean duration of follow-up was 92 months (range 60-134), with a minimum of 5 years. The overall follow-up rate was 92%. The 30-day mortality rate was 0.4% for VBG and 0.2% for AGB. The overall reintervention rate in the long term was 49.7% for VBG and 8.6% for AGB (p<0.0001). The reoperation rate was 39.9% for VBG and 7.5% for AGB (p<0.0001). The excess weight loss was significantly greater in the VBG group (58%) than the AGB group (42%) after 12 months (p<0.05). At 92-month follow-up, no significant difference in weight loss was found between the two study groups (59% for VBG and 62% for AGB, p=0.923). The BAROS score was significantly in favor of the AGB group (p<0.0001). The overall resolution rate of co-morbidities was 80% in both groups.

Although reoperation rates have been reported to be higher for VBG, the available evidence suggests that substantial weight loss can be achieved with this restrictive procedure. VBG has been largely replaced by adjustable silicone gastric banding however, and is now rarely performed (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services [CMS], 2006).

Gastric Banding: In this restrictive procedure, a band made of special material (e.g., silicone, polypropylene mesh, Dacron vascular graft) is placed around the stomach near its upper end, creating a small pouch and a narrow passage into the larger remainder of the stomach. Adjustable gastric banding refers to bands in which the pressure can be changed without an invasive procedure. The open approach to gastric banding is considered obsolete in practice and has largely been replaced by laparoscopic techniques.

Laparoscopic Adjustable Silicone Gastric Banding (LASGB): LASGB is a minimally invasive gastric restrictive procedure that involves the wrapping of a saline-filled band around an area of the stomach with the goal of limiting food consumption. The adjustable band can be inflated or deflated percutaneously via an access port (reservoir) attached to the band by connection tubing, based on weight changes. The access port is placed in or on the rectus muscle, allowing for noninvasive band adjustment. This adjustment process helps determine the rate of weight loss and is an essential part of LASGB therapy. Appropriate adjustments, made up to six times annually, are critical for successful outcomes (Buchwald, 2005). Currently, adjustable gastric banding devices approved for marketing in the U.S. include the Bioenterics® LAP-BAND® Adjustable Gastric Banding (LAGB®) System (INAMED Health, Santa Barbara, CA), and the REALIZE™ Adjustable Gastric Band (Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc., Cincinnati, OH).

LAP-BAND: The LAP-BAND received premarket approval (PMA) from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in June 2001. The FDA- approval letter states that the LAP-BAND is indicated for use in weight reduction for severely obese patients with a BMI of at least 40; with a BMI of at least 35 with one or more severe comorbid conditions; or who are 100 lbs. or more over their estimated ideal weight according to the 1983 Metropolitan Life

Insurance Tables. The letter further states that the device is indicated for use only in severely obese patients who have failed more conservative weight reduction alternatives, such as supervised diet, exercise and behavior modification programs (FDA, 2001).

According to patient information provided by the manufacturer of the LAP-BAND, when the band is initially placed, it is usually left empty or only slightly inflated to allow time for adjustment to the device and healing. The first band adjustment is typically done approximately four to six weeks after the initial placement. There is no set schedule for adjustments, as the surgeon decides when it is appropriate to adjust the band based on weight loss, amount of food the individual can eat, exercise and amount of fluid currently in the band. Adjustments can be done either in the hospital or in a doctor's office. Fluoroscopy may be used to assist in locating the access port, or to guide the needle into the port. It is also used after the band has been adjusted to evaluate the pouch size and stoma size. During each adjustment, a very small amount of saline will be added to or removed from the band. The exact amount of fluid required to make the stoma the right size is unique for each person. More than one adjustment may be needed to achieve an ideal fill that will result in gradual weight loss. If a band is too loose, this may cause a patient to feel hungry or dissatisfied with small meals. A band that is too tight may result in dysphagia, regurgitation or maladaptive eating.

REALIZE: The REALIZE Adjustable Gastric Band received a PMA from the U.S. FDA in September 2007. The Band has been registered and marketed in Europe since 1996 and became available to other countries excluding the U.S. in 2004. Similar to the LAP-BAND, the REALIZE is indicated for weight reduction in morbidly obese patients with a BMI of at least 40 or a BMI of at least 35 combined with one or more comorbid conditions. The Band is also indicated for use only in morbidly obese adult patients who have failed more conservative weight-reduction alternatives such as supervised diet, exercise and behavior modification programs. The Band comes in one size and the fit is customized by increasing or decreasing the amount of saline in the balloon. The balloon is designed to hold up to nine milliliters of saline. Contraindications for the Band are also similar to those of the LAP-BAND and include inflammatory diseases of the gastrointestinal tract, severe cardiopulmonary disease, portal hypertension, and cirrhosis of the liver.

The clinical data submitted to the FDA as part of the FDA-approval process for The Band are from a prospective, multicenter, single-arm trial (n=276) in which each patient served as his or her own control. At three years post-implantation the % excess weight loss (EWL) in the 228 patients who completed the study was 42% with 77% of patients having at least a 25% EWL. A statistically significant decrease from baseline was seen in glycosylated hemoglobin, total cholesterol, LDL cholesterol and triglyceride levels at three-year follow-up. A statistically significant increase in HDL cholesterol levels was also found. Adverse events included injection port site pain (6%), port disconnection (4.3%), pouch dilatation (3.6%), esophageal dilatation (3.3%), and band slippage (3.3%). A total of 43 patients re-operations such as port revisions (n=22), band revisions (n=10), and port replacements (n=5). As part of the U.S. FDA PMA-approval, the manufacturer is required to conduct a post-approval study to evaluate the longer-term safety and effectiveness of the device five years post-implantation.

LASGB Literature Review: Evidence in the published, peer-reviewed scientific literature suggests that laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding is a safe and effective surgical treatment option for patients with morbid obesity. Although a large number of studies have reported on the effectiveness of this technique, available evidence supporting the use of adjustable gastric banding is primarily in the form of retrospective and prospective case series. Numerous case series have been published, with several studies including over 500 patients each. A limited number of randomized trials have been published, with few studies comparing adjustable gastric banding with established surgical approaches, such as gastric bypass. Well-designed comparative clinical trials comparing adjustable banding with established bariatric surgical procedures are limited. While a number of these studies and case series report a substantial weight loss following laparoscopic banding, the percentage of excess weight loss (EWL) after one year appears to be less than the percentage of EWL associated with gastric bypass procedures (O'Brien, et al., 2003; BCBSA, 2003). Reported success rates and results have been variable across studies.

Several earlier studies report high failure and complication rates associated with the banding procedure. Reported complications include both operative complications (splenic or esophageal injury) and late complications (band slippage, gastric erosion of the band, dilatation, reservoir deflation/leak, persistent vomiting, long-term failure to lose weight and gastric reflux) (Gustavsson, et al., 2002; Victorzon and Tolonen, 2001; Holeczy, et al., 2001). Jan et al. (2005) studied a consecutive series of patients who underwent either laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (LRYGB) or laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (LAGB) over a

three-year period by a single surgeon. The authors reported that the LAGB group had shorter operative times, less blood loss and shorter hospital stays as compared to the LRYGB group. The incidence of minor and major complications was reported to be similar in the two groups, with the morbidity after LRYGB potentially greater and the reoperation rate greater in the LAGB group. Early weight loss was greater in the bypass group; however, it was noted that the difference appeared to diminish over time (Jan, et al., 2005).

More recently, Angrisani et al. (2007) performed a prospective, randomized comparison (n= 51) of LAGB with the LAP-BAND system and LRYGB. The mean BMI was 43.4 for patients who underwent LAGB (n=27), and 43.4 for those who had LRYGB. Outcome measures included operative time, complications, reoperations with hospital stay, weight, BMI, percentage of excess weight loss, and co-morbidities. Failure was considered a BMI >35 at five years postoperatively. One patient in the LAGB group was lost to follow-up. There was a statistically significant difference between the two groups in mean operative time (p<0.001). Conversion to laparotomy was performed in one of 24 LRYGB patients (4.2%) because of a posterior leak of the gastrojejunal anastomosis. Reoperations were required in four of 26 LAGB patients (15.2%) due to gastric pouch dilation (n=2) and unsatisfactory weight loss (n=2). Reoperations were needed for three of the 24 LRYGB patients (12.5%) because of early complications. At five-year follow-up, the LRYGB patients had significantly lower weight and BMI and a greater percentage of excess weight loss than those in the LAGB group (p<0.001). Weight loss failure was observed in nine of 26 LAGB patients and in one of 24 LRYGB patients (p<0.001). These study results suggest that LRYGB results in a higher percentage of weight loss compared to LAGB.

While short-term complication rates have been low relative to those for other procedures, such as gastric bypass, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the incidence of long-term adverse events due to the lack of available data. Data supporting the use of laparoscopic gastric banding comes primarily from a large number of clinical series. There is evidence to suggest that laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding is safe and effective and may be a surgical option for those obese individuals with a BMI of less than 50 who are not candidates for Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (Chapman, et al., 2004).

Gastric Bypass: Gastric bypass procedures combine the creation of a small stomach pouch to restrict food intake and construction of a bypass of the duodenum and other segments of the small intestine to produce malabsorption. The Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB) is the most commonly performed gastric bypass procedure. A small stomach pouch is created by stapling or by vertical banding to restrict food intake. Next, a Y-shaped section of the small intestine consisting of two limbs and a common channel is attached to the pouch to allow food to bypass the duodenum and jejunum. This causes reduced calorie and nutrient absorption. The degree of intended malabsorption is determined by the length of the Roux limb or common channel and varies as follows: standard (short-limb), 40 cm; long-limb, 75 cm; and very long-limb, 150 cm. Complications of the RYGB include anastomotic leaking and strictures, nutritional deficiencies, and the dumping syndrome. The dumping syndrome occurs when a large amount of undigested food passes rapidly from the stomach into the small intestine and is characterized by abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting and weakness.

RYGB can be performed via open and laparoscopic approaches. A systematic review of the scientific literature on open and laparoscopic surgery for morbid obesity (Gentileschi, et al., 2002) concluded that laparoscopic Roux-en-Y is as safe as open RYGB. The overall body of evidence indicates that, in general, laparoscopic RYGB has been shown to achieve significant sustained weight loss with resolution of obesity-related comorbidities (Jan, et al., 2005; Schauer, et al., 2000; DeMaria, et al., 2002; Wittgrove and Clark, 2000). Evidence suggests that weight-loss outcomes are comparable to open gastric bypass at one year (BCBSA, 2003). In comparative trials, RYGB has been reported to be associated with substantially greater weight loss and reduction of comorbidities following surgery. It continues to be the surgical treatment of choice for morbid obesity (Weber, et al., 2004; BCBSA, 2003; Lee, et al., 2004).

Roux-en-Y Gastric Bypass Combined with Gastric Banding: The combination of RYGB with a banding procedure is being investigated as a treatment to enhance weight loss and avoid weight regain. The evidence evaluating this combined procedure is currently limited. A prospective randomized double-blind trial (n=90) by Bessler et al (2007) compared banded and nonbanded open gastric bypass for the treatment of super obesity. No significant differences were found in the overall number of complications, resolution of co-morbidities, or % excess weight loss (EWL) at six, 12, and 24 months (43.1% versus 24.7%, 64.0% versus 57.4%, and 64.2% versus 57.2%, respectively) postoperatively. The banded patients had achieved a significantly greater %EWL at 36 months (73.4% versus 57.7%; p<0.05). The incidence of intolerance to meat and bread was greater in the

banded patients. No band erosions had occurred at the last follow-up visit, and there was no mortality in either group.

The available evidence for gastric bypass combined with simultaneous gastric banding is insufficient to support safety and efficacy for the treatment of obesity, and to demonstrate a clinical benefit with improved long-term outcomes.

Loop Gastric Bypass: The loop gastric bypass involves the creation of a gastric pouch in the shape of a tube by dividing the stomach at the junction of the body and the antrum, parallel to the lesser curve. A loop of jejunum is then anastomosed to the gastric pouch. Some patients who undergo loop gastric bypass develop symptomatic bile reflux gastritis and esophagitis, necessitating conversion to Roux-en-y gastric bypass (Salameh, 2006). The loop gastric bypass as developed years ago has generally been abandoned by many bariatric surgeons.

Jejunioleal Bypass: In a jejunioleal or intestinal bypass the proximal jejunum is joined to the distal ileum, bypassing a large segment of the small bowel. Various technical modifications of the jejunioleal anastomosis have been developed, all bypassing extensive length of small intestine and leading to inevitable malabsorption of protein, carbohydrate, lipids, and vitamins. However, unabsorbed fatty acids entering the colon has caused significant diarrhea in patients who have undergone this procedure. Other long-term complications have been observed in jejunioleal bypass patients, the most serious of which is irreversible hepatic cirrhosis (Collins, et al., 2007). Because of these complications, jejunioleal bypass has fallen out of favor and is no longer one of the more commonly performed bariatric procedures.

Biliopancreatic Diversion with and without Duodenal Switch: As described originally by Scopinaro, the biliopancreatic diversion (BPD) is principally a malabsorptive procedure in which the distal two-thirds of the stomach is removed. The small pouch that remains is connected directly to the final segment of the small intestine, diverting bile and pancreatic juice into the distal ileum. Increased malabsorption and greater excess weight loss (EWL) occur, but at the expense of a higher incidence of both surgical and metabolic complications. These complications include: anastomotic ulceration, diarrhea, protein caloric malnutrition, metabolic bone disease and deficiencies in the fat-soluble vitamins, vitamin B₁₂, iron and calcium.

Hess adapted the procedure to include the duodenal switch (DS). The biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch (BPD/DS) incorporates both malabsorptive and restrictive mechanisms to minimize complications while still producing significant therapeutic weight loss. The procedure involves vertical subtotal gastrectomy with preservation of the pylorus. The first part of the duodenum is divided and attached to the terminal ileum. Sparing the pylorus significantly reduces the incidence of dumping syndrome, obstruction and stricture. Preservation of the early part of the duodenum results in a reduction in the incidence of vitamin and iron deficiencies. The majority of surgeons who perform BPD now incorporate DS (Neligan and Williams, 2005). In some centers, BPD/DS has been proposed as the procedure of choice for a subset of patients with a BMI > 50 or the super morbidly obese. The procedure is considered technically demanding with an operative mortality of 2% and major perioperative morbidity of 10% (Clegg, et al., 2001). Postoperative EWL is reported to range between 70% and 80%.

BPD Literature Review: There is a paucity of evidence in the literature evaluating the safety and effectiveness of BPD without DS. Gracia et al. (2007) studied two series of BPD patients depending on the length of the common and alimentary limbs in their procedures. A modified BPD (75-225 cm) was performed in 70 patients and 150 patients underwent BPD as described by Scopinaro (50-200 cm). The results were analyzed in terms of weight loss, co-morbidity improvement, and postoperative morbidity using BAROS. The follow-up range was 1-12 years. BMI loss and percentage of excess BMI lost (%EBMIL) were higher in the Scopinaro group than in the modified group, without statistical significance. At four-year follow-up, the EBMIL was 78.9% for patients in the Scopinaro group and 77.2% for those in the modified group. There was more prevalence of malnutrition and of iron deficiency in the Scopinaro group 16% and 60% respectively, than in the modified group 2% and 40% respectively. Early postoperative morbidity was 28.5% in the Scopinaro group and 15.5% in the modified group. The most common complication was wound infection 9% in the Scopinaro group versus 7% in the modified group. More major complications included wound dehiscence (n=2, 2.7%) occurring in the Scopinaro group, anastomotic leaks that required reoperation in both the Scopinaro (n=3, 2%) and the modified (n=1, 1.4%) groups. On long-term follow-up, major complications were: incisional hernia (50%, 42 %) and protein malnutrition that required in-hospital parenteral nutrition (11%, 2.8%) (n=16) respectively for patients in the

Scopinaro and modified groups. Total postoperative mortality of BPD was 1.3% (3/220). The causes of death were anastomotic leak, pulmonary thromboembolism, and pneumonia with adult respiratory distress syndrome.

