

Medical Policy



An Independent Licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

Title: Virtual Colonoscopy / CT Colonography

Professional

Original Effective Date: July 1, 2007
Revision Date(s): December 31, 2009;
October 8, 2010; September 17, 2013
Current Effective Date: October 8, 2010

Institutional

Original Effective Date: July 1, 2007
Revision Date(s): December 31, 2009;
November 8, 2010; September 17, 2013
Current Effective Date: November 8, 2010

State and Federal mandates and health plan member contract language, including specific provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. To verify a member's benefits, contact [Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Customer Service](#).

The BCBSKS Medical Policies contained herein are for informational purposes and apply only to members who have health insurance through BCBSKS or who are covered by a self-insured group plan administered by BCBSKS. Medical Policy for FEP members is subject to FEP medical policy which may differ from BCBSKS Medical Policy.

The medical policies do not constitute medical advice or medical care. Treating health care providers are independent contractors and are neither employees nor agents of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas and are solely responsible for diagnosis, treatment and medical advice.

If your patient is covered under a different Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan, please refer to the Medical Policies of that plan.

DESCRIPTION

Computed tomography colonography, also known as "virtual colonoscopy," is an imaging technique of the colon involving thin-section helical CT to generate high-resolution 2-dimensional axial images of the colon. Three-dimensional images, which resemble the endoluminal images obtained with conventional endoscopic colonoscopy, are then reconstructed offline. CT colonography has been investigated as an alternative to conventional endoscopic ("optical") colonoscopy, specifically as an alternative screening technique for colon cancer. While CT colonography requires a full bowel preparation, similar to conventional colonoscopy, no sedation is required, and the examination is less time-consuming. However, the technique involves gas insufflation of the intestine, which may be uncomfortable to the patient, and training and credentialing of readers may be needed to achieve optimal performance.

POLICY

Virtual colonoscopy / CT Colonography as a test for colorectal cancer is considered **not medically necessary**, except when the patient:

- A. failed to successfully complete a colonoscopy (an inadequate prep does not constitute a failed colonoscopy); or
- B. when a patient is not an appropriate candidate to safely perform a colonoscopy.

Examples of conditions where the patient might not be an appropriate candidate to safely perform a colonoscopy are as follows, but not limited to:

- Known colonic obstruction or stenosing lesions
- Inability to perform colonoscopy because anticoagulant therapy cannot be discontinued
- High anesthesia risk for the patient

RATIONALE

Colon cancer screening prevents morbidity from colon cancer by the detection of early colon cancers and the detection and removal of cancer precursors such as polyps. The detection of cancer and removal of polyps initially or ultimately require an optical colonoscopy. Computed tomography (CT) colonography ("virtual colonoscopy") is an imaging procedure that can identify cancers or polyps. The effectiveness and efficiency of virtual colonoscopy is dependent on its capability to accurately identify cancer or polyps, so that all or most patients who have such lesions are appropriately referred for colonoscopy for ultimate diagnosis and treatment and that polyps or cancer are not falsely identified.

Diagnostic accuracy of CT colonography

The diagnostic characteristics of CT colonography as a colon cancer screening test have been investigated in many studies in which patients who are referred for optical colonoscopy agree to first undergo a CT colonography. Using a second-look unblinded colonoscopy aided by the results of the CT colonography as the reference standard, the diagnostic characteristics of CT colonography and the blinded colonoscopy can be calculated and compared. The sensitivity of CT colonography is a function of the size of the polyp; sensitivity is poorer for smaller polyps. A 2004 TEC Assessment (1) found variable sensitivity and specificity of CT colonography at that time, with many studies showing poor sensitivity. A subsequent meta-analysis of studies that examined the diagnostic performance of CT colonoscopy showed variation between studies but increasing sensitivity for larger polyps. (2) Sensitivity was 48% for detection of polyps smaller than 6 mm, 70% for polyps 6 to 9 mm, and 85% for polyps larger than 9 mm. Characteristics of the CT scanner explained some of the variation between studies. In contrast, specificity was homogeneous (92% for detection of polyps smaller than 6 mm, 93% for polyps 6 to 9 mm, and 97% for polyps larger than 9 mm).

Diagnostic performance of CT colonography is highly dependent on the technology and techniques used. Thus, many of the older studies reviewed may no longer represent currently possible diagnostic performance of the test. A large study published in 2003 showed diagnostic test performance of CT colonography for polyps to be equivalent to that of optical colonoscopy.

(3) Other studies showed variable performance, with 2 large studies showing much lower sensitivity than optical colonoscopy. (4, 5) Results from the largest study of a screening population ($n > 2,500$), the American College of Radiology Imaging Network (ACRIN) 6,664 trial, (6) were recently published and reviewed in a 2009 TEC Assessment. (7)

This study used 16- to 64-row detector CT scanners, stool-tagging techniques, and minimum training standards for interpreters of the test. The results of this study showed 90% sensitivity of CT colonography for polyps 10 mm or larger and 86% specificity; positive and negative predictive values were 23% and 99%, respectively.

The results of the ACRIN trial may have been dependent on the technical standards required for performance of the test and the training and skill of the interpreters of the test. If these practices can be replicated in the community, then it is likely that improved health outcomes similar to those in the trial can be achieved. Standards of performance and interpretation of CT colonography consistent with those reported in the ACRIN trial will be necessary for CT colonography to be an effective screening test.

A meta-analysis published in 2011 by de Haan et al. (8) of diagnostic characteristics of CT colonography in screening populations showed summary sensitivities and specificities that were similar to prior studies. Estimated sensitivities for polyps or adenomas 10 mm or larger were 83.3% and 97.9%, respectively.

The diagnostic accuracy of CT colonography compared to colonoscopy was recently assessed in a study by Zalis et al. in 2012, using a laxative-free bowel preparation technique for CT colonography. (9) For adenomas 10mm or larger, the sensitivity of CT colonography was similar but slightly lower than colonoscopy. For smaller adenomas, the sensitivity of CT colonography was lower than colonoscopy.

Conclusions. There is some variability in the diagnostic accuracy of CT colonography in the literature, this is likely due to the improvement in technical performance over time. The most recent studies have reported that diagnostic accuracy for CT colonography is high and in the same range as optical colonoscopy for polyps greater than 10 mm.

CT colonography in patients with contraindications to optical colonoscopy

CT colonography may also be indicated in patients who have contraindications to conventional colonoscopy or in patients who have incomplete conventional colonoscopy because of colonic obstruction or stenosis. A case series by Yucel and colleagues (10) reported on 42 patients older than 60 years (mean: 71 years; range: 60–87 years) referred for CT colonography because of contraindications to the conventional procedure ($n=12$) or incomplete colonoscopy ($n=30$). Contraindications included anticoagulation therapy ($n=8$), increased anesthesia risk ($n=3$), or poor tolerance for colonoscopy preparation ($n=1$). The most common reasons for incomplete colonoscopy included diverticular disease, colonic redundancy, adhesions, and residual colonic content. Optimal distension of the entire colon was achieved in 38 patients (90%), and 39 (93%) of the patients had abnormal findings. Extracolonic findings potentially requiring further evaluation or treatment were observed in 26 patients (62%).

Impact of CT colonography on health outcomes

There is no direct evidence that evaluates the impact of CT colonography on health outcomes compared to optical colonoscopy. Modeling studies, generally done as part of cost-effectiveness analyses, can provide some insights into the health outcome benefits of CT colonography, as well as provide relevant data on cost-effectiveness.