Guedea et al. (2004) evaluated weight loss, morbidity and mortality after BPD in 74 patients who completed five or more years of follow-up. Mean preoperative BMI was 54 +/- 8 kg/m². The procedure consisted of a 200-cm alimentary limb and a 50-cm common limb. Initial excess weight loss (EWL) and course of BMI were analyzed between morbidly obese and super-obese patients. EWL at one year follow-up was 67%, at two years 75%, at five years 70% and at seven years 71%. There were significant differences between morbidly obese (BMI <50 kg/m²) and super-obese (BMI >50 kg/m²), with better results in the morbidly obese group (p=0.026). There was no mortality in this series. Early postoperative morbidity was 16% with the most frequent complication being wound infection (6.75%). Major complications were: wound dehiscence (n=2, 2.7%) and anastomotic leak (2, 2.7%). The late postoperative rate of incisional hernias was 33.8%, however, 16.2% of patients had had an abdominal hernia prior to bariatric surgery. Glycemia, cholesterolemia, and triglyceridemia became normal in 100% of patients at one year after BPD and remained stable during all follow-up. Blood pressure decreased, so that 82.4% of the patients who were on antihypertensive medications had stopped these by one year after the operation. All patients who had sleep apnea syndrome and overnight continuous positive airway pressure were able to discontinue that treatment at six months.

BPD/DS Literature Review: Evidence evaluating the use of BPD/DS has been limited to numerous uncontrolled case series and patient registry data. Many studies are retrospective in design with significant loss to follow-up. It is also difficult to compare studies due to variations of the procedure(s) performed by open and/or laparoscopic approach. O'Rourke et al. (2006) analyzed postoperative morbidity and mortality in a retrospective review of 452 patients who underwent either open or laparoscopic gastric bypass or BPD/DS. The mean BMI of all patients was 55. The overall mean follow-up time was 419 days. The mortality rate was found to be 0.9%. Major and minor morbidity rates were reported to be 10% and 13%, respectively. BPD/DS was reported to be associated with higher risk of major morbidity than gastric bypass (p=0.05). Anastomotic leak was analyzed separately and also occurred at a higher rate with BPD/DS than with gastric bypass. Excess weight loss was 54% at one-year follow-up for all patients and did not differ significantly among procedure type or approach. The authors propose that older patients (i.e., ≥ 60 years) should be counseled regarding the higher risk associated with BPD/DS, as age was found to be a significant predictor of postoperative complications in this study.

In a comparative series, Prachand et al. (2006) reported on 350 super-obese patients who underwent open duodenal switch (DS) (n=198) or Roux-en-y gastric bypass (RYGB) (n=152). Successful weight loss was defined as achieving at least 50% loss of excess body weight. At 36 months, the follow-up rate was approximately 50% for each group. The percentage excess weight loss (EWL) at this point continued to be greater for DS than RYGB, 68.9% vs. 54.9% respectively (p < 0.05). The 30-day mortality rate was found to be equal (i.e., one of 198 for DS patients, zero of 152 for RYGB patients). The authors concluded that direct comparison of DS to RYGB demonstrates superior weight loss outcomes for DS. Limitations of the study include its nonrandomized design and loss to follow-up.

In a review of their experience with open biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch (BPD/DS), Hess et al. (2005) reported 10-year follow-up data on 167 (92%) of a cohort of 182 patients. The average EWL was reported to be 75%. Type 2 diabetics have had a 98% cure rate (i.e., normal plasma glucose a few weeks after surgery). Hypercholesterolemia and other comorbidities were also reportedly improved. There were eight reversals typically due to excessive weight loss and protein malnutrition. A total of 37 revisions were necessary for the same two reasons, in addition to inadequate weight loss and uncontrolled diarrhea. The investigators maintain that BPD/DS has proven to be a safe and effective procedure for the treatment of morbid obesity with low rates of complications and sustained long-term weight loss.

Parikh et al. (2005) conducted a retrospective review of super-obese patients who underwent laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (LAGB) (n=192), RYGB (n=97) or BPD with or without DS (n=43). The mean BMI for these patients was 55.3. There were no mortalities. The perioperative complication rate for LAGB, RYGB and BPD was 4.7%, 11.3% and 16.3%, respectively. The LAGB had a statistically significant lower complication rate compared with the other groups (p=0.02). The difference in complication rate between RYGB and BPD was not statistically significant. BPD patients had the highest percentage of EWL at three-year follow-up, but these patients also had the highest complication rate. It was concluded that LAGB is the safest of the three bariatric procedures for super-obese patients.

In another retrospective review, Rabkin et al. (2003) reported results of 345 laparoscopic BPD/DS procedures for patients with a mean BMI of 50. Overall perioperative morbidity, including reoperations, was 10%. There were no deaths. The mean percentages of excess weight loss (EWL) at six, 18 and 24 months were 51%, 89% and 91%, respectively. The authors note that while the laparoscopic technique for BPD/DS is technically feasible with acceptable morbidity, there is a steep learning curve for this procedure. Also, longer-term data as well as comparison between open and laparoscopic BPD/DS patients are needed.

Anthone and colleagues (2003) conducted a review of data collected prospectively from 701 patients who underwent open BPD/DS as the primary surgical treatment of morbid obesity at a single institution. Preoperative BMI was 50 or more for 58% of patients, and 22% had a preoperative BMI of 60 or greater. There were 10 (1.4%) perioperative deaths. Significant morbidity occurred in 21 patients (2.9%). Complications included nonfatal leaks, rhabdomyolysis, wound dehiscence and bleeding requiring surgical intervention. Revisional surgery was needed in 40 patients (5.7%) due to malnutrition, persistent diarrhea or chronic, unexplained abdominal pain. EWL at one-, three- and five-year follow-up was 69% of 333 patients, 73% of 71 patients and 66% of 50 patients, respectively. At follow-up of three years (n=71) or more, patients reported and maintained a mean restriction of 63% of their preoperative intake with no specific food intolerances. Normal levels of serum albumin were reported in 98% of patients, hemoglobin in 52% and calcium in 71%. The authors noted that compared to procedures that severely restrict intake, BPD/DS allows patients to eat a wide variety of foods and approximately half of their preoperative intake without the associated dumping symptoms.

The Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES) guideline for laparoscopic bariatric surgery states that In BPD, the common channel should be 60–100 cm, and the alimentary limb 200–360 cm. DS diminishes the most severe complications of BPD, including dumping syndrome and peptic ulceration of the anastomosis. BPD is effective in all BMI >35 kg/m² subgroups, with durable weight loss and control of comorbidities beyond five years. Laparoscopic BPD provides equivalent weight loss, shorter hospital stay, and fewer complications than the open approach. BPD may result in greater weight loss and resolution of comorbidities than other bariatric surgeries, but with the highest mortality rate (SAGES, 2008).

There is insufficient evidence in the literature to support the use of BPD without DS. The available data suggests that BPD with DS is safe and technically feasible, can be accomplished in patients who are considered candidates for bariatric surgery, and can produce significant long-term weight loss. Additional well-designed randomized trials comparing BPD/DS to other procedures are needed to further define the role of open or laparoscopic BPD/DS in the treatment of morbid obesity.

Fobi-Pouch: The Fobi-Pouch has been proposed by one investigator as an alternative to traditional bariatric surgery. The limiting proximal gastric pouch procedure involves a small (less than 25 ml) vertical banded pouch, a Silastic[®] ring around the stomach creating a stoma, and a gastroenterostomy to a Roux-en-Y limb. Published evidence supporting the use of this procedure is in the form of one descriptive article (Fobi and Lee, 1998) and one case series (Fobi, et al., 2002; n=50), both authored by the developers of the technique, along with anecdotal information. Current evidence available in the published, peer-reviewed scientific literature indicates that the safety and efficacy of this procedure have not been established.

Mini-Gastric Bypass: The mini-gastric bypass has been proposed as a bariatric surgery method. The controversial procedure is performed laparoscopically and is similar to the Roux-en-Y technique except that, after the division of the stomach, a jejunal loop is created and anastomosed to the gastric pouch. Complications include biliary reflux and esophagitis. Evidence supporting the use of the mini-gastric bypass is in the form of small case series (Rutledge, 2001) and one small randomized open comparison of the procedure to LRYGB (Lee, et al., 2005). The authors reported similar efficacy in terms of excess weight loss (EWL) at two years. However, longer-term follow-up with regard to the risk of complications is recommended by the investigators.

There is insufficient evidence in the published, peer-reviewed scientific literature to support the safety and efficacy of the mini-gastric bypass.

Intragastric Balloon (IGB): Treatment with the IGB has been proposed as a temporary aid for obese patients who have had unsatisfactory results in their clinical treatment for obesity and for super-obese patients with higher surgical risk. The IGB technique allows the reduction of the gastric reservoir capacity, causing a premature sensation of satiety, facilitating the consumption of smaller amounts of food (Fernandes, et al., 2007).

The balloon is typically removed within six months of insertion. Adverse effects associated with the intragastric balloon include gastric erosion, reflux, and obstruction.

Much of the literature evaluating the safety and efficacy of the intragastric balloon includes retrospective studies with relatively small sample sizes. Doldi et al. (2000) reported on intragastric balloon placement in 132 obese and morbidly obese patients. Mean BMI was 41.0 (29–81). The balloon was removed in the majority of patients four months after insertion. Mean weight loss was 14.4 kg, and mean reduction in BMI was 5.2. The weight loss produced an improvement of the complications associated with the obesity. Complications observed included balloon intolerance necessitating early removal from nine patients and two cases of gastric ulcer at balloon removal. The authors of this early study stated that the indications for intragastric balloon placement should be patients with a BMI > 40 in preparation for a bariatric operation; patients with BMI 30–35 with a chronic disease otherwise unresolved; patients with BMI < 30 in a multidisciplinary approach.

A larger retrospective study conducted by Genco et al. (2005) evaluated 2515 patients with a mean BMI of 44.4 who underwent intragastric balloon placement. The balloon was removed after six months. Mortality, complications, BMI, percentage excess weight loss (EWL), BMI loss and comorbidities were evaluated. The overall complication rate was reported to be 2.8%, including the death of two patients. Gastric perforation occurred in five patients (0.19%), four of whom had undergone previous gastric surgery. A total of 19 gastric obstructions (0.76%) presented in the first week after balloon positioning and were successfully treated by balloon removal. Preoperative comorbidities resolved in 617 (44.3%) of 1394 patients. After six months, mean BMI was 35.4 and the EWL was 33.9%. BMI loss was reported to be 4.9 (range 0–25). Despite the complications noted, it was concluded that intragastric balloon is an effective procedure with reduced comorbidities and satisfactory weight loss within a follow-up period of six months. Previous gastric surgery was noted to be a contraindication to intragastric balloon placement.

In a Cochrane review of the evidence for intragastric balloon, Fernandes et al. (2007) included nine randomized, controlled clinical trials (n=395) spanning the years 1988 to 1999. One study was performed in 2005. In these trials, intragastric balloon was compared to no treatment, diet and a combination of balloon placement and diet. According to the authors, results indicated that compared with conventional management, intragastric balloon did not show convincing evidence of a greater weight loss. Although few serious complications of intragastric balloon placement occurred, the relative risks for minor complications like gastric ulcers and erosions were significantly raised (Fernandes, et al., 2007).

A technology assessment of the intragastric balloon from the Canadian Coordinating Office for Health Technology Assessment (CCOHTA) concluded that moderate weight loss may be achieved with intragastric balloon placement if patients are compliant with a weight-reduction program. Weight gain has been found to recur when the balloon is removed after six months. More data are needed before the intragastric balloon can be compared to other short-term interventions such as low-calorie diets (CCOHTA, 2006).

Currently, the available evidence in the published, peer-reviewed scientific literature is insufficient to establish the safety and efficacy of this procedure.

Sleeve Gastrectomy: Sleeve gastrectomy, also known as partial or vertical gastrectomy, is a less common restrictive procedure that has been proposed for severely obese patients (i.e., BMI > 60). Sleeve gastrectomy can be an open or laparoscopic procedure and involves the resection of the greater curvature of the stomach with the remainder resembling a tube or sleeve. The resulting decrease in stomach size inhibits distention of the stomach so that early satiety is achieved. Preservation of the pyloric sphincter prevents the dumping syndrome. Sleeve gastrectomy may be performed as a one-stage procedure or as the first of a two-stage procedure prior to gastric bypass or duodenal switch. Weight loss following sleeve gastrectomy is thought to reduce the risk of a subsequent, more extensive procedure, such as biliopancreatic diversion, in very high-risk patients.

A number of retrospective and prospective studies have evaluated the safety and efficacy of sleeve gastrectomy. Milone et al. (2005) compared laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (LSG) and the intragastric balloon as a first-stage procedure for effective initial weight loss before more definitive surgery. LSG was performed in 20 patients and intragastric balloon placed in 57 patients. No complications were reported for patients who underwent LSG. For patients who had intragastric balloon placement, four patients (7%) had the balloon removed due to intolerance. The mean weight loss for patients undergoing LSG and intragastric balloon placement at six months was 45.5 and 22.3 kg, respectively, and the excess weight loss (EWL) was 35% for

LSG versus 24% for the intragastric balloon. BMI decreased respectively from 69 to 53 for the LSG group and from 59 to 51 for the intragastric balloon group. Weight loss decreased comorbidities in 90% of patients after both procedures. According to the authors, study results suggest that LSG may be superior to the intragastric balloon procedure as a first stage for super-obesity.

Roa et al. (2006) assessed the safety and short-term efficacy of LSG as a treatment option for weight reduction. The data of 62 patients who underwent LSG and completed the three- and six-month follow-up visits were retrospectively reviewed. Mean preoperative BMI was 41.4. The mean hospital stay was 3.2 days (i.e., range 2–25). The mean weight loss was reported to be 22.7 kg at three-month follow-up and 30.5 kg at six months. The mean percentage of EWL was 40.7% and 52.8%, respectively. Three patients were considered to have mild complications, and one patient had a major complication that required surgical intervention. The authors concluded that LSG is a safe and effective treatment option in the short-term.

Himpens and colleagues (2006) conducted a prospective randomized study to compare the results of laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (GB) and sleeve gastrectomy (SG) after one and three years of surgery. Median BMI was 37 for GB patients (n=40) versus 39 for SG patients (n=40). Weight loss, feeling of hunger, sweet eating, gastroesophageal reflux disease, complications and reoperations were assessed in both groups. Median weight loss after one year was 14 kilograms (kg) for GB patients and 26 kg for those who underwent SG (p<0.0001). After three years, the median weight loss for SG patients continued to be greater than for GB patients (p<0.0001). At three years, the median percentage EWL was 48% after GB and 66% after SG (p=0.0025). Loss of feeling of hunger after three years was reported in 2.9% of patients with GB and 46.7% of patients with SG (p<0.0001). Postoperative complications requiring reoperation occurred in two patients after SG. Late complications requiring reoperation affected seven patients after GB. It was concluded that weight loss and loss of feeling of hunger were greater for those who underwent SG. Although the number of reoperations was found to be important in both groups, the severity of complications appears higher in SG (Himpens, et al., 2006).

Hamoui et al. (2006) presented the results of SG performed in a series of 118 patients. Median BMI was 55, with 73% of patients having a BMI \geq 50. The procedure was performed by laparotomy in all but three cases, which were performed laparoscopically. Median hospital stay was six days. There was one perioperative death (0.85%), and 18 patients (15.3%) had postoperative complications. Median follow-up was 13 months. The median percentage EWL was 37.8% at six months, 49.4% at 12 months, and 47.3% at 24 months. According to the investigators, "Although the SG does not result in as much weight loss as the duodenal switch or gastric bypass, it can be used as a stand-alone operation or as a bridge to more complex procedures in the high-risk super-obese patient" (Hamoui, et al., 2006).

Silecchia et al. (2006) evaluated the effect of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (LSG) on major comorbidities such as hypertension, type 2 diabetes and the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) operative risk score in high-risk super-obese patients (n=41) undergoing two-stage laparoscopic BPD-DS. Patient selection criteria included a BMI \geq 60 or BMI \geq 50 with at least two severe comorbidities. In 10 patients, at least one intragastric balloon had been positioned and four had undergone laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (LAGB), all with unsatisfactory results. At the time of surgery, 41.5% were classified as ASA 4 and 58.5% as ASA 3. Patients were evaluated every three months postoperatively and were restaged at 12 months and/or before the second procedure. The average BMI after six and 12 months was 44.5 and 40.8, respectively. After 12 months, 57.8% of the patients were free of comorbidities, and 31.5% had only one major comorbid condition. At the time of restaging, 20% of patients were still classified as ASA score 4. In the opinion of the authors, LSG represents a safe and effective procedure to achieve significant weight loss and reduction of major obesity-related comorbidities. It was also noted that the procedure reduced the operative risk (i.e., ASA score) in super-obese patients undergoing two-stage laparoscopic BPD-DS.