Given the chain of logic and other underlying evidence that supports the practice of accepted colon cancer screening techniques such as optical colonoscopy, a 90% sensitivity of CT colonography for detection of polyps 10 mm or larger is consistent with an improvement in health outcomes. The 86% specificity of CT colonography would result in some false-positive tests, which, in turn, would result in some unnecessary follow-up colonoscopies. However, compared with optical colonoscopy, there are several other types of health outcomes that may differ in terms of convenience, cost, detection of unrelated health problems, and radiation exposure. These are difficult to quantify and are probably small in magnitude compared to the health benefit of identifying and removing cancer precursors.

As a companion piece to the 2009 clinical TEC Assessment on CT colonography, (7) a 2009 TEC Special Report provided a critical appraisal of cost-effectiveness analyses of CT colonography to inform this policy document. (11) Seven published studies were selected. (12-18)

Two studies completely simulated assumptions that are consistent with current diagnostic capability of CT colonography and recommended practice guidelines. (16, 18) In the study by Zauber et al., (18) colonoscopy was slightly more effective and was less expensive than CT colonography. This was based on a model using 1,000 individuals who were 65 years-old. In spite of a somewhat lower per procedure cost, the strategy using CT colonography was found to be more expensive because CT colonography was performed every 5 years (compared to every 10 years for optical colonography), and patients with polyps 6 mm or larger were referred for optical colonoscopy for polyp removal. In this model, the payment for colonoscopy without polypectomy was \$500 and for CT colonography was \$488. In the study by Scherer et al., (16) the model was based on 1,000 individuals aged 50 years. In this analysis, the only model for CT colonography that was more effective than every 10-year optical colonoscopy was CT colonography every 5 years, with removal of polyps 6 mm or larger. Using these assumptions, this CT colonography approach saved 118.5 lives compared to 116.8 for every 10-year optical colonoscopy; the costs of the two approaches were \$2.95 million and \$1.86 million, respectively. In this analysis, the costs of each procedure were comparable, \$523 for CT colonography compared to \$522 for optical colonoscopy without polypectomy. Thus, the outcomes using CT colonography were comparable to optical colonoscopy, yet the CT colonography strategy was more costly. In this study, a sensitivity analysis showed that when the cost of CT colonography was 0.36 that of colonoscopy, CT colonography became less expensive.

A published cost-effectiveness analysis (19) performed by the same authors as a previously published analysis, (12) but applied to a simulated Medicare-age population 65 years and older, reached similar conclusions as the previously published analysis, which also incorporates the benefits of aortic aneurysm screening. Another cost-effectiveness analysis of several colon cancer screening techniques by Heitman et al. (20) compared several colon cancer screening techniques. This review reported that CT colonography was similar in effectiveness to several other established screening techniques but was more expensive and was, therefore a dominated, or unpreferred strategy.

Lansdorp-Vogelaar et al. (21) conducted a systematic review of cost-effectiveness studies of colon cancer screening techniques and found 55 publications relating to 32 unique cost-effectiveness models. CT colonography was evaluated in 8 models. Although CT colonography was deemed cost-effective compared with no screening, it was dominated (i.e., both more expensive and less effective) by established screening strategies in 5 of the analyses. They found one study in which CT colonography would be the recommended screening strategy at a cost per life-year gained of less than \$50,000.

None of the aforementioned studies included the costs of anesthesia; costs for colonoscopy may be particularly high when anesthesiologists provide pain control. (MPRM policy 7.02.01 concludes that "Use of monitored anesthesia care is considered not medically necessary for gastrointestinal endoscopic procedures in patients at average risk related to use of anesthesia and sedation.")

In general, in these cost-effectiveness analyses, colonoscopy was the more effective screening test. CT colonography was a dominant option (more effective and less costly) only in the 1 study that added CT colonography's benefit of detection of aortic aneurysm and extracolonic cancers. (12) This study also incorporated long-term radiation effects. (12) This benefit of detecting extra-colonic disease was calculated to account for up to 20% of the total health benefit achieved. Most of the benefit was estimated to be from early detection of aortic aneurysms. Screening for aneurysm using ultrasound has been demonstrated to be effective in older (i.e., age 65 or older) men and has been recommended for older male smokers. Screening for the other cancers assumed to be detected has not been shown to be effective. Further research is needed to bolster the data supporting considerable benefit of CT colonography regarding aortic aneurysm, especially in older individuals, and extracolonic cancer detection, as well as the costs and potential health risks of false-positive findings.

Hanly et al. published a systematic review of cost-effectiveness studies of CT colonography in 2012. (22) They concluded that CT colonography is cost-effective compared to no screening. They could not reach a conclusion regarding a comparison to colonoscopy, due to differences in study parameters and assumptions. They note that in early studies colonoscopy dominated CT colonography; that is, was both more effective and less expensive. More recent studies have had variable results, dependent on the threshold for colonoscopy referral and whether the costs and effects of acting upon extra-colonic findings seen on CT colonography are accounted for.

Due to differing assumptions, current studies vary in their evaluation of the comparative costs and effects of CT colonography and colonoscopy with currently available data and practice guidelines. Overall benefit without consideration of costs appears to be similar between the two tests regarding colon cancer prevention. Most studies did not consider the potential benefits of aortic aneurysm detection and extracolonic cancer detection. CT colonography was generally more expensive and in many studies less effective as a screening strategy than colonoscopy, and in other studies only slightly more effective.

Conclusions. There are no long-term comparative studies that directly report on outcomes of CT colonography compared to optical colonoscopy. The determination of comparative outcomes of CT colonography and optical colonoscopy is complex, due to the differing patterns of follow-up associated with each strategy. Studies of cost-effectiveness have modeled outcomes of the two procedures and generally conclude that outcomes are similar, or that optical colonoscopy results in better outcomes. These analyses assume equal participation rates between the two strategies.

Impact of CT colonography on colon cancer screening adherence

Compliance with recommendations for optical colonoscopy is suboptimal. CT colonography has been proposed as an alternative colon cancer screening technique that may improve patient compliance, compared to optical colonoscopy. A literature survey of studies which attempt to determine whether the availability of CT colonography would improve population screening rates found a diffuse literature consisting of survey studies, patient satisfaction studies, and focus group studies. It is unclear how such studies provide a sufficient base of evidence to demonstrate that population adherence to colon cancer screening would improve through CT colonography.

Stoop et al published a randomized controlled trial (RCT) in 2012 that evaluated the impact of CT colonography on colon cancer screening rates. (23) This study was performed in the Netherlands, and members of the general population aged 50-75 years were randomized to an invitation for CT colonography or optical colonoscopy. The CT colonography protocol included a non-cathartic preparation, consisting of iodinated contrast agent given the day before the exam and 1.5 hours before the exam, in conjunction with a low fiber diet. The participation rate in the CT colonography group was 34% (982/2,920), compared to a rate of 22% (1,276/5,924) in the optical colonoscopy group ($p<0.0001$). The diagnostic yield per patient of advanced polyps was higher in the optical colonoscopy group, at 8.7/100 participants compared to 6.1/100 participants for CT colonography ($p=0.02$). However, the diagnostic yield of advanced neoplasia per invitee was similar, at 2.1/100 invitees for CT colonography compared to 1.9/100 invitees for optical colonoscopy ($p=0.56$). These data indicate that the increased participation rates with CT colonography offset the advantages of optical colonoscopy, and that overall outcomes are likely to be similar between the two strategies. It is not known whether the same participation rates would be achieved if CT colonography employed a cathartic preparation, or whether the different preparation regimens affect participation rates.

Conclusions. At least one well-done RCT reports that participation rates are improved with CT colonography compared to optical colonoscopy. The improved screening rate may offset, or even outweigh, any benefit of optical colonoscopy on outcomes. However, the available study used a non-cathartic preparation, and it is not certain that similar screening rates would be achieved with a cathartic preparation.