Cottam et al. (2006) presented 126 patients with a mean BMI of 65.3 who underwent LSG as a first-stage procedure. It was determined that 42% of these patients were ASA 3 and 52% were ASA 4. The mean number of comorbid conditions per patient was 9.3 with a median of 10 (range 3–17%). At one year after LSG, the mean EWL was 46%. A total of 36 patients with a mean BMI of 49.1 had the second-stage laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (LRYGB). The mean number of comorbidities in this group was 6.4, reduced from 9. The ASA class of the majority of patients had been down-staged at the time of LRYGB. The mean time interval between the first and second stages was 12.6 +/- 0.8 months. The mean and median hospital stays were 3 +/- 1.7 and 2.5 (range 2–7) days, respectively. The incidence of major complications was 8%, and no deaths were reported.

It was concluded that “the staging concept of LSG followed by LRYGBP is a safe and effective surgical approach for high-risk patients seeking bariatric surgery” (Cottam, et al., 2006).

Nocca et al. (2008) conducted a multicenter prospective study to evaluate the effectiveness of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (LSG). The average BMI was 45.9 kg/m². Indications for the procedure included superobesity (BMI>50 kg/m²), and morbidly obese patients (BMI)>40 kg/m² or severely obese patients (BMI>35 kg/m²) with severe comorbidities (e.g., diabetes, sleep apnea, hypertension) who had high-volume eating disorders. Of the 163 patients in this study, 44 (26.99%) were superobese, 84 (51.53%) presented with morbid obesity, and 35 (21.47%) were severely obese patients. Follow-up evaluation occurred at one, six, 12, 18, and 24 months. Excess weight loss (EWL), mortality, and morbidity were analyzed. There was no operative mortality. Perioperative complications occurred in 12 cases (7.36%). The reoperation rate was 4.9% and the postoperative morbidity was 6.74% due to six gastric fistulas (3.66%). Long-term morbidity was caused by esophageal reflux symptoms (11.8%). The EWL was 48.97% at six months, 59.45% at 12 months for 120 available patients, 62.02% at 18 months, and 61.52% for the 98 patients available at 24 months of follow-up. No statistical difference was noticed in weight loss between obese and extreme obese patients. At last follow-up, ten patients had regained weight. It was noted that long-term follow-up is needed to further evaluate the effectiveness of LSG in terms of weight regained, quality of life, and evolution of morbidities due to obesity.

Felberbauer et al. (2008) reported results for a series of 126 LSGs. After a mean follow-up of 19.1 months, patients had lost between 2.3 and 27 kg/m² or between 6.7% and 130% of their excessive weight. Within an average of 20 months, 64% of the patients lost >50% of their excess weight. Surgical complications included three cases of staple-line leakage needing revisional surgery. There were no operative mortalities. The failure rate was 6.8% with two patients who gained weight gain and four patients who achieved an EWL of <25% after one year. Study limitations include the retrospective, nonrandomized design and short-term follow-up. The authors noted that although these results are encouraging, the final place of LSG in bariatric surgery is still unclear.

Arias et al (2009) performed a retrospective review of 130 consecutive patients who underwent LSG as a final procedure for morbid obesity. Patient selection criteria included patient's preference; high risk; contraindications for gastric bypass (i.e., inflammatory bowel disease, severe small bowel adhesions); low BMI (≥ 35) without comorbidities; patients on anticoagulants. The mean BMI was 43.2 (range 30.2-75.4) kg/m². There was no mortality. Trocar site infection developed in four patients (2.8%) and one patient (0.7%) had leakage at the stapler line. The mean weight loss was 37.4 and 41.7 kg at 12 and 24 months, respectively. The mean BMI decreased to 29.5 and 27.1 at 12 and 24 months, respectively. The %EWL was 62.2 at 12 months and 67.9 at 24 months.

Fuks et al. (2009) evaluated the efficacy of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (LSG) for weight loss in a series of 135 patients. The mean preoperative BMI was 48.8 kg/m² (range, 37-72). Median history of obesity was 17 \pm 7 years. Study endpoints included mean BMI, excess weight loss, comorbidity, conversion to laparotomy, and major and minor complication rates. The median follow-up was 12.7 months. The mean postoperative BMI decreased to 39.8 kg/m² at six months ($p < 0.001$). Average EWL was 38.6% and 49.4% at six months and one year, respectively. In terms of late complications, two patients had insufficient weight loss which was treated by a second-stage operation (laparoscopic duodenal switch). There was no mortality, and the major complication rate was 5.1% (n=7) due to gastric fistula in every case. BMI > 60 kg/m² was reported to be a risk factor for PGF.

In a 2007 position statement, the American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery (ASMBS) noted that sleeve gastrectomy has been utilized as a first-stage bariatric procedure to reduce surgical risk in high-risk patients by induction of weight loss and that this may currently be its most useful application. It is further stated that sleeve gastrectomy appears to be a technically easier and/or faster laparoscopic procedure than RYGB or malabsorptive procedures in complex or high risk patients including the super-super-obese patient (BMI > 60 kg/m²). However, long-term data demonstrating weight loss and comorbidity resolution have not been reported at this time (ASMBS, 2007).

According to the AACE/TOS/ASMBS guidelines, a first-stage sleeve gastrectomy may be performed in high-risk patients to induce an initial weight loss (25 to 45 kg), with the possibility of then performing a second-stage RYGB or BPD/DS after the patient's operative risk has improved. This is currently an investigational procedure (Mechanick, et al., 2008).

Although promising, the available evidence is insufficient to support the use of sleeve gastrectomy as a stand-alone procedure or as the first of a two-stage procedure. Additional randomized controlled studies are needed to further define the role of this procedure in the surgical treatment of obesity.

Natural Orifice Transluminal Endoscopic Surgery™ (NOTES™): NOTES, also referred to as endoscopic (oral)-assisted, endoluminal, or transoral incisionless surgery, is a new technique currently being investigated for use in a range of procedures including gastric bypass. The NOTES technique involves the use of natural orifice access (e.g., mouth, anus) to perform a surgical procedure which potentially reduces or eliminates the trauma of access incisions (Schauer, et al., 2007). Devices used in this type of endoscopic surgery include the StomaphyX™ endoluminal fastener and delivery system (EndoGastric Solutions, Inc., Redmond, WA). The StomaphyX was granted marketing approval by the FDA via the 510(k) process on March 9, 2007 because it is considered to be substantially equivalent to another device already on the market. Under the FDA 510(k) approval process, the manufacturer is not required to supply to the FDA evidence of the effectiveness of the StomaphyX prior to marketing the device. The 510(k) summary stated that the StomaphyX is substantially equivalent to LSI Solutions Flexible Suture Placement Device and the Bard Endoscope Suturing System/Bard Endocinch. According to the FDA, the StomaphyX system is indicated for use in endoluminal trans-oral tissue approximation and ligation in the gastrointestinal tract. StomaphyX is popularly described as a non-invasive weight loss procedure to reduce the size of a patient's stomach without any incisions and has reportedly been used in patients who were regaining weight due to pouch expansion after laparoscopic gastric bypass surgery. Currently there is insufficient evidence in the peer-reviewed medical literature to support the use of transluminal endoscopic surgery using devices such as StomaphyX for the management of severe obesity.

There is insufficient evidence in the published, peer-reviewed scientific literature to support the use of any of the following bariatric procedures in the treatment of clinically severe/morbid obesity, as they have not been proven to achieve equivalent or improved patient outcomes relative to available alternatives:

- Fobi-Pouch
- intragastric balloon (IGB)
- mini-gastric bypass (jejunum is anastomosed to the stomach, as in the Billroth II procedure)
- sleeve gastrectomy (SG)
- Natural Orifice Transluminal Endoscopic Surgery™ (NOTES™) (e.g., StomaphyX™)/endoscopic oral-assisted procedures

Gastric Pacing/Gastric Electrical Stimulation (GES)

GES is being investigated as a treatment for morbidly obese patients. It is thought that GES may cause increased satiety resulting in decreased food intake and weight loss. The exact mechanism by which gastric pacing impacts eating and behavior is unclear. There is currently insufficient evidence in the literature to support the use of GES for the treatment of obesity. Please refer to the Gastric Pacing/Gastric Electrical Stimulation (GES) Coverage Policy for additional information.

Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS)

VNS provides intermittent electrical stimulation to the tenth cranial nerve, which influences certain patterns of brain activity. The vagus nerve is a major connection between the brain and the rest of the body and as such, carries sensory information from the body to the brain and motor commands from the brain to the body. A potential use of VNS concerns the regulation of brain satiety signals. The brain knows that the stomach is empty or full, largely on the basis of information transmitted by the vagus nerve. Based on the theory the vagus signal could be altered to modify eating behavior, VNS has been proposed as a treatment for obesity. Currently the literature regarding the use of VNS for obesity is limited and therefore conclusions about safety and efficacy cannot be made at this time. Please refer to the Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS) Coverage Policy for additional information.

Vagus Nerve Blocking

Vagus nerve blocking (VNB) or vagal blocking therapy is also being investigated as a treatment for obesity. VNB uses high-frequency, low-energy electrical pulses to block vagus nerve signals in the abdominal region, inhibiting gastric motility and increasing satiety (feeling full). No VNB devices have yet received U.S. FDA

approval. Early clinical trial results suggest that VNB may achieve excess weight loss (EWL) that is comparable to approximately half of that achievable by LAGB (ECRI, 2009).

Camilleri et al. (2009) conducted an open-label multicenter study to assess the effects of a vagal blocking device on EWL, safety, dietary intake, and vagal function. Electrodes were implanted laparoscopically near the esophagogastric junction to provide intermittent vagal blocking in 31 patients with a BMI range of 35-50 kg/m²). The mean EWL at six months follow-up was 14.2% (p<0.001). Calorie intake decreased by >30% at six months (p ≤ 0.01), with earlier satiation (p<0.001) and reduced hunger (p=0.005). There were no deaths or device-related serious adverse events. The study is limited by its small sample size and lack of randomization. Additional well-designed studies are needed to further evaluate the role of this therapy in the treatment of obesity.

Evidence evaluating the safety and effectiveness of VNB is limited at this point and is therefore insufficient to support use of the procedure for the treatment of obesity.

Systematic Reviews on Bariatric Surgery

National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE): The NICE systematic review (2002) concluded, "jejunioileal bypass is effective in achieving weight loss but is associated with serious complications, including liver disease. Gastric bypass appears to be more effective than gastroplasty in terms of achieving weight loss. However, it is a technically demanding operation with potentially serious metabolic complications. VBG appears to be more effective than horizontal gastroplasty. Gastric banding is associated with more long-term weight loss, fewer reoperations and greater patient satisfaction than vertical banded gastroplasty, although the difference in the results is not statistically significant. It is the least invasive of the procedures, involving no permanent alteration of the anatomy. Laparoscopic surgery is as effective as open surgery, but results in fewer complications and a reduced length of hospital stay" (NICE, 2002).

Blue Cross Blue Shield Technology Evaluation Center (TEC): The TEC (2003) conducted a review to determine whether less invasive procedures (e.g., laparoscopic gastric bypass, laparoscopic gastric banding) improve outcomes as compared to open gastric bypass, and whether variations of gastric bypass (e.g., biliopancreatic diversion, long-limb gastric bypass) improve outcomes for patients with super-obesity. The TEC report concluded, "There is insufficient evidence to conclude whether these procedures (i.e., laparoscopic gastric bypass, laparoscopic gastric banding, biliopancreatic diversion, long-limb gastric bypass) either improve net health outcomes or whether they are as beneficial as current established surgery, open gastric bypass with Roux-en-Y anastomosis" (BCBSA TEC, 2003).

The TEC conducted a more recent evaluation of the evidence on LAGB and concluded that the procedure "meets the TEC criteria when performed in appropriately selected patients, by surgeons who are adequately trained and experienced in the specific techniques used, and in institutions that support a comprehensive bariatric surgery program, including a long-term monitoring and follow-up post-surgery" (BCBSA TEC, 2007).

California Technology Assessment Forum (CTAF): Tice (2004) conducted a systematic review of evidence for the use of BPD/DS. Uncontrolled and case series describing several variations of the procedure were identified. There were no trials using randomized controls that compared BPD/DS to RYGB. The author concluded that, while case series indicate the degree of weight loss achieved with BPD/DS is comparable to that of RYGB, it is not possible to draw any firm conclusions regarding the relative benefits and harms of the two procedures. It was recommended that BPD/DS does not meet the technology assessment criteria for safety, effectiveness and improvement in health outcomes.

Buchwald and colleagues: Buchwald et al. (2004) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to determine the impact of bariatric surgery on weight loss, operative mortality outcome, and four obesity comorbidities (diabetes, hyperlipidemia, hypertension and obstructive sleep apnea). The authors concluded, "Bariatric surgery in morbidly obese individuals reverses, eliminates, or significantly ameliorates diabetes, hyperlipidemia, hypertension, and obstructive sleep apnea. These benefits occur in the majority of patients who undergo surgery" (Buchwald, et al., 2004). The authors further state that resolution of diabetes was found to be more prevalent in patients who underwent malabsorptive procedures and mixed malabsorptive/restrictive gastric bypass than in those who had restrictive-only procedures, gastroplasty and gastric banding.

Chapman and colleagues (The Australian Safety and Efficacy Register of New Interventional Procedures-Surgical Review Group, 2004): This group conducted a systematic review of the literature to compare the safety and efficacy of laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding with vertical banded gastroplasty and gastric bypass. The authors identified six studies that reported comparative results for gastric banding and other procedures and one study reporting results for all three procedures. The authors concluded, "The evidence base was of average quality up to four years for LAGB. Laparoscopic gastric bypass is safer than VBG and RYGB, in terms of short-term mortality rates. LAGB is effective, at least up to four years, as are the comparator procedures. Up to two years, LAGB results in less weight loss than RYGB; from two to four years there is no significant difference between LAGB and RYGB, but the quality of data is only moderate. The long-term efficacy of LAGB remains unproven, and evaluation by randomized controlled trials is recommended to define its merits relative to the comparator procedures" (Chapman, et al., 2004).

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Evidence Report: In October 2004, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services released an evidence report on the surgical and pharmacological treatment of obesity. The press release on the AHRQ Evidence Report stated: "The AHRQ review did not find enough evidence to draw conclusions about differences in the safety of different types of weight-loss surgery, which include adjustable gastric banding, vertical-banded gastroplasty, and biliopancreatic diversion procedures. Less than 1% of patients operated on by experienced bariatric surgeons die as a result of the surgery or from complications, but the rate may be higher for less-experienced surgeons."

In addition, the detailed report drew the following conclusions regarding surgery:

- "Bariatric surgical treatment results in greater sustained weight loss than nonsurgical treatments in very obese individuals (BMI \geq 40), resulting in improved health outcomes (reduction in diabetes and sleep apnea, improved quality of life). While not conclusive, the data suggest greater sustained weight loss for bariatric surgical treatment than for nonsurgical treatment in patients with BMI between 35 and 40.
- RYGB, VBG, and adjustable banding procedures all result in substantial weight loss.
- RYGB results in greater weight loss than VBG in severely obese individuals.
- Postoperative mortality rates of less than one percent have been achieved by a number of surgeons and bariatric surgical centers. The postoperative mortality rate in other settings may be higher.
- Few clinical trials have compared outcomes among different bariatric surgical procedures. The existing data suggest the possibility of clinically important differences in the proportion of patients reporting various complications and adverse events among those treated with RYGB, VBG, and adjustable banding procedures.
- Laparoscopic procedures result in fewer wound complications or incisional hernias than open procedures.
- The actual proportions of patients who experience some complications of bariatric surgery may be quite substantial, greater than 20 percent (although most are minor in severity)" (Shekelle, et al., 2004).