Summary

The available evidence supports the conclusion that the diagnostic accuracy of CT colonography is in the same range as optical colonoscopy, with a moderate to high sensitivity and a high specificity for larger polyps. As a result, screening with CT colonography may provide similar diagnostic results to screening using conventional colonoscopy. The majority of modeling studies report that the overall health outcome benefits of a strategy that uses optical colonoscopy likely exceed the benefits of a strategy using CT colonography. However, these analyses assume equal participation rates in screening between the two strategies. Participation in screening may be higher with CT colonography than with optical colonoscopy, and this may ameliorate or offset any improved outcomes associated with optical colonoscopy.

A strategy that employs CT colonography is generally more costly than a strategy that employs optical colonoscopy. This increased cost relates to a more frequent screening interval and the need for subsequent colonoscopy for removal of polyps. Thus, for use in colorectal cancer screening, CT colonography is considered not medically necessary when patients are able to

undergo optical colonoscopy. When it is determined at a local level that CT colonography is not more costly than optical colonoscopy, then CT colonography may be considered medically necessary.

For patients who have contraindications to colonoscopy, such as the need for continuous anticoagulation and/or high anesthetic risk, or in patients with an incomplete colonoscopy due to colonic obstruction or stenosis, CT colonography is a reasonable alternative, and therefore may be considered medically necessary.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

The 2008 edition of colorectal cancer screening guidelines released jointly by the American Cancer Society (ACS), the American College of Radiology, and the U.S. Multisociety Task Force on Colorectal Cancer (24) recognizes two types of screening tests: colon cancer prevention and cancer detection. Colon cancer prevention tests detect both early cancer and adenomatous polyps. The cancer prevention options recommended were flexible sigmoidoscopy every 5 years, colonoscopy every 10 years, double-contrast barium enema every 5 years, or CT colonography every 5 years. For cancer detection, three types of fecal screening tests were supported: annual guaiac-based tests, annual fecal immunochemical tests, and stool DNA tests. The ACS endorses colon cancer prevention as the "primary goal of [colorectal cancer] screening" where resources and patient acceptance permit. (24)

In the 2008 clinical guideline statement of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) on colorectal cancer screening, (25) the evidence for CT colonography was judged to be insufficient to evaluate the benefits and harms. This guideline was based on concerns about potential harms of radiation exposure and potential for harm due to evaluation of extracolonic findings.

Given that much of the evidence supporting colorectal cancer screening is indirect, it is not so surprising that consensus groups reviewing the same evidence might come to different conclusions, as have the USPSTF and the ACS regarding CT colonography. Although both groups reviewed the same evidence and similar decision models to reach their conclusions, Pignone and Sox (26) suggest that subtle differences in emphasis may underlie the differing conclusions. The USPSTF is more concerned with the potential unknown effects of radiation exposure and workups for extracolonic findings, taking a more longitudinal perspective. The ACS report concentrates on the capability of CT colonography to detect large polyps in a single screening visit as the principal criterion to determine colon cancer prevention. Thus, the ACS report favors screening technologies with superior single-screening detection characteristics over less sensitive tests that have demonstrated efficacy with repeated screening.

A 2006 statement by ACS and the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer on colonoscopy surveillance after cancer resection recommended that in patients with obstructing colon cancers, CT colonography with intravenous contrast may be used to detect neoplasms in the proximal colon. (27)

A position statement by the American College of Gastroenterology in 2006 (prior to the publication of the ACRIN 6664 trial) also expressed concerns over additional areas of uncertainty such as the radiation risk, interpretation, and management of extracolonic findings, and the cost-effectiveness of CT colonography. (28)

Medicare National Coverage

On May 12, 2009, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services published a decision memo for CT colonography screening (29) that states "The evidence is inadequate to conclude that CT colonography is an appropriate colorectal cancer screening test under §1861(pp)(1) of the Social Security Act. CT colonography for colorectal cancer screening remains noncovered."

CODING

The following codes for treatment and procedures applicable to this policy are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

CPT/HCPCS

- 74261 Computed tomographic (CT) colonography, diagnostic, including image postprocessing; without contrast material
- 74262 Computed tomographic (CT) colonography, diagnostic, including image postprocessing; with contrast material(s) including non-contrast images, if performed
- 74263 Computed tomographic (CT) colonography, screening, including image postprocessing

DIAGNOSIS

- 153.0 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Hepatic flexure
- 153.1 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Transverse colon
- 153.2 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Descending colon
- 153.3 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Sigmoid colon
- 153.4 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Cecum
- 153.5 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Appendix
- 153.6 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Ascending colon
- 153.7 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Splenic flexure
- 153.8 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Other specified sites of large intestine
- 153.9 Malignant neoplasm of colon, Colon, unspecified
- 154.0 Malignant neoplasm of rectosigmoid junction
- 197.5 Secondary malignant neoplasm of large intestine and rectum
- 211.3 Benign neoplasm of colon
- 211.4 Benign neoplasm of rectum and anal canal
- 230.3 Carcinoma in situ of colon
- 230.4 Carcinoma in situ of rectum
- 230.5 Carcinoma in situ of anal canal
- 230.6 Carcinoma in situ of anus, unspecified
- 235.2 Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of stomach, intestines, and rectum
- 555.1 Regional enteritis of large intestine
- 556.0 Ulcerative colitis
- 556.1 Ulcerative (chronic) ileocolitis
- 556.2 Ulcerative (chronic) proctitis
- 556.3 Ulcerative (chronic) proctosigmoiditis

556.4	Pseudopolyposis of colon
556.5	Left-sided ulcerative (chronic) colitis
556.6	Universal ulcerative (chronic) colitis
556.8	Other ulcerative colitis
556.9	Ulcerative colitis, unspecified
558.1	Other and unspecified noninfectious gastroenteritis and colitis, Gastroenteritis and colitis due to radiation
558.2	Other and unspecified noninfectious gastroenteritis and colitis, Toxic gastroenteritis and colitis
558.3	Other and unspecified noninfectious gastroenteritis and colitis, Allergic gastroenteritis and colitis
558.9	Other and unspecified noninfectious gastroenteritis and colitis,
562.10	Diverticulosis of colon (without mention of hemorrhage)
562.11	Diverticulitis of colon without mention of hemorrhage
562.12	Diverticulosis of colon with hemorrhage
562.13	Diverticulitis of colon with hemorrhage
564.1	Irritable bowel syndrome
564.7	Megacolon, other than Hirschsprung's
569.0	Anal and rectal polyp
569.1	Rectal prolapse
569.3	Hemorrhage of rectum and anus
V12.72	Diseases of digestive system, Colonic polyps
V18	Family history of certain other specific conditions, Colonic polyps
V76.51	Special screening for malignant neoplasm of colon

ICD-10 Diagnosis (*Effective October 1, 2014*)

C18.0	Malignant neoplasm of cecum
C18.1	Malignant neoplasm of appendix
C18.2	Malignant neoplasm of ascending colon
C18.3	Malignant neoplasm of hepatic flexure
C18.4	Malignant neoplasm of transverse colon
C18.5	Malignant neoplasm of splenic flexure
C18.6	Malignant neoplasm of descending colon
C18.7	Malignant neoplasm of sigmoid colon
C18.8	Malignant neoplasm of overlapping sites of colon
C19	Malignant neoplasm of rectosigmoid junction
C78.5	Secondary malignant neoplasm of large intestine and rectum
D01.0	Carcinoma in situ of colon
D01.2	Carcinoma in situ of rectum
D12.0	Benign neoplasm of cecum
D12.1	Benign neoplasm of appendix
D12.2	Benign neoplasm of ascending colon
D12.3	Benign neoplasm of transverse colon
D12.4	Benign neoplasm of descending colon
D12.5	Benign neoplasm of sigmoid colon
D12.7	Benign neoplasm of rectosigmoid junction
D12.8	Benign neoplasm of rectum
D12.9	Benign neoplasm of anus and anal canal
D37.1	Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of stomach