Cochrane Review: In their systematic review, Colquitt and colleagues (2005) assessed the effects of surgery for morbid obesity on weight, comorbidities and quality of life. The group reviewed randomized controlled trials comparing different surgical procedures and randomized controlled trials and nonrandomized controlled trials comparing surgery with nonsurgical obesity management. The authors concluded, "The limited evidence suggests that surgery for morbid obesity results in greater weight loss than conventional treatment, and that the results are maintained at least up to eight years. Furthermore, the weight loss is associated with reductions in comorbidities such as diabetes and hypertension. However, surgery is associated with adverse effects and the possibility of postoperative mortality. There are a number of procedures available. However, due to the limited evidence and poor quality of the trials, the comparative safety and effectiveness of these procedures are uncertain" (Colquitt, et al., 2005).

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)

In February 2006, CMS issued an updated coverage decision for bariatric surgery. Based on their analysis of the medical literature, it was determined that the evidence is adequate to conclude that open and laparoscopic RYGB, laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (LAGB), and open and laparoscopic biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch (BPD/DS) are reasonable and necessary for Medicare beneficiaries who have a BMI \geq 35, have at least one comorbidity related to obesity, and have been previously unsuccessful with medical treatment

for obesity. According to CMS, medical treatment which includes dietary manipulation, behavior modification and medication, should be routinely attempted either individually or in combination and shown to be unsuccessful prior to considering a patient for bariatric surgery. There are no consistent standards in the literature regarding the optimal length of a medical treatment trial; however, 6–12 months is believed to be a reasonable time frame.

Reanalysis of the data on surgical volume identified surgical experience as a significant factor in safety for bariatric surgery at both facility and surgeon levels. Based on this finding, CMS modified their proposed decision to now provide coverage for patients age 65 and older as long as the bariatric procedures are performed in facilities that are most likely to achieve better outcomes. CMS has determined that covered bariatric surgery procedures are reasonable and necessary only when performed at facilities that are certified by the American College of Surgeons (ACS) or by the ASBS as a Bariatric Surgery Center of Excellence (BSCOE).

O'Brien and colleagues: O'Brien et al. (2006) conducted a systematic review of studies evaluating medium-term weight loss after bariatric surgical procedures. Procedures examined in the 43 studies included LAGB (n=18), BPD with and without DS (n=7), and RYGBP (n=18). Of the LAGB reports, 12 provided data on the LAP-BAND, five on the Obtech[®] band (Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc., Cincinnati, OH), and one study included both devices. Pooled data for all procedures showed a mean EWL in the range of 54–67% with no evidence of loss of effect at 10 years. It was concluded that all current bariatric operations lead to major weight loss in the medium term. BPD and banded RYGBP appear to be more effective than both RYGBP and LAGB, which are equal in the medium term (O'Brien, et al., 2006).

ECRI Health Technology Assessment (HTA): ECRI performed an evaluation of the evidence on bariatric surgery in the pediatric population. A total of 17 studies met inclusion criteria, reporting outcomes after LAGB (n=8), RYGB (n=6), VBG (n=2), and banded bypass (n=1). The average age ranged from 15.6 years to 18.1 years, with little difference in mean age among bariatric procedures. Prior to surgery, all patients had undergone multiple unsuccessful attempts at weight loss using non-surgical methods. The report defined clinically significant weight loss as 7% of body weight. The most frequently reported complication after LAGB was band slippage. Reoperations were performed on 26 (7.92%) of the 328 LAGB patients to correct various complications. No reported in-hospital or postoperative death. The most frequently reported complication after RYGB was related to protein-calorie malnutrition and micronutrient deficiency. One postoperative death was reported for RYGB; no in-hospital death was reported. Potentially life-threatening complications such as shock, pulmonary embolism, severe malnutrition, immediate postoperative bleeding, and gastrointestinal obstructions were reported in the RYGB studies. The HTA summarized that LAGB and RYGB for morbidly obese patients aged 21 or less does lead to sustained and clinically significant weight loss and resolve comorbid conditions linked to obesity (diabetes, hypertension) compared to non-operative approaches. The evidence was found to be insufficient to allow conclusions about quantitative estimates of the precise amount of weight loss, weight loss in specific age groups (i.e., 18-21, 13-17, 12 or less), or weight loss after other bariatric surgical procedures in this population. The evidence was also found to be insufficient to permit any conclusions on potential impacts of bariatric surgery on growth and development of pediatric patients (ECRI, 2007).

Bariatric Surgery: Impact on Health Outcomes

The potential benefits of bariatric surgery on health outcomes include the following:

- The increase in reported morbidity associated with obesity is thought to be mediated primarily by insulin resistance, diabetes, hypertension and lipid disturbances (Sjöstrom, et al., 2004).
- Diet therapy alone in the absence of surgery is relatively ineffective in treating obesity over the long term (Buchwald, et al., 2004).
- Severely obese patients who undergo bariatric surgery achieve greater short-, intermediate- and long-term (i.e., 10 years) weight loss, more physical activity and lower energy intake than severely obese patients treated with conventional medical interventions, such as very low-calorie diets and pharmacotherapy (Sjöstrom, et al., 2004; Buchwald, et al., 2004).
- Intermediate- and long-term (i.e., 10 years) incidence rates of recovery from risk factors such as diabetes, hypertriglyceridemia, low levels of high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, hypertension, hyperlipidemia and hyperuricemia are more favorable in surgically-treated patients than in nonsurgical, severely obese patients (Sjöstrom, et al., 2004; Buchwald, et al., 2004).

- Bariatric surgery reverses, eliminates or significantly improves risk factors of diabetes, hyperlipidemia, hypertension and obstructive sleep apnea (Buchwald, et al., 2004).
- Severely obese diabetic individuals treated with bariatric surgery have shown an 80% reduction in mortality (Sjöström, et al., 2004).
- Weight-loss surgery has been reported to reduce the relative risk of death by 89% with an absolute mortality reduction of 5.49% (Christou, et al., 2004).
- Gastric bypass has been reported to result in more favorable overall health outcomes (i.e., weight loss, risk factor recovery/reduction) relative to other surgical interventions, such as banding procedures (Buchwald, et al., 2004).

Adams et al. (2007) conducted a retrospective cohort study to compare long-term rates of death from any cause and from specific causes in subjects who had undergone gastric bypass surgery compared to a group of severely obese controls. A total of 7925 surgical patients and 7925 severely obese control subjects were matched for age, sex, and BMI. The mean BMI differed significantly between the surgery group and the control group ($p < 0.001$). During a mean follow-up of 7.1 years, adjusted long-term mortality from any cause in the surgery group decreased by 40%, as compared to the control group ($p < 0.001$). Cause-specific mortality in the surgery group decreased by 56% for coronary artery disease ($p = 0.006$), by 92% for diabetes ($p = 0.005$), and by 60% for cancer ($p < 0.001$). The estimated number of lives saved after a mean follow-up of 7.1 years was 136 per 10,000 gastric bypass surgeries. Rates of death not caused by disease (e.g., accidents, suicide), were reported to be 58% higher in the surgery group than in the control group ($p = 0.04$). Acknowledged limitations to the study include the unknown baseline health status of patients seeking bypass surgery compared to that of control subjects. Also, the risk of death according to the amount of weight lost could not be analyzed as data on weight at time of death was unavailable (Adams, et al., 2007).

Sjöström et al. (2007) conducted a prospective, matched, surgical interventional trial, referred to as the Swedish Obese Subjects study, which involved 4047 obese subjects. Of these subjects, 2010 underwent bariatric surgery (surgery group) and 2037 received conventional treatment (matched control group). A total of 376 subjects underwent nonadjustable or adjustable banding, 1369 underwent vertical banded gastroplasty, and 265 received gastric bypass. For adjustable banding, the Swedish adjustable Gastric Band was used. Outcome measures included weight change and overall mortality during an average of 10.9 years of follow-up. Vital status was known for all but three subjects at the time of the analysis. In the surgery group, participation rates of subjects at follow-up examination at two, 10, and 15 years were 94%, 84%, and 66%, respectively. Corresponding rates for subjects in the control group were 83%, 75% and 87%. The average weight change in control subjects was less than $\pm 2\%$ during the period of up to 15 years during which weights were recorded. At 10 years, the weight losses from baseline were stabilized at 25% after gastric bypass, 16% after vertical-banded gastroplasty, and 14% after banding. There were 129 deaths in the control group and 101 deaths in the surgery group. The most common causes of death were myocardial infarction which occurred in 25 subjects in the control group and 13 subjects in the surgery group. Cr was the most common cause of death from noncardiovascular causes (control group [$n = 47$]; surgery group [$n = 29$]). The main limitation of the study is the lack of randomization, however it is questionable whether randomization is feasible in bariatric surgery trials designed to study mortality. Although study results indicate that bariatric surgery is associated with a reduction in overall mortality, it is undetermined whether the favorable survival effect is explained by weight loss or by other beneficial effects of the surgical procedure (Sjöström, et al., 2007).

Dixon et al. (2008) conducted an unblinded randomized controlled trial to determine if surgically induced weight loss results in better glycemic control and less need for diabetes medications than conventional approaches to weight loss and diabetes control. This study included 60 obese patients with a BMI range of 30–40, recently diagnosed (i.e., < 2 years) type 2 diabetes, and with no evidence of renal impairment or diabetic retinopathy. The surgical group ($n = 30$) underwent laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (LAGB) along with conventional diabetes care and the conventional-therapy group received diabetes therapy with a focus on weight loss by lifestyle change. The primary outcome measure was remission of type 2 diabetes demonstrated by a fasting glucose level < 126 mg/dL [7.0 mmol/L] and glycated hemoglobin [HbA1c] value $< 6.2\%$ while taking no glycemic therapy. Secondary measures included weight and components of the metabolic syndrome. Of the 60 patients enrolled, 55 (92%) completed the two-year follow-up. Remission of type 2 diabetes was achieved by 22 (73%) in the surgical group ($n = 30$) and four (13%) in the conventional-therapy group ($p < 0.001$). Relative risk of remission for the surgical group was 5.5 (95% confidence interval, 2.2-14.0). The surgical group achieved a mean 20% body weight loss at two years compared to a 1.4% body weight loss among the conventional-therapy group

($p < 0.001$). The reduction in metabolic syndrome was significant in the surgical group ($p < 0.001$), but not in the conventional-therapy group ($p = 0.23$). It was noted that although study results suggest that patients who received surgical intervention were more likely to achieve remission of type 2 diabetes through greater weight loss, these results need to be confirmed in a larger study with a more diverse population and an assessment of long-term efficacy (Dixon, et al., 2008).

Buchwald et al. (2009) performed a metaanalysis of 19 studies with 43 treatment arms and 11,175 patients to determine the impact of bariatric surgery on type 2 diabetes in association with the procedure performed and the weight reduction achieved. The included studies reported both weight loss and diabetes resolution separately for the 4070 diabetic patients. At baseline, the mean age was 40.2 years, BMI was 47.9 kg/m², and 10.5% had previous bariatric procedures. Meta-analysis of weight loss was 38.5 kg or 55.9% excess weight loss (EWL). Overall, 78.1% of diabetic patients had complete resolution, and diabetes was improved or resolved in 86.6% of patients. Weight loss and diabetes resolution were greatest for patients undergoing biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch (BPD/DS), followed by gastric bypass, and least for banding procedures. In the studies reporting only diabetic patients, 82% of patients had resolution of the clinical and laboratory manifestations of diabetes in the first two years after surgery, and 62% remained free of diabetes more than two years after surgery (80% and 75% for the total group) (Buchwald, et al., 2009).

Gracia et al. (2009) conducted a retrospective cohort study of different procedures for morbid obesity: open vertical banded gastroplasty (VBG) (n=125), open Scopinaro biliopancreatic diversion (BPD) (n=150), open modified BPD (i.e., common limb 75 cm; alimentary limb 225 cm) (n=100), and laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (LRYGB) (n=115). Mean follow-up was: VBG 12 years, BPD seven years, and LRYGB 4 years. An excellent initial weight loss was observed at the end of the second year of follow-up in all techniques, followed by regain of weight observed in the VBG and LRYGB groups. Patients in the BPD groups maintained weight loss results. Mortality was: VBG 1.6%, BPD 1.2%, and LRYGB 0%. Early postoperative complications were: VBG 25%, BPD 20.4%, and LRYGB 20%. Late postoperative morbidity was: protein malnutrition 11% in Scopinaro BPD, 3% in modified BPD group, and no cases reported either in VBG group or LRYGB group; iron deficiency 20% VBG, 62% Scopinaro BPD, 40% modified BPD, and 30.5% LRYGBP. Conversion to gastric bypass or to BPD was needed for 14.5% of VBG group due to 100% weight regain or vomiting. For those in the Scopinaro BPD group, revision surgery was needed to lengthen the common limb to 100 cm in 3.2% of cases due to severe protein malnutrition. Revision surgery to distal LRYGBP (common limb 75 cm) was required for 0.8% of LRYGBP patients due to 100% weight regain. It was noted that the more complex bariatric procedures increase effectiveness but also increase morbidity and mortality. In the opinion of these investigators, "LRYGB is safe and effective for the treatment of morbid obesity. Modified BPD (75-225 cm) can be considered for the treatment of superobesity (BMI > 50 kg/m²), and restrictive procedures such as VBG should only be performed in well-selected patients due to high rates of failure in long-term follow-up" (Gracia, et al., 2009).

The National Institutes of Diabetes and Digestion and Kidney Disease (NIDDK) has sponsored the Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery (LABS) program. This program involves six clinical centers that have expertise in relevant fields including bariatric surgery, obesity research, endocrinology, epidemiology, and outcomes research. The purpose of the LABS program is to plan and conduct studies that will analyze the risks and benefits of bariatric surgery and its impact on the health and well-being on patients with severe obesity as well as to identify the types of patients who are most likely to benefit from bariatric surgery (NIDDK, 2007).

Reoperation/Repeat Bariatric Surgery

Previous bariatric operative approaches may fail for functional or technical reasons, causing inadequate weight loss or severe complications. The literature indicates that reoperative procedures may be required for metabolic complications of jejunoileal bypass, obstruction, alkaline or acid reflux esophagitis, band erosion, stricture, anastomatic ulcer, or gastric pouch dilatation (may occur following gastric restrictive procedures). In addition, it has been reported that many patients do not achieve adequate weight loss with certain gastric restrictive procedures, such as vertical banded gastroplasty, even when fully compliant with postoperative nutritional and exercise recommendations. In general, up to two years may be required for patients to reach their maximum weight loss following bariatric surgery. Follow-up bariatric surgery, such as conversion to Roux-en-Y, may be proposed when adequate weight loss has not occurred after one to two years following the initial surgery. Although there is no consensus on the definition of "adequate weight loss," bariatric surgery is considered by some experts to be successful when a patient loses at least 50% of excess weight or achieves body weight that is within 30% of ideal. Inadequate weight loss due to patient noncompliance with the postoperative nutrition and

exercise program is not considered a medically necessary indication to undergo revision surgery or conversion to another procedure.

In general, revision surgery due to inadequate weight loss is reserved for those individuals in whom the original surgery was initially successful in achieving weight loss and who, due to the technical failure of the original procedure (e.g., pouch dilatation), have failed to achieve adequate weight loss in the two years following the original surgery. These patients should also have demonstrated that they have been fully compliant with their prescribed postoperative diet and exercise programs.

Reoperation by surgical reversal (i.e., "takedown") or surgical revision of bariatric surgery is generally considered to be medically necessary at any time following the original surgery when the patient experiences complications from the original surgery, such as stricture, obstruction, pouch dilatation, erosion or band slippage. In addition, reoperation for inadequate weight loss is generally considered to be medically necessary if the original procedure was performed at least one year prior to the reoperation date and the patient has not achieved adequate weight loss despite being compliant with postoperative nutritional and exercise recommendations. Conversion from a gastric restrictive procedure to a Roux-en-Y is a common reoperative technique.