D37.2	Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of small intestine
D37.3	Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of appendix
D37.4	Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of colon
D37.5	Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of rectum
K50.10	Crohn's disease of large intestine without complications
K50.111	Crohn's disease of large intestine with rectal bleeding
K50.112	Crohn's disease of large intestine with intestinal obstruction
K50.113	Crohn's disease of large intestine with fistula
K50.114	Crohn's disease of large intestine with abscess
K50.118	Crohn's disease of large intestine with other complication
K51.00	Ulcerative (chronic) pancolitis without complications
K51.011	Ulcerative (chronic) pancolitis with rectal bleeding
K51.012	Ulcerative (chronic) pancolitis with intestinal obstruction
K51.013	Ulcerative (chronic) pancolitis with fistula
K51.014	Ulcerative (chronic) pancolitis with abscess
K51.018	Ulcerative (chronic) pancolitis with other complication
K51.20	Ulcerative (chronic) proctitis without complications
K51.211	Ulcerative (chronic) proctitis with rectal bleeding
K51.212	Ulcerative (chronic) proctitis with intestinal obstruction
K51.213	Ulcerative (chronic) proctitis with fistula
K51.214	Ulcerative (chronic) proctitis with abscess
K51.218	Ulcerative (chronic) proctitis with other complication
K51.30	Ulcerative (chronic) rectosigmoiditis without complications
K51.311	Ulcerative (chronic) rectosigmoiditis with rectal bleeding
K51.312	Ulcerative (chronic) rectosigmoiditis with intestinal obstruction
K51.313	Ulcerative (chronic) rectosigmoiditis with fistula
K51.314	Ulcerative (chronic) rectosigmoiditis with abscess
K51.318	Ulcerative (chronic) rectosigmoiditis with other complication
K51.40	Inflammatory polyps of colon without complications
K51.411	Inflammatory polyps of colon with rectal bleeding
K51.412	Inflammatory polyps of colon with intestinal obstruction
K51.413	Inflammatory polyps of colon with fistula
K51.414	Inflammatory polyps of colon with abscess
K51.418	Inflammatory polyps of colon with other complication
K51.50	Left sided colitis without complications
K51.511	Left sided colitis with rectal bleeding
K51.512	Left sided colitis with intestinal obstruction
K51.513	Left sided colitis with fistula
K51.514	Left sided colitis with abscess
K51.518	Left sided colitis with other complication
K51.80	Other ulcerative colitis without complications
K51.811	Other ulcerative colitis with rectal bleeding
K51.812	Other ulcerative colitis with intestinal obstruction
K51.813	Other ulcerative colitis with fistula
K51.814	Other ulcerative colitis with abscess
K51.818	Other ulcerative colitis with other complication
K51.90	Ulcerative colitis, unspecified, without complications
K51.911	Ulcerative colitis, unspecified with rectal bleeding
K51.912	Ulcerative colitis, unspecified with intestinal obstruction