Cholecystectomy at the Time of Bariatric Surgery

It has been shown that there is a moderate correlation between obesity and the development of gallstones, with the risk of cholelithiasis rising as BMI increases. Furthermore, evidence in the scientific literature suggests that the rapid weight loss which occurs following certain bariatric surgical procedures increases cholesterol load, thereby increasing the risk for gallstone formation. For these reasons, some surgeons advocate the routine removal of asymptomatic normal gallbladders at the time of bariatric surgery (specifically gastric bypass procedures). It has been suggested that patients undergoing gastric bypass are at a greater risk than with other procedures, such as gastric banding, due to the malabsorption and early and rapid postoperative weight loss associated with this procedure. The issue of performing routine prophylactic cholecystectomy concurrently with bariatric surgery continues to be debated, however. Many experts contend that performing cholecystectomy on nondiseased, normal-appearing gallbladders is not recommended and places unnecessary risk on the patient (Sreenarasimhaiah, 2004; Villegas, et al., 2004). Combining procedures increases operative time and has been reported to lengthen hospital stay significantly (Hamad, et al., 2003). Additionally, many of these individuals who do form gallstones do not develop symptoms that will ultimately lead to the need to remove the gallbladder. O'Brien and Dixon (2003) reported that only 6.8% of patients undergoing laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding developed symptomatic gallstones necessitating cholecystectomy. Rather than surgical removal of the nonsymptomatic gallbladder, some surgeons support the prophylactic use of ursodiol, a bile acid which prevents gallstone formation.

Villegas et al. (2004) attempted to determine the incidence of gallstone formation requiring cholecystectomy following laparoscopic Roux-en-Y. Of the 289 patients studied, 189 patients had no stone formation when examined intraoperatively. Of these 189 individuals, 151 patients had postoperative ultrasounds at six-month follow-up. A total of 33 patients developed gallstones (22%), and 8% had biliary sludge. Only 11 patients experienced gallstone-related symptoms requiring cholecystectomy (Villegas, et al., 2004).

Caruana et al. (2005) reported on a series of 125 patients who underwent Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB) and were not treated with ursodiol postoperatively. These patients had no palpable gallstones at the time of surgery and were followed for at least 16 months (range 16–48 months) after RYGB. Cholecystectomy for symptomatic stones was performed in 4.9% of patients during the first year of follow-up and in an additional 5% of patients within the second year of follow-up. There were no serious complications from the stones or the cholecystectomy. It was noted that prophylactic cholecystectomy would have been unnecessary in 115 of the 125 patients in this particular study group (Caruana, et al., 2005).

Fuller et al. (2007) reported on 144 consecutive patients undergoing RYGB who were routinely screened for cholelithiasis by ultrasound. The mean age was 43 years and the mean BMI was 46 kg/m². A total of 29 patients had a history of prior cholecystectomy. Cholelithiasis was diagnosed preoperatively in 22 of the remaining 115 patients. Of those 22 patients, nine (41%) were symptomatic and underwent concurrent cholecystectomy and RYGB. The remaining 13 patients (59%) had asymptomatic cholelithiasis preoperatively but did not undergo cholecystectomy at the time of surgery. Patients who did not have cholecystectomy were managed with ursodiol for 6 months postoperatively. Only one of these asymptomatic patients subsequently

developed symptoms requiring cholecystectomy at up to one-year follow-up. This incidence did not reach statistical significance ($p=0.59$), suggesting that the relative risk of requiring a cholecystectomy after RYGB in the absence of preoperative symptoms is small (Fuller, et al., 2007).

The published, peer-reviewed scientific literature indicates that the prophylactic removal of a normal gallbladder (i.e., no evidence of gallstones or biliary sludge demonstrated on ultrasound or other diagnostic testing) is not considered medically necessary when performed concurrently with bariatric surgery, including gastric bypass. The impact on health outcomes has not been established through well-designed studies. Cholecystectomy performed concurrently with bariatric surgery is considered medically necessary when there is preoperative or intraoperative evidence of gallstones or biliary sludge on diagnostic study or when there is a recent history of cholecystitis.

Routine Liver Biopsy at the Time of Bariatric Surgery

Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), generally considered a clinically benign finding, is common in the general adult population, with a reported prevalence of approximately 23% in the U.S. It has been estimated that NAFLD can be found in 65% of obese patients (Beymer, et al., 2003). A variant of NAFLD, nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), has been reported to predispose individuals to liver fibrosis, and ultimately, cirrhosis. Often clinically hidden, NASH can be present despite liver function studies within acceptable parameters. Few studies, however, have reported on the role of NASH in obese patients. There is very little information available on the prevalence of asymptomatic liver disease in morbidly obese patients (Beymer, et al., 2003). The exact role of NASH as an independent predictor in advanced liver disease has not been clearly established. It has been suggested that there may be several clinical triggers needed for NASH to progress to advanced liver disease including, but not limited to, type 2 diabetes, high BMI, liver toxins, and alcohol consumption. Liver biopsy is currently used to confirm the diagnosis of NAFLD and to differentiate between NAFLD and NASH. However there are no clear guidelines as to when and in whom liver biopsy is necessary (Duvnjak, et al., 2007).

Dolce et al. 2009 presented a series of 108 patients undergoing bariatric surgery who had routine intraoperative liver biopsy. The aim of this study was to determine the relationship between the intraoperative liver appearance and the histopathologic findings during laparoscopic bariatric surgery. An intraoperative liver visual score was recorded according to the size, tan-speckling, and contour. The liver histologic findings were categorized into 3 groups: (1) normal; (2) bland steatosis; and (3) nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH). The liver visual score was compared with the liver histologic findings. The prevalence of NASH was found to be 23% ($n=25$). Of the 25 patients with NASH, 12 (48%) had normal-appearing livers. Of the 50 normal-appearing livers, 12 (24%) had NASH and 14 (28%) had bland steatosis. The authors noted that the correlation between the general appearance of the liver and the presence of NASH is poor, limiting the sensitivity of selective liver biopsy.

Shalhub et al. (2004) analyzed prospective data on 242 patients who underwent open and laparoscopic RYGB to determine the role of routine liver biopsy in managing bariatric patients. The same pathologist graded all liver biopsies as mild, moderate or severe steatohepatitis. NASH was defined as steatohepatitis without alcoholic or viral hepatitis. Consecutive liver biopsies were compared to those liver biopsies selected because of grossly fatty livers. Selective liver biopsies were performed in 86 of the first 174 patients and routine liver biopsies were done in the remaining 68 consecutive patients. The two groups were reported to have to have similar findings of steatosis, but more patients were categorized as having moderate and severe NASH based on routine liver biopsy compared to selective biopsy ($p<0.05$). Both groups had a similar prevalence of cirrhosis. There was no correlation found between BMI, abnormal liver tests, and the severity of NASH. Study results indicate that liver biopsy is the gold standard for diagnosing NASH. However, additional data from well-designed RCTs are needed to support the need for routine liver biopsy during bariatric surgical procedures.

Some surgeons support the use of concurrent routine liver biopsy in all patients undergoing bariatric surgery. Like prophylactic cholecystectomy, routine liver biopsy in the absence of clinical findings at the time of bariatric surgery continues to be debated. Just what role routine liver biopsy plays in patients undergoing bariatric surgery is not known. Impact on health outcomes has not been established through well-designed clinical trials. At this time, there is not sufficient evidence to support routine liver biopsy in patients undergoing bariatric surgery.

Vena Cava Filter Placement at the Time of Bariatric Surgery

Obesity and general surgery are risk factors for venous thromboembolism. Patients undergoing bariatric surgery are considered generally to be at moderate risk for lower extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT) and pulmonary

embolus (PE) may be the first manifestation of venous thromboembolism (VTE) and is the leading cause of mortality in experienced bariatric surgery centers. Obese patients undergoing bariatric surgery should receive preventive measures in the perioperative period. Early postoperative ambulation and perioperative use of lower extremity sequential compression devices are safe and suggested for all bariatric patients when feasible. Unless contraindicated, chemoprophylaxis using various anticoagulant regimens is an important adjunct to these methods which should be routinely administered to bariatric surgery patients. The possible role of inferior vena cava (IVC) filters remains controversial and recommendations regarding this issues have not been established (ASMBS, 2007). Because of the long-term complications of permanent IVC filters, retrievable IVC filters may be an option for selected patients in whom an elevated risk of thromboembolism is limited to the early postoperative period (Hamad and Bergqvist, 2006)

The evidence evaluating the safety and effectiveness of prophylactic IVC filter placement with bariatric surgery is primarily in the form of small, uncontrolled studies. Trigilio-Black et al. (2007) evaluated IVC filter use for PE risk reduction in high-risk super morbidly obese bariatric surgery patients. In this cohort of patients (n=41) had a mean BMI of 64.2 +/- 12 kg/m² (range 47-105). IVC filters were inserted at the time of bariatric surgery according to the patient's risk factors, including immobility, previous DVT/PE, venous stasis, and pulmonary compromise. No instances of PE were documented, and no immediate or late complications related to filter placement occurred. DVT occurred in one patient, and one patient, with a BMI 105 kg/m², died secondary to rhabdomyolysis. Study limitations include the lack of randomization and small sample size. The authors noted that additional studies are needed to confirm the efficacy of IVC filter placement for PE risk reduction and related mortality in the super morbidly obese.

Obeid et al. (2007) conducted a retrospective study to evaluate whether prophylactic placement of an IVC filter in bariatric patients determined to be at high risk is effective in reducing their risk of PE. A total of 1851 patients were identified as low risk and did not receive an IVC filter. Among these patients, 12 DVTs, 11 PEs, and four deaths occurred. Of the 248 high-risk patients who received IVC filters, three DVTs, two PEs, and two deaths occurred. The difference in the rates of PE was not significant (p=0.69). According to the authors, study results suggest that the use of prophylactic IVC filters reduces the risk of PE in high-risk patients to a rate comparable to the baseline risk of a low-risk group. The study is limited by its retrospective, nonrandomized design.

Halmi and Kolesnikov (2007) reported on 27 of 652 mini-open Roux-en-y gastric bypass (RYGB) patients who were at high risk for PE and received preoperative retrievable IVC filters placed by the interventional radiology two hours before bypass surgery. The mean BMI was 48.7 +/- 4.2 kg/m² (range 38-75). The indications for filter placement were previous DVT/PE, thrombophlebitis, a hypercoagulable state, pulmonary hypertension, an inability to ambulate, a body mass index >65 kg/m², and the presence of severe sleep apnea. Of the 27 filters, 26 were successfully removed during an outpatient procedure 18-21 days postoperatively. No thromboembolic complications occurred in this high-risk group. One retrievable filter was not removed because of prolonged hospitalization secondary to small bowel obstruction. Of the 625 patients who did not receive IVC filters preoperatively, two developed clinically significant PE and seven developed lower extremity DVT. It was noted that additional studies on larger clinical series are needed to prove the effectiveness of retrievable IVC filters in bariatric surgery (Halmi and Kolesnikov, 2007).

The AACE/ TOS/ ASMBS guidelines for the bariatric surgery patient state that “although randomized trials to support this action are lacking, prophylactic vena caval filter should be considered for patients with a history of prior PE, prior iliofemoral DVT, evidence of venostasis, known hypercoagulable state, or increased right-sided heart pressures” (Mechanick, et al., 2008).

There is insufficient evidence in the published peer-reviewed medical literature to support routine prophylactic placement of IVC filters in all patients undergoing bariatric surgery. However, there is some evidence in the form of case series and professional society guidance to suggest that the procedure is appropriate in those bariatric surgery patients who are determined to be at high risk for venous thromboembolism (VTE).

Upper Endoscopy at the Time of Bariatric Surgery

The role of routine upper endoscopy in obese patients prior to bariatric surgery is controversial. The rationale for performing an upper endoscopy before bariatric surgery is to detect and/or treat lesions that might potentially affect the type of surgery performed, cause complications in the immediate postoperative period, or result in symptoms after surgery (American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy [ASGE], 2008).

The American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, The Obesity Society, and the American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery (AACE/TOS/ASMBS) guidelines for bariatric surgery state that all gastrointestinal symptoms should be evaluated and treated before bariatric surgery. According to these guidelines, although it is commonplace for surgeons to perform a routine upper gastrointestinal study or endoscopy to screen for peptic ulcer disease before many other types of surgical procedures, this practice has been questioned for bariatric surgery. After bariatric surgery, upper intestinal endoscopy is the preferred diagnostic procedure for the evaluation of persistent and severe gastrointestinal symptoms (e.g., nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain). In many circumstances, upper endoscopy can also incorporate a therapeutic intervention with transendoscopic dilation of a recognized stricture (Mechanik, et al., 2008).

In 2008, the ASGE issued a guideline on the use of endoscopy in the bariatric surgery patient. Recommendations include the following:

- An upper endoscopy should be performed in all patients with upper-gastrointestinal-tract symptoms who are undergoing bariatric surgery.
- Upper endoscopy should be considered in all patients undergoing Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB), regardless of the presence of symptoms.
- In asymptomatic patients who are undergoing gastric banding, a preoperative upper endoscopy should be considered to exclude large hernias that may change the surgical approach.
- An endoscopic evaluation is useful for diagnosis and management of postoperative bariatric surgical symptoms and complications.

The guideline does not discuss any indications for upper endoscopy performed during bariatric surgery.

Professional society guidance suggests that upper endoscopy is warranted when performed in symptomatic patients prior to bariatric surgery. Well-designed prospective studies are needed to further evaluate the utility of preoperative routine upper endoscopy in bariatric surgery patients. Upper endoscopy performed at the time of bariatric surgery is not supported in the peer-reviewed medical literature, and is not considered medically necessary. .

Professional Societies/Organizations

The American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, The Obesity Society, and the American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery (AACE/TOS/ASMBS) guidelines for bariatric surgery state that the best choice for any bariatric procedure (type of procedure and type of approach) depends on the available local-regional expertise (surgeon and institution), patient preferences, risk stratification, and other factors, with which the referring physician(s) must become familiar. Within the guidelines, the following bariatric procedures are categorized as investigational:

- gastric bypass with laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (LAGB)
- robotic procedures
- endoscopic (oral)-assisted techniques
- gastric balloon
- gastric pacer
- vagus nerve pacing
- vagus nerve block
- sleeve gastrectomy

It is further stated that at this time there is insufficient conclusive evidence to recommend specific bariatric surgical procedures for the general severely obese population. If there is appropriate surgical and institutional expertise available, laparoscopic procedures should be selected over open procedures because of decreased postoperative complications. This approach applies for vertical banded gastroplasty, laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding, Roux-en-Y gastric bypass, and biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch (Mechanick, et al., 2008).

The following are recommended AACE/TOS/ASMBS selection criteria for bariatric surgery:

- Weight (adults): BMI \geq 40 kg/m² with no comorbidities, BMI \geq 35 kg/m² with obesity-associated comorbidity
- Weight loss history: failure of previous nonsurgical attempts at weight reduction, including nonprofessional programs (e.g., Weight Watchers, Inc)
- Commitment: expectation that patient will adhere to postoperative care; follow-up visits with physician(s) and team members; recommended medical management, including the use of dietary supplements; instructions regarding any recommended procedures or tests
- Exclusions: reversible endocrine or other disorders that can cause obesity; current drug or alcohol abuse; uncontrolled, severe psychiatric illness; lack of comprehension of risks, benefits, expected outcomes, alternatives, and lifestyle changes required with bariatric surgery

According to the Society of American Gastrointestinal Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES) guideline for clinical application of laparoscopic bariatric surgery, preoperative weight loss may be useful to reduce liver volume and improve access for laparoscopic bariatric procedures, but mandated preoperative weight loss does not affect postoperative weight loss or comorbidity improvements. Laparoscopic Roux-en-y gastric bypass, gastric banding by vertical banded gastroplasty or adjustable gastric banding, and biliopancreatic diversion with and without duodenal switch are established and validated bariatric procedures that provide effective long-term weight loss and resolution of co-morbid conditions. Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy is validated as providing effective weight loss and resolution of comorbidities to 3-5 years. Laparoscopic revisional procedures may be performed safely, but with more complications than primary bariatric procedures, therefore the relative risks and benefits of laparoscopy should be considered on a case-by-case basis (SAGES, 2008).

The NICE guidance on obesity management in adults and children stated that bariatric surgery is recommended as a treatment option for people with obesity if all of the following criteria are fulfilled:

- the person has a BMI of 40 kg/m² or more, or between 35 kg/m² and 40 kg/m² and other significant disease (e.g., type 2 diabetes or high blood pressure) that could be improved if they lost weight
- all appropriate non-surgical measures have been tried but have failed to achieve or maintain adequate, clinically beneficial weight loss for at least 6 months
- the person has been receiving or will receive intensive management in a specialist obesity service
- the person is generally fit for anaesthesia and surgery
- the person commits to the need for long-term follow-up

Bariatric surgery is also recommended as a first-line option instead of lifestyle interventions or drug treatment for adults with a BMI of more than 50 kg/m² in whom surgical intervention is considered appropriate (NICE, 2006).

The North American Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition states that until more data are available in children, gastric bypass surgery should be considered only for well-informed and motivated adolescents who meet the following criteria:

- severe obesity (BMI \geq 40)
- failure of \geq 6 months of organized attempts at weight loss
- near-complete skeletal maturity
- significant comorbidities that would be responsive to sustained weight loss

Extensive counseling, education, and support are required both before and after gastric bypass. Only a surgeon with extensive experience with bariatric surgery should perform gastric bypass surgery. Finally, adolescents undergoing gastric bypass require lifelong medical and nutritional surveillance, especially during pregnancy (Baker, et al., 2005).

The European Association for Endoscopic Surgery (EAES) issued evidence-based guidelines for obesity surgery in 2004. According to the EAES, adjustable gastric banding (AGB), vertical banded gastroplasty (VBG), Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB) and biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch (BPD/DS) are all effective in the treatment of morbid obesity. There is evidence that the laparoscopic approach is advantageous for LAGB, VBG, and RYGB. Preliminary data suggest that the laparoscopic approach may also be preferable for BPD/DS if surgical expertise is available, but further studies are needed. The report concluded that in terms of excess

weight loss (EWL) percentages, BPD/DS is superior to RYGB which, in turn, yields greater EWL than VBG and AGB. However, the greater degree of EWL resulting from BPD/DS is at the expense of other outcomes (Sauerland, et al., 2005).

The American Gastroenterological Association (AGA) medical position statement on obesity states that surgical therapy is the most effective approach for achieving long-term weight loss. Patients with class III obesity (i.e., BMI ≥ 40), or class II obesity (i.e., BMI 35.0–39.9) with one or more severe obesity-related medical complications, should be considered for surgery if they have been unable to achieve or maintain weight loss with conventional therapy, have acceptable operative risks, and are able to comply with long-term treatment and follow-up. According to the AGA, data from several prospective, randomized controlled trials demonstrate that weight loss is greater with the gastric bypass procedure than with vertical-banded gastroplasty. The laparoscopic approach is associated with fewer postoperative complications, shorter hospital stay, and earlier return to functional life and is the preferred approach in appropriate patients when it can be performed by an experienced surgeon. Malabsorptive procedures, such as BPD/DS or long-limb gastric bypass, usually cause more weight loss than generally observed after gastric bypass. Therefore, malabsorptive procedures should be considered as potential options for very obese patients (i.e., BMI > 50). However, the weight loss efficacy of malabsorptive and restrictive operations has never been compared in a prospective randomized trial (AGA, 2002).

The American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists/American College of Endocrinology (AACE/ACE) states that all obese patients should undergo basic treatment which includes counseling, caloric restriction, behavior therapy, and physical activity. The goal of any basic treatment program is to integrate positive eating and physical activity behaviors into the patient's life. The AACE/ACE recommends programs that actively encourage lifestyle changes and require participation in an ongoing, well-supervised weight-maintenance program. According to the AACE/ACE, surgical treatment of obesity may be considered only in carefully selected patients who are between 18 and 65 years of age with a very high medical risk (BMI >40 or BMI of 35 to 39 with life-threatening or disabling comorbid conditions such as diabetes mellitus, dyslipidemia, hypertension, or serious cardiopulmonary disorders). Suitable candidates should also have no history of alcoholism or a major psychiatric disorder and have a history of obesity for at least five years (AACE/ACE, 1998).

Summary

Certain bariatric surgical procedures have been shown to achieve significant weight loss, as well as to reverse or significantly improve obesity-related comorbidities in a carefully selected subset of morbidly/clinically severe obese individuals, when nonsurgical methods have failed.

Coding/Billing Information

Note: This list of codes may not be all-inclusive.

Covered when medically necessary:

CPT®*	Description
43644	Laparoscopy, surgical, gastric restrictive procedure; with gastric bypass and Roux-en-Y gastroenterostomy (roux limb 150 cm or less)
43645	Laparoscopy, surgical, gastric restrictive procedure; with gastric bypass and small intestine reconstruction to limit absorption
43770	Laparoscopy, surgical, gastric restrictive procedure; placement of adjustable gastric restrictive device (eg, gastric band and subcutaneous port components)
43771	Laparoscopy, surgical, gastric restrictive procedure; revision of adjustable gastric restrictive device component only
43772	Laparoscopy, surgical, gastric restrictive procedure; removal of adjustable gastric restrictive device component only
43773	Laparoscopy, surgical, gastric restrictive procedure; removal and replacement of adjustable gastric restrictive device component only
43774	Laparoscopy, surgical, gastric restrictive procedure; removal of adjustable

	gastric restrictive device and subcutaneous port components
43842	Gastric restrictive procedure, without gastric bypass, for morbid obesity; vertical banded gastroplasty
43845	Gastric restrictive procedure with partial gastrectomy, pylorus-preserving duodenoileostomy and ileoileostomy (50 to 100 cm common channel) to limit absorption (biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch)
43846	Gastric restrictive procedure, with gastric bypass for morbid obesity; with short limb (150 cm or less) Roux-en-Y gastroenterostomy
43847	Gastric restrictive procedure, with gastric bypass for morbid obesity; with small intestine reconstruction to limit absorption
43848	Revision, open, of gastric restrictive procedure for morbid obesity, other than adjustable gastric restrictive device (separate procedure)
43886	Gastric restrictive procedure, open; revision of subcutaneous port component only
43887	Gastric restrictive procedure, open; removal of subcutaneous port component only
43888	Gastric restrictive procedure, open; removal and replacement of subcutaneous port component only
75940	Percutaneous placement of IVC filter, radiological supervision and interpretation

HCPCS Codes	Description
S2083	Adjustment of gastric band diameter via subcutaneous port by injection or aspiration of saline

ICD-9-CM Diagnosis Codes	Description
250.00	Diabetes mellitus without mention of complication, type II or unspecified type, not stated as uncontrolled
250.02	Diabetes mellitus without mention of complication, type II or unspecified type, uncontrolled
278.01	Morbid obesity
401.0 – 401.9	Essential hypertension
414.01	Coronary atherosclerosis of native coronary artery
416.0	Primary pulmonary hypertension
416.8	Other chronic pulmonary heart diseases
997.4	Digestive system complications
V45.3	Intestinal bypass or anastomosis status
V85.35	Body Mass Index 35.0-35.9, adult
V85.36	Body Mass Index 36.0-36.9, adult
V85.37	Body Mass Index 37.0-37.9, adult
V85.38	Body Mass Index 38.0-38.9, adult
V85.39	Body Mass Index 39.0-39.9, adult
V85.4	Body Mass Index 40 and over, adult

Experimental/Investigational/Unproven/Not Covered:

CPT* Codes	Description
43659 [†]	Unlisted laparoscopy procedure, stomach
43843 [†]	Gastric restrictive procedure, without gastric bypass, for morbid obesity; other than vertical banded gastroplasty
43999 [†]	Unlisted procedure, stomach

†Note: CPT codes 43659, 43843, and 43999 may be used to describe bariatric surgical procedures that are not otherwise described by other codes. These procedures are not covered when used to report any of the bariatric surgical procedures indicated as experimental, investigational, or unproven.

***Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®) ©2008 American Medical Association: Chicago, IL.**

References

1. Adams TD, Gress RE, Smith SC, Halverson RC, Simper SC, Rosamond WD, et al. Long-term mortality after gastric bypass surgery. *N Engl J Med*. 2007 Aug 23;357(8):753-61.
2. Alami RS, Morton JM, Schuster R, Lie J, Sanchez BR, Peters A, et al. Is there a benefit to preoperative weight loss in gastric bypass patients? A prospective randomized trial. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2007 Mar-Apr;3(2):141-5; discussion 145-6. Epub 2007 Feb 27.
3. Ali MR, Baucom-Pro S, Broderick-Villa GA, Campbell JB, Rasmussen JJ, Weston AN, et al. Weight loss before gastric bypass: feasibility and effect on postoperative weight loss and weight loss maintenance. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2007 Sep-Oct;3(5):515-20. Epub 2007 Aug 8.
4. Ali MR, Fuller WD, Choi MP, Wolfe BM. Bariatric surgical outcomes. *Surg Clin North Am*. 2005 Aug;85(4):835-52, vii.
5. American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists/American College of Endocrinology (AAACE/ACE). Position Statement on the Prevention, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Obesity (1998 Revision). Revised 1998 Sep. Accessed April 18, 2008. Available at URL address: <http://www.ace.com/pub/pdf/guidelines/obesityguide.pdf>
6. American College of Surgeons Bariatric Surgery Center Network (ACS BSCN). Bariatric Accreditation Program Manual. Version 11.1.08. Accessed Apr 1, 2009 Available at URL address: <http://acsbscn.org/docs/Program%20Manual%20V2.11-1-08.pdf>
7. American Gastroenterological Association. American Gastroenterological Association medical position statement on Obesity. *Gastroenterology*. 2002 Sep;123(3):879-81.
8. American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery. Guidelines for granting privileges in bariatric surgery. Established 2003 Jan; revised 2005. Accessed Apr 18, 2005. Available at URL address: http://www.asbs.org/Newsite07/resources/asbs_granting_privileges.htm
9. American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery (ASMBS). Position Statement on Sleeve Gastrectomy as a Bariatric Procedure. 2007 Jun 17. Accessed Feb 2, 2008. Available at URL address: http://www.asbs.org/Newsite07/resources/sleeve_statement.pdf
10. American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery (ASMBS). Position Statement on Prophylactic Measures to Reduce the Risk of Venous Thromboembolism in Bariatric Patients. 2007 Jun. Accessed Mar 13, 2009. Available at URL address: http://www.asbs.org/Newsite07/resources/vte_statement.pdf
11. Angrisani L, Lorenzo M, Borrelli V. Laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding versus Roux-en-Y gastric bypass: 5-year results of a prospective randomized trial. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2007 Mar-Apr;3(2):127-32; discussion 132-3. Epub 2007 Feb 27.
12. Angrisani L, Di Lorenzo N, Favretti F, Furbetta F, Iuppa A, Doldi SB, et al. The Italian Group for LAP-BAND: predictive value of initial body mass index for weight loss after 5 years of follow-up. *Surg Endosc*. 2004 Oct;18(10):1524-7. Epub 2004 Aug.
13. Angrisani L, Furbetta F, Doldi SB, Basso M, Lucchese F, Giacomelli M, et al. Lap Band® adjustable gastric banding system. *Surg Endosc*. 2003;17:409-12.

14. Anthonie GJ. The duodenal switch operation for morbid obesity. *Surg Clin North Am*. 2005 Aug;85(4):819-33, viii.
15. Anthonie GJ, Lord RV, DeMeester TR, Crookes PF. The duodenal switch operation for the treatment of morbid obesity. *Ann Surg*. 2003 Oct;238(4):618-27; discussion 627-8.
16. Arias E, Martínez PR, Ka Ming Li V, Szomstein S, Rosenthal RJ. Mid-term Follow-up after Sleeve Gastrectomy as a Final Approach for Morbid Obesity. *Obes Surg*. 2009 Mar 12. [Epub ahead of print]
17. Azagra JS, Goergen M, Ansay J, De Simone P, Vanhaverbeek M, Devuyst L, et al. Laparoscopic gastric reduction surgery. Preliminary results of a randomized, prospective trial of laparoscopic vs. open vertical banded gastroplasty. *Surg Endosc*. 1999 Jun;13(6):555-8.
18. Baker S, Barlow S, Cochran W, Fuchs G, Klish W, Krebs N, et al. Overweight children and adolescents: a clinical report of the North American Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr*. 2005 May;40(5):533-43.
19. Balsiger BM, Murr MM, Poggio JL, Sarr MG. Bariatric surgery: surgery for weight control in patients with morbid obesity. *Med Clin North Am*. 2000 Mar;84(2):477-89.
20. Baltasar A, Bou R, Bengochea M, Arlandis F, Escrivá C, Miró J, et al. Duodenal switch: an effective therapy for morbid obesity-intermediate results. *Obes Surg*. 2001 Feb;11(1):54-8.
21. Baltasar A, Serra C, Perez N, Bou R, Bengochea M, Ferri L. Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy: a multi-purpose bariatric operation. *Obes Surg*. 2005 Sep;15(8):1124-8.
22. Bessler M, Daud A, Kim T, DiGiorgi M. Prospective randomized trial of banded versus nonbanded gastric bypass for the super obese: early results. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2007 Jul-Aug;3(4):480-4; discussion 484-5. Epub 2007 Jun 4.
23. Beymer C, Kowdley KV, Larson A, Edmonson P, Dellinger EP, Flum DR. Prevalence and predictors of asymptomatic liver disease in patients undergoing gastric bypass surgery. *Arch Surg*. 2003 Nov;138(11):1240-4.
24. Biertho L, Steffen R, Ricklin T, Horber FF, Pomp A, Inabnet WB, et al. Laparoscopic gastric bypass versus laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding: a comparative study of 1,200 cases. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2003 Oct;197(4):536-44.
25. BlueCross BlueShield Association (BCBSA) Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Newer techniques in bariatric surgery. TEC Assessment Program. Vol. 18, No. 10. Chicago, IL: BCBSA; 2003 Sep. Accessed Apr 16, 2005. Available at URL address: http://www.bcbs.com/tec/vol18/18_10.html
26. BlueCross BlueShield Association (BCBSA) Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Special report: the relationship between weight loss and changes in morbidity following bariatric surgery for morbid obesity. TEC Assessment Program. Vol. 18, No. 9. Chicago, IL: BCBSA; 2003 Sep. Accessed Apr 16, 2005. Available at URL address: http://www.bcbs.com/tec/vol18/18_09.html
27. BlueCross BlueShield Association (BCBSA) Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Laparoscopic Gastric Bypass Surgery for Morbid Obesity. TEC Assessment Program. Vol. 20, No. 15. Chicago, IL: BCBSA; 2006 Feb. Accessed Mar 31, 2006. Available at URL address: http://www.bcbs.com/tec/vol20/20_15.html
28. BlueCross BlueShield Association (BCBSA) Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Newer Techniques in Bariatric Surgery for Morbid Obesity: Laparoscopic Adjustable Gastric Banding, Biliopancreatic Diversion, and Long-Limb Gastric Bypass. TEC Assessment Program Vol 20, No. 5. Chicago, IL: BCBSA; 2005 Aug. Accessed Apr 14, 2007. Available at URL: http://www.bcbs.com/betterknowledge/tec/vols/20/20_05.html

29. BlueCross BlueShield Association (BCBSA) Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Laparoscopic Adjustable Gastric Banding for Morbid Obesity. TEC Assessment Program. Vol. 21, No. 13. Chicago, IL. BCBSA; 2007 Feb. Accessed Apr 14, 2007. Available at URL: <http://www.bcbs.com/betterknowledge/tec/vols/21/laparoscopic-adjustable.html>
30. Bouldin MJ, Ross LA, Sumrall CD, Loustalot FV, Low AK, Land KK. The effect of obesity surgery on obesity comorbidity. *Am J Med Sci*. 2006 Apr;331(4):183-93.
31. Brolin RE. Bariatric surgery and long-term control of morbid obesity. *JAMA*. 2002 Dec 11;288(22):2793-6.
32. Buchwald H, Avidor Y, Braunwald E, Jensen MD, Pories W, Fahrbach K, et al. Bariatric surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2004 Oct 13;292(14):1724-37.
33. Buchwald H; Consensus Conference Panel. Consensus conference statement bariatric surgery for morbid obesity: health implications for patients, health professionals, and third-party payers. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2005 May-Jun;1(3):371-81.
34. Buchwald H, Estok R, Fahrbach K, Banel D, Jensen MD, Pories WJ, et al. Weight and type 2 diabetes after bariatric surgery: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Med*. 2009 Mar;122(3):248-256.e5.
35. Camilleri M, Toouli J, Herrera MF, Kulseng B, Kow L, Pantoja JP, et al. Intra-abdominal vagal blocking (VBLOC therapy): clinical results with a new implantable medical device. 2008 Jun;143(6):723-31. Epub 2008 May 9.
36. Canadian Coordinating Office for Health Technology Assessment (CCOHTA). Issues in Emerging Health Technologies. Issue 79. January 2006. Intra-gastric Balloons: A Temporary Treatment for Obesity. Accessed Apr 11, 2007. Available at URL address: http://www.cadth.ca/media/pdf/401_balloons_cetap_e.pdf
37. Capella JF, Capella R. An assessment of vertical banded gastroplasty-Roux-en-Y gastric bypass for the treatment of morbid obesity. *Am J Surg*. 2002 Feb;183(2):117-23.
38. Ceelen W, Walder J, Cardon A, Van Renterghem K, Hesse U, El Malt M, et al. Surgical treatment of severe obesity with a low-pressure adjustable gastric band: experimental data and clinical results in 625 patients. *Ann Surg*. 2003 Jan;237(1):10-6.
39. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Coverage Decision Memorandum for Bariatric Surgery for Treatment of Co-morbidities Associated with Morbid Obesity. February 21, 2006. Accessed Mar 31, 2006. Available at URL address: <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/mcd/viewdecisionmemo.asp?id=160>
40. Chapman AE, Kiroff G, Game P, Foster B, O'Brien P, Ham J, et al. Laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding in the treatment of obesity: a systematic literature review. *Surgery*. 2004 Mar;135(3):326-51.
41. Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, Cushman WC, Green LA, Izzo JL Jr. The Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. *JAMA*. 2003 May 21;289(19):2560-72.
42. Christou NV, Sampalis JS, Liberman M, Look D, Auger S, McLean AP, MacLean LD. Surgery decreases long-term mortality, morbidity, and health care use in morbidly obese patients. *Ann Surg*. 2004 Sep;240(3):416-23.
43. Clegg A, Sidhu MK, Colquitt J, Royle P, Loveman E, Walker A. Clinical and cost effectiveness of surgery for people with morbid obesity. The National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). 2001 Dec. Accessed Apr 2, 2004. Available at URL address: <http://www.nice.org.uk/Docref.asp?id=28703>

44. Collins BJ, Miyashita T, Schweitzer M, Magnuson T, Harmon JW. Gastric bypass: why Roux-en-Y? A review of experimental data. *Arch Surg.* 2007 Oct;142(10):1000-3; discussion 1004.
45. Colquitt J, Clegg A, Loveman E, Royle P, Sidhu MK. Surgery for morbid obesity. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2005 Oct 19;(4):CD003641.
46. Cottam D, Qureshi FG, Mattar SG, Sharma S, Holover S, Bonanomi G, et al. Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy as an initial weight-loss procedure for high-risk patients with morbid obesity. *Surg Endosc.* 2006 Jun;20(6):859-63. Epub 2006 Apr 22.
47. Cunneen SA. Review of meta-analytic comparisons of bariatric surgery with a focus on laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2008 May-Jun;4(3 Suppl):S47-55.
48. DeMaria EJ, Sugerman HJ, Kellum JM, Meador JG, Wolfe LG. Results of 281 consecutive total laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypasses to treat morbid obesity. *Ann Surg.* 2002 May;235(5):640-5.
49. DeMaria EJ, Sugerman HJ, Meador JG, Doty JM, Kellum JM, Wolfe L, et al. High failure rate after laparoscopic adjustable silicone gastric banding for treatment of morbid obesity. *Ann Surg.* 2001 Jun;233(6):809-18.
50. DeWald T, Khaodhjar L, Donahue MP, Blackburn G. Pharmacological and surgical treatments for obesity. *Am Heart J.* 2006 Mar;151(3):604-24.
51. de Wit LT, Mathus-Vliegen L, Hey C, Rademaker B, Gouma DJ, Obertop H. Open versus laparoscopic adjustable silicone gastric banding: a prospective randomized trial for treatment of morbid obesity. *Ann Surg.* 1999 Dec;230(6):800-7.
52. Dixon JB, O'Brien PE, Playfair J, Chapman L, Schachter LM, Skinner S, et al. Adjustable gastric banding and conventional therapy for type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA.* 2008 Jan 23;299(3):316-23.
53. Dolce CJ, Russo M, Keller JE, Buckingham J, Norton HJ, Heniford BT, et al. Does liver appearance predict histopathologic findings: prospective analysis of routine liver biopsies during bariatric surgery. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2009 Jan 23. [Epub ahead of print]
54. Doldi SB, Micheletto G, Di Prisco F, Zappa MA, Lattuada E, Reitano M. Intra-gastric balloon in obese patients. *Obes Surg.* 2000 Dec;10(6):578-81.
55. ECRI Institute. Surgery in Pediatric Patients (Washington Health Technology Assessment [HTA]). Plymouth Meeting (PA): ECRI Institute Health Technology Assessment Information Service; 2007 August. 117 p. Accessed 2009 Mar 13. Available at URL address: <http://www.ecri.org>
56. ECRI Institute. Health Technology Forecast [database online]. Vagus nerve blocking for obesity. Plymouth Meeting (PA): ECRI; 2009 Mar 5. Accessed 2009 Mar 13. Available at URL address: <http://www.ecri.org>
57. Elder KA, Wolfe BM. Bariatric surgery: a review of procedures and outcomes. *Gastroenterology.* 2007 May;132(6):2253-71.
58. Fernandes M, Atallah AN, Soares BG, Humberto S, Guimaraes S, Matos D, et al. Intra-gastric balloon for obesity. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2007 Jan 24;(1):CD004931.
59. Fielding GA. Laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding for massive superobesity (greater than 60 body mass index kg/m²). *Surg Endosc.* 2003 Oct;17(10):1541-5. Epub 2003 Aug 15.
60. Fielding GA, Ren CJ. Laparoscopic adjustable gastric band. *Surg Clin North Am.* 2005 Feb;85(1):129-40.

61. Fielding GA, Rhodes M, Nathanson LK. Laparoscopic gastric banding for morbid obesity: surgical outcome in 335 cases. *Surg Endosc.* 1999 Jun;13(6):550-4.
62. Felberbauer FX, Langer F, Shakeri-Manesch S, Schmaldienst E, Kees M, Kriwanek S, et al. Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy as an isolated bariatric procedure: intermediate-term results from a large series in three Austrian centers. *Obes Surg.* 2008 Jul;18(7):814-8. Epub 2008 Apr 8.
63. Fobi MA, Lee H, Igwe D Jr, Felahy B, James E, Stanczyk M, et al. Gastric bypass in patients with BMI < 40 but > 32 without life-threatening co-morbidities: preliminary report. *Obes Surg.* 2002 Feb;12(1): 52-6.
64. Fobi M, Lee H, Igwe D Jr, Felahy B, James E, Stanczyk M, et al. Prophylactic cholecystectomy with gastric bypass operation: incidence of gallbladder disease. *Obes Surg.* 2002 Jun;12(3):350-3.
65. Fobi MA, Lee H, Igwe D Jr, Felahy B, James E, Stanczyk M, et al. Revision of failed gastric bypass to distal Roux-en-Y gastric bypass: a review of 65 cases. *Obes Surg.* 2001 Apr;11(2):190-5.
66. Fobi MA, Lee H. The surgical technique of the Fobi-Pouch operation for obesity (the transected silastic vertical gastric bypass). *Obes Surg.* 1998 Jun;8(3):283-8.
67. Fuks D, Verhaeghe P, Brehant O, Sabbagh C, Dumont F, Riboulot M, et al. Results of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy: a prospective study in 135 patients with morbid obesity. *Surgery.* 2009 Jan;145(1):106-13. Epub 2008 Sep 30.
68. Gagner M, Matteotti R. Laparoscopic biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch. *Surg Clin North Am.* 2005;85:141-9.
69. Gagner M, Gumbs AA. Gastric banding: conversion to sleeve, bypass, or DS. *Surg Endosc.* 2007 Nov;21(11):1931-5. Epub 2007 Aug 20.
70. Gastrointestinal surgery for severe obesity. NIH Consensus Statement Online. 1991 Mar 25-27;9(1):1-20. Accessed Apr 2, 2004. Available at URL address: http://consensus.nih.gov/cons/084/084_statement.htm
71. Genco A, Bruni T, Doldi SB, Forestieri P, Marino M, Busetto L, et al. BioEnterics Intra-gastric Balloon: The Italian Experience with 2,515 Patients. *Obes Surg.* 2005 Sep;15(8):1161-4.
72. Gentileschi P, Kini S, Catarci M, Gagner M. Evidence-based medicine: open and laparoscopic bariatric surgery. *Surg Endosc.* 2002 May;16(5):736-44.
73. Goroll AH, Mulley Jr AG, editors. *Primary Care Medicine: Office Evaluation and Management of the Adult Patient.*, 6th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2009
74. Gracia JA, Martinez M, Aguilera V, Elia M, Royo P. Postoperative morbidity of biliopancreatic diversion depending on common limb length. *Obes Surg.* 2007 Oct;17(10):1306-11.
75. Gracia JA, Martínez M, Elia M, Aguilera V, Royo P, Jiménez A, Bielsa MA, Arribas D. Obesity surgery results depending on technique performed: long-term outcome. *Obes Surg.* 2009 Apr;19(4):432-8. Epub 2008 Nov 12.
76. Gravante G, Araco A, Araco F, Delogu D, De Lorenzo A, Cervelli V. Laparoscopic adjustable gastric bandings: a prospective randomized study of 400 operations performed with 2 different devices. *Arch Surg.* 2007 Oct;142(10):958-61.
77. Guedea ME, Arribas del Amo D, Solanas JA, Marco CA, Bernadó AJ, Rodrigo MA, Diago VA, Díez MM. Results of biliopancreatic diversion after five years. *Obes Surg.* 2004 Jun-Jul;14(6):766-72.
78. Guidelines for laparoscopic and conventional surgical treatment of morbid obesity. *Surg Endosc.* 2001 Oct;15(10):1251-2.

79. Gustavsson S, Westling A. Laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding: complications and side effects responsible for the poor long-term outcome. *Semin Laparosc Surg.* 2002 Jun;9(2):115-24.
80. Halmi D, Kolesnikov E. Preoperative placement of retrievable inferior vena cava filters in bariatric surgery. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2007 Nov-Dec;3(6):602-5. Epub 2007 Jun 4.
81. Hamad GG, Ikramuddin S, Gourash WF, Schauer PR. Elective cholecystectomy during laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass: is it worth the wait? *Obes Surg.* 2003 Feb;13(1):76-81.
82. Hamad GG, Bergqvist D. Venous thromboembolism in bariatric surgery patients: an update of risk and prevention. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2007 Jan-Feb;3(1):97-102. Epub 2006 Dec 27.
83. Hamoui N, Anthone GJ, Kaufman HS, Crookes PF. Sleeve gastrectomy in the high-risk patient. *Obes Surg.* 2006 Nov;16(11):1445-9.
84. Hamoui N, Chock B, Anthone GJ, Crookes PF. Revision of the duodenal switch: indications, technique, and outcomes. *J Am Coll Surg.* 2007 Apr;204(4):603-8.
85. Harnisch MC, Portenier DD, Pryor AD, Prince-Petersen R, Grant JP, DeMaria EJ. Preoperative weight gain does not predict failure of weight loss or co-morbidity resolution of laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass for morbid obesity. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2008 May-Jun;4(3):445-50.
86. Hell E, Miller KA, Moorehead MK, Norman S. Evaluation of health status and quality of life after bariatric surgery: comparison of standard Roux-en-Y gastric bypass, vertical banded gastroplasty and laparoscopic adjustable silicone gastric banding. *Obes Surg.* 2000 Jun;10(3):214-9.
87. Hess DS, Hess DW. Biliopancreatic diversion with a duodenal switch. *Obes Surg.* 1998 Jun;8(3):267-82.
88. Hess DS, Hess DW, Oakley RS. The biliopancreatic diversion with the duodenal switch: results beyond 10 years. *Obes Surg.* 2005 Mar;15(3):408-16.
89. Himpens J, Dapri G, Cadiere GB. A prospective randomized study between laparoscopic gastric banding and laparoscopic isolated sleeve gastrectomy: results after 1 and 3 years. *Obes Surg.* 2006 Nov;16(11):1450-6.
90. Holeczy P, Novak P, Kralova A. 30% complications with adjustable gastric banding: what did we do wrong? *Obes Surg.* 2001 Dec;11(6):748-51.
91. Iglezias Brandao de Oliveira C, Adami Chaim E, Borges da Silva B. Impact of rapid weight reduction on risk of cholelithiasis after bariatric surgery. *Obes Surg.* 2003 Aug;13(4):625-8.
92. Inge TH, Krebs NF, Garcia VF, Skelton JA, Guice KS, Strauss RS, et al. Bariatric surgery for severely overweight adolescents: concerns and recommendations. *Pediatrics.* 2004 Jul;114(1):217-23.
93. Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement (ICSI). Healthcare Guideline. Prevention and Management of Obesity (Mature Adolescents and Adults). Jan 2009. Accessed May 12, 2009. Available at URL address:
http://www.icsi.org/obesity/prevention_and_management_of_obesity__mature_adolescents_and_adults__2.html
94. Jamal MK, DeMaria EJ, Johnson JM, Carmody BJ, Wolfe LG, Kellum JM, et al. Insurance-mandated preoperative dietary counseling does not improve outcome and increases dropout rates in patients considering gastric bypass surgery for morbid obesity. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2006 Mar-Apr;2(2):122-7.

95. Jan JC, Hong D, Periera N, Patterson EJ. Laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding versus laparoscopic gastric bypass for morbid obesity: a single-institution comparison study of early results. *J Gastrointest Surg.* 2005 Jan;9(1):30-9.
96. Jones KB Jr. Revisional bariatric surgery: safe and effective. *Obes Surg.* 2001 Apr;11(2):183-9.
97. Karason K, Lindroos AK, Stenlof K, Sjöstrom L. Relief of cardiorespiratory symptoms and increased physical activity after surgically induced weight loss: results from the Swedish Obese Subjects Study: *Arch Intern Med.* 2000 Jun 26;160(12):1797-802.
98. Kim WW, Gagner M, Kini S, Inabnet WB, Quinn T, Herron D, et al. Laparoscopic vs. open biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch: a comparative study. *J Gastrointest Surg.* 2003 May-Jun;7(4):552-7.
99. Korenkov M, Sauerland S, Junginger T. Surgery for obesity. *Curr Opin Gastroenterol.* 2005 Nov;21(6):679-83.
100. Lee WJ, Huang MT, Yu PJ, Wang W, Chen TC. Laparoscopic vertical banded gastroplasty and laparoscopic gastric bypass: a comparison. *Obes Surg.* 2004 May;14(5):626-34.
101. Lee CW, Kelly JJ, Wassef WY. Complications of bariatric surgery. *Curr Opin Gastroenterol.* 2007 Nov;23(6):636-43.
102. Livingston EH. Complications of bariatric surgery. *Surg Clin North Am.* 2005 Aug;85(4):853-68, vii.
103. Malik A, Mellinger JD, Hazey JW, Dunkin BJ, MacFadyen BV Jr. Endoluminal and transluminal surgery: current status and future possibilities. *Surg Endosc.* 2006 Aug;20(8):1179-92. Epub 2006 Jul 24.
104. Mason EE, Renquist KE. Gallbladder management in obesity surgery. *Obes Surg.* 2003 Apr;12(2): 222-9.
105. McNatt SS, Longhi JJ, Goldman CD, McFadden DW. Surgery for obesity: a review of the current state of the art and future directions. *J Gastrointest Surg.* 2007 Mar;11(3):377-97.
106. Mechanick JI, Kushner RF, Sugerman HJ, Gonzalez-Campoy JM, Collazo-Clavell ML, Guven S, et al. American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, The Obesity Society, and American Society for Metabolic & Bariatric Surgery Medical guidelines for clinical practice for the perioperative nutritional, metabolic, and nonsurgical support of the bariatric surgery patient. *Endocr Pract.* 2008 Jul-Aug;14 Suppl 1:1-83.
107. Miller K, Pump A, Hell E. Vertical banded gastroplasty versus adjustable gastric banding: prospective long-term follow-up study. *Surg Obes Relat Dis.* 2007 Jan-Feb;3(1):84-90. Epub 2006 Nov 20.
108. Morino M, Toppino M, Bonnet G, del Genio G. Laparoscopic adjustable silicone gastric banding versus vertical banded gastroplasty in morbidly obese patients: a prospective randomized controlled clinical trial. *Ann Surg.* 2003 Dec;238(6):835-41.
109. Nadler EP, Youn HA, Ren CJ, Fielding GA. An update on 73 US obese pediatric patients treated with laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding: comorbidity resolution and compliance data. *J Pediatr Surg.* 2008 Jan;43(1):141-6.
110. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI). Clinical guidelines on the identification, evaluation, and treatment of overweight and obesity in adults. The Evidence Report. NIH Pub. No. 98-4083. 1998 Sep. Accessed Apr 16, 2005. Available at URL address: http://nhlbi.nih.gov/guidelines/obesity/ob_home.htm

111. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI). The Practical Guide: Identification, Evaluation, and Treatment of Overweight and Obesity in Adults. 2000 Oct. Accessed Apr 16, 2007. Available at URL address: http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/guidelines/obesity/prctgd_c.pdf
112. National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). Guidance on the use of surgery to aid weight reduction for people with morbid obesity. Technology Appraisal Guidance No. 46. 2002 Jul. Accessed Apr 16, 2005. Available at URL address: <http://www.nice.org.uk/page.aspx?o=20>
113. National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). CG43 Obesity: guidance on the prevention, identification, assessment and management of overweight and obesity in adults and children. Dec, 2006. Accessed Apr 12, 2007. Available at URL address: <http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/pdf/CG43NICEGuideline.pdf>
114. National Institutes of Diabetes and Digestion and Kidney Disease (NIDDK). Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery (LABS). January, 2007. Accessed Feb 2, 2008. Available at URL address: <http://win.niddk.nih.gov/publications/labs.htm>
115. Neligan PJ, Williams N. Nonsurgical and surgical treatment of obesity. *Anesthesiol Clin North America*. 2005 Sep;23(3):501-23, vii.
116. Nocca D, Krawczykowsky D, Bomans B, Noël P, Picot MC, Blanc PM, et al. A prospective multicenter study of 163 sleeve gastrectomies: results at 1 and 2 years. *Obes Surg*. 2008 May;18(5):560-5.
117. Obeid FN, Bowling WM, Fike JS, Durant JA. Efficacy of prophylactic inferior vena cava filter placement in bariatric surgery. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2007 Nov-Dec;3(6):606-8; discussion 609-10. Epub 2007 Oct 23.
118. O'Brien PE, Dixon JB. A rational approach to cholelithiasis in bariatric surgery: its application to the laparoscopically placed gastric band. *Arch Surg*. 2003 Aug;138(8):908-12.
119. O'Brien PE, McPhail T, Chaston TB, Dixon JB. Systematic review of medium-term weight loss after bariatric operations. *Obes Surg*. 2006 Aug;16(8):1032-40.
120. O'Rourke RW, Andrus J, Diggs BS, Scholz M, McConnell DB, Deveney CW. Perioperative morbidity associated with bariatric surgery: an academic center experience. *Arch Surg*. 2006 Mar;141(3):262-8.
121. Parikh MS, Laker S, Weiner H, Hajiseyedjavadi O, Ren CJ. Objective comparison of complications resulting from laparoscopic bariatric procedures. *Am Coll Surg*. 2006 Feb;202(2):252-61. Epub 2005 Dec 19.
122. Parikh MS, Shen R, Weiner M, Siegel N, Ren CJ. Laparoscopic bariatric surgery in super-obese patients (BMI>50) is safe and effective: a review of 332 patients. *Obes Surg*. 2005 Jun-Jul;15(6):858-63.
123. Pasanisi F, Contaldo F, DeSimone G, Mancini M. Benefits of sustained moderate weight loss in obesity. *Nutr Metab Cardiovascular Dis*. 2001 Dec;11(6):401-6.
124. Phillips E, Ponce J, Cunneen SA, Bhoyrul S, Gomez E, Ikramuddin S, et al. Safety and effectiveness of Realize adjustable gastric band: 3-year prospective study in the United States. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2009 Jan 18. [Epub ahead of print]
125. Pontiroli AE, Pizzocri P, Librenti MC, Vedani P, Marchi M, Cucchi E, et al. Laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding for the treatment of morbid (grade 3) obesity and its metabolic complications: a three-year study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2002 Aug;87(8):3555-61.
126. Prachand VN, Davee RT, Alverdy JC. Duodenal switch provides superior weight loss in the super-obese (BMI > or =50 kg/m²) compared with gastric bypass. *Ann Surg*. 2006 Oct;244(4):611-9.

127. Rabkin RA, Rabkin JM, Metcalf B, Lazo M, Rossi M, Lehman-Becker LB. Laparoscopic technique for performing duodenal switch with gastric reduction. *Obes Surg.* 2003 Apr;13(2):263-8.
128. Ren CJ, Horgan S, Ponce J. U.S experience with the LAP-BAND system. *Am J Surg.* 2002;184:46S-50S.
129. Ren CJ, Weiner M, Allen JW. Favorable early results of gastric banding for morbid obesity. *Surg Endosc.* 2004;18:543-6.
130. Rendon SE, Pories WJ. Quality assurance in bariatric surgery. *Surg Clin North Am.* 2005 Aug;85(4):757-71, vi-vii.
131. Roa PE, Kaidar-Person O, Pinto D, Cho M, Szomstein S, Rosenthal RJ. Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy as treatment for morbid obesity: technique and short-term outcome. *Obes Surg.* 2006 Oct;16(10):1323-6.
132. Rubenstein RB. Laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding at a U.S. center with up to 3-year follow-up. *Obes Surg.* 2002 Jun;12(3):380-4.
133. Rutledge R. The mini-gastric bypass: experience with the first 1,274 cases. *Obes Surg.* 2001 Jun;11(3):276-80.
134. Safadi BY. Trends in insurance coverage for bariatric surgery and the impact of evidence-based reviews. *Surg Clin North Am.* 2005 Aug;85(4):665-80, v.
135. Salameh JR. Bariatric surgery; past and present. *Am J Med Sci.* 2006 Apr;331(4):194-200.
136. Sauerland S, Angrisani L, Belachew M, Chevallier J, Favretti F, Finer N, et al. Obesity surgery: evidence-based guidelines of the European Association for Endoscopic Surgery (EAES). *Surg Endosc.* 2005 Feb;19(2):200-21. Epub 2004 Dec 2.
137. Schauer P, Chand B, Brethauer S. New applications for endoscopy: the emerging field of endoluminal and transgastric bariatric surgery. *Surg Endosc.* 2007 Mar;21(3):347-56. Epub 2006 Dec 16.
138. Schauer PR, Burguera B, Ikramuddin S, Cottam D, Gourash W, Hamad W, et al. Effect of laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass on type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Ann Surg.* 2003 Oct;238(4):467-85.
139. Schauer PR, Ikramuddin S, Gourash W, Ramanathan R, Luketich J. Outcomes after laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass for morbid obesity. *Ann Surg.* 2000 Oct;232(4):515-29.
140. Schweitzer M, Lidor A, Magnuson T. Bariatric surgery. *Adv Psychosom Med.* 2006;27:53-60.
141. Shalhub S, Parsee A, Gallagher SF, Haines KL, Willkomm C, Brantley S, et al. The importance of routine liver biopsy in diagnosing nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in bariatric patients. *Obes Surg.* 2004 Jan;14(1):54-9.
142. Shekelle PG, Morton SC, Maglione MA, Suttrop M, Tu W, Li Z, et al. Pharmacological and surgical treatment of obesity. *Evid Rep Technol Assess (Summ).* 2004 Jul;(103):1-6.
143. Silecchia G, Boru C, Pecchia A, Rizzello M, Casella G, et al. Effectiveness of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (first stage of biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch) on co-morbidities in super-obese high-risk patients. *Obes Surg.* 2006 Sep;16(9):1138-44.
144. Sjöström L, Lindroos AK, Peltonen M, Torgerson J, Bouchard C, Carlsson B, et al. Lifestyle, diabetes, and cardiovascular risk factors 10 years after bariatric surgery. *N Engl J Med.* 2004 Dec 23;351(26):2683-93.

145. Sjöström L, Narbro K, Sjöström CD, Karason K, Larsson B, Wedel H, et al. Effects of bariatric surgery on mortality in Swedish obese subjects. *N Engl J Med*. 2007 Aug 23;357(8):741-52.
146. Society of American Gastrointestinal Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES). Guidelines for the clinical application of laparoscopic bariatric surgery. 2008 Mar. Accessed Mar 31, 2009. Available at URL address: <http://www.sages.org/publication/id/30/>
147. Solomon H, Liu GY, Alami R, Morton J, Curet MJ. Benefits to patients choosing preoperative weight loss in gastric bypass surgery: new results of a randomized trial. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2009 Feb;208(2):241-5. Epub 2008 Dec 4.
148. Spivak H, Anwar F, Burton C, Guerrero C, Onn A. The Lap-Band system in the United States: one surgeon's experience with 271 patients. *Surg Endosc*. 2004;18:198-202.
149. Spivak H, Hewitt MF, Onn A, Half E. Weight loss and improvement of obesity-related illness in 500 U.S. patients following laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding procedure. *Am J Surg*. 2005 Jan;189(1):27-32.
150. Spyropoulos C, Katsakoulis E, Mead N, Vagenas K, Kalfarentzos F. Intra-gastric balloon for high-risk super-obese patients: a prospective analysis of efficacy. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2007 Jan-Feb;3(1):78-83.
151. Sreenarasimhaiah J. Prevention or surgical treatment of gallstones in patients undergoing gastric bypass surgery for obesity. *Curr Treat Options Gastroenterol*. 2004 Apr;7(2):99-104.
152. Still CD, Benotti P, Wood GC, Gerhard GS, Petrick A, Reed M, et al. Outcomes of preoperative weight loss in high-risk patients undergoing gastric bypass surgery. *Arch Surg*. 2007 Oct;142(10):994-8; discussion 999.
153. Sugerma HJ, Wolfe LG, Sica DA, Clore JN. Diabetes and hypertension in severe obesity and effects of gastric bypass-induced weight loss. *Ann Surg*. Jun 2003;237(6):751-8.
154. Surgical Review Corporation (SRC). © 2009 Surgical Review Corporation. Accessed May 1, 2009. Available at URL address: <http://www.surgicalreview.org/index.aspx>
155. Suter M, Giusti V, Heraief E, Zysset F, Calmes JM. Laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass: initial 2-year experience. *Surg Endosc*. 2003 Apr;17(4):603-9.
156. Thomusch O, Keck T, Dobschutz EV, Wagner C, Ruckauer KD, Hopt UT. Risk factors for the intermediate outcome of morbid obesity after laparoscopically placed adjustable gastric banding. *Am J Surg*. 2005 Feb;189(2):214-8.
157. Tice JA. California Technology Assessment Forum. Duodenal Switch Procedure for the Treatment of Morbid Obesity. 2004, Feb. Accessed April 3, 2006. Available at URL address: <http://www.ctaf.org/ass/viewfull.ctaf?id=6071375849>
158. Trigilio-Black CM, Ringley CD, McBride CL, Sorensen VJ, Thompson JS, Longo GM, et al. Inferior vena cava filter placement for pulmonary embolism risk reduction in super morbidly obese undergoing bariatric surgery. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2007 Jul-Aug;3(4):461-4. Epub 2007 Jun 4.
159. Tucker ON, Szomstein S, Rosenthal RJ. Indications for sleeve gastrectomy as a primary procedure for weight loss in the morbidly obese. *J Gastrointest Surg*. 2008 Apr;12(4):662-7. Epub 2008 Feb 9.
160. U. S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). LAP-BAND® Adjustable Gastric Banding (LAGB®) System - P000008. June 5, 2001. Accessed Mar 21, 2003. Available at URL address: <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/pdf/P000008c.pdf>

161. U. S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data. REALIZE™ Adjustable Gastric Band. - P070009. September 28, 2007. Accessed Feb 2, 2008. Available at URL address: <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/pdf7/p070009b.pdf>
162. U. S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FDA approves implanted stomach band to treat severe obesity [FDA Talk Paper]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Accessed Mar 21, 2003. Available at URL address: <http://www.fda.gov>
163. van Gemert WG, van Wersch MM, Greve JW, Soeters PB. Revisional surgery after failed vertical banded gastroplasty: restoration of vertical banded gastroplasty or conversion to gastric bypass. *Obes Surg.* 1998 Feb;8(1):21-8.
164. Victorzon M, Tolonen P. Bariatric Analysis and Reporting Outcome System (BAROS) following laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding in Finland. *Obes Surg.* 2001 Dec;11(6):740-3.
165. Victorzon M, Tolonen P. Intermediate results following laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding for morbid obesity. *Dig Surg.* 2002;19(5):354-7.
166. Villegas L, Schneider B, Provost D, Chang C, Scott D, Sims T, et al. Is routine cholecystectomy required during laparoscopic gastric bypass? *Obes Surg.* 2004 Jan;14(1):60-6.
167. Weber M, Muller MK, Bucher T, Wildi S, Dindo D, Horber F, et al. Laparoscopic gastric bypass is superior to laparoscopic gastric banding for treatment of morbid obesity. *Ann Surg.* 2004 Dec;240(6):975-82.
168. Weiner R, Blanco-Engert R, Weiner S, Matkowitz R, Schaefer L, Pomhoff I. Outcome after laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding-8 years experience. *Obes Surg.* 2003 Jun;13(3):427-34.
169. Weiner R, Bockhorn H, Rosenthal R, Wagner D. A prospective randomized trial of different laparoscopic gastric banding techniques for morbid obesity. *Surg Endosc.* 2001 Jan;15(1):63-8.
170. Westling A, Bjurling K, Ohrvall M, Gustavsson S. Silicone-adjustable gastric banding: disappointing results. *Obes Surg.* 1998 Aug;8(4):467-74.
171. Westling A, Ohrvall M, Gustavsson S. Roux-en-Y gastric banding after previous unsuccessful gastric restrictive surgery. *J Gastrointest Surg.* 2002 Mar-Apr;6(2):206-11.
172. Wittgrove AC, Clark GW. Laparoscopic gastric bypass, Roux-en-Y-500 patients: technique and results, with 3-60 month follow-up. *Obes Surg.* 2000 Jun;10(3):233-9.
173. World Health Organization (WHO). Methodological considerations for childhood surveillance systems: the case of obesity. 2000. Accessed Apr 17, 2009 Available at URL address: <http://www.euro.who.int/Document/e90617.pdf>
174. Zinzindohoue F, Chevallier J-M, Douard R, Elian N, Ferraz J-M, Blanche P, et al. Laparoscopic gastric banding: a minimally invasive surgical treatment for morbid obesity: prospective study of 500 consecutive patients. *Ann Surg.* 2003 Jan;237(1):1-9.

Policy History

Pre-Merger Organizations	Last Review Date	Policy Number	Title
CIGNA HealthCare	05/15/2008	0051	Bariatric Surgery
Great-West Healthcare	07/28/2006	95.204.06	Bariatric Surgery

“CIGNA” and the “Tree of Life” logo are registered service marks of CIGNA Intellectual Property, Inc., licensed for use by CIGNA Corporation and its operating subsidiaries. All products and services are provided exclusively by such operating subsidiaries and not by CIGNA Corporation. Such operating subsidiaries include Connecticut General Life Insurance Company, CIGNA Behavioral Health, Inc., Intracorp, and HMO or service company subsidiaries of CIGNA Health Corporation and CIGNA Dental Health, Inc. In Arizona, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare of Arizona, Inc. In California, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare of California, Inc. and Great-West Healthcare of California, Inc. In Connecticut, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare of Connecticut, Inc. In North Carolina, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare of North Carolina, Inc. In Virginia, HMO plans are offered by CIGNA HealthCare Mid-Atlantic, Inc. All other medical plans in these states are insured or administered by Connecticut General Life Insurance Company.

Connecticut General Life Insurance Company has acquired the business of Great-West Healthcare from Great-West Life & Annuity Insurance Company (GWLA). Certain products continue to be provided by GWLA (Life, Accident and Disability, and Excess Loss). GWLA is not licensed to do business in New York. In New York, these products are sold by GWLA's subsidiary, First Great-West Life & Annuity Insurance Company, White Plains, N.Y.