K51.913	Ulcerative colitis, unspecified with fistula
K51.914	Ulcerative colitis, unspecified with abscess
K51.918	Ulcerative colitis, unspecified with other complication
K52.0	Gastroenteritis and colitis due to radiation
K52.1	Toxic gastroenteritis and colitis
K52.2	Allergic and dietetic gastroenteritis and colitis
K52.89	Other specified noninfective gastroenteritis and colitis
K57.20	Diverticulitis of large intestine with perforation and abscess without bleeding
K57.21	Diverticulitis of large intestine with perforation and abscess with bleeding
K57.30	Diverticulosis of large intestine without perforation or abscess without bleeding
K57.31	Diverticulosis of large intestine without perforation or abscess with bleeding
K57.32	Diverticulitis of large intestine without perforation or abscess without bleeding
K57.33	Diverticulitis of large intestine without perforation or abscess with bleeding
K57.40	Diverticulitis of both small and large intestine with perforation and abscess without bleeding
K57.41	Diverticulitis of both small and large intestine with perforation and abscess with bleeding
K57.50	Diverticulosis of both small and large intestine without perforation or abscess without bleeding
K57.51	Diverticulosis of both small and large intestine without perforation or abscess with bleeding
K57.52	Diverticulitis of both small and large intestine without perforation or abscess without bleeding
K57.53	Diverticulitis of both small and large intestine without perforation or abscess with bleeding
K57.80	Diverticulitis of intestine, part unspecified, with perforation and abscess without bleeding
K57.92	Diverticulitis of intestine, part unspecified, without perforation or abscess without bleeding
K58.0	Irritable bowel syndrome with diarrhea
K58.9	Irritable bowel syndrome without diarrhea
K59.3	Megacolon, not elsewhere classified
K62.0	Anal polyp
K62.1	Rectal polyp
K62.2	Anal prolapse
K62.3	Rectal prolapse
K62.5	Hemorrhage of anus and rectum
K63.5	Polyp of colon
Z12.11	Encounter for screening for malignant neoplasm of colon
Z86.010	Personal history of colonic polyps

REVISIONS

12-31-2009	Updated Description section. In Policy section: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Removed "Virtual colonoscopy/CT colonography as a screening test for colorectal polyps is considered experimental/investigational. Virtual colonoscopy/CT colonography screening for colorectal cancer is considered
------------	--

	<p>medically necessary as an alternative to colonoscopy when the patient has failed a colonoscopy AND the patient is at higher than average risk for colorectal cancer based on one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Personal history of resected colorectal cancer; OR ▪ Prior history of adenomatous polyps; OR ▪ Older unscreened relatives of an individual with newly diagnosed Familial Adenomatous Polyposis (FAP) but who do not have specific genetic evidence or clinical manifestations of the disease; OR ▪ Patients with a genetic or clinical diagnosis of Hereditary Non Polyposis Colorectal Cancer (HNPCC), OR ▪ Inflammatory bowel disease OR ▪ Family history of colorectal cancer or adenomas as evidenced by ANY ONE of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ One first degree relative with colorectal cancer or adenoma diagnosed < age 60; OR ➢ Multiple (2 or more) first degree relatives with colorectal cancer or adenomas at any age; OR ➢ One or more first degree relatives with colorectal cancer or adenoma diagnosed > age 60, or two second degree relatives." ▪ Added the policy liberalization of, "Virtual colonoscopy / CT colonography as a test for colorectal cancer is considered not medically necessary, except when the patient failed to successfully complete a colonoscopy." <p><u>Added Rationale section.</u></p> <p>In Coding Section (effective 01/01/2010):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Added CPT Codes: 74261, 74262, 74263 ▪ Removed CPT Codes: 0066T, 0067T
10-08-2010	<p><u>Updated Policy Language</u></p> <p>In the policy language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Removed "screening" to read "Virtual colonoscopy / CT Colonography as a test for colorectal cancer is considered not medically necessary, except when the patient: ..." ▪ Inserted "A. Failed to successfully complete a colonoscopy (an inadequate prep does not constitute a failed colonoscopy)."; "B. when a patient is not an appropriate candidate to safely perform a colonoscopy." ▪ Inserted "Examples of conditions where the patient might not be an appropriate candidate to safely perform a colonoscopy are as follows, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Known colonic obstruction or stenosing lesions --Inability to perform colonoscopy because anticoagulant therapy cannot be discontinued --High anesthesia risk for the patient"
09-17-2013	<p><u>Updated Description section.</u></p> <p><u>Updated Rationale section.</u></p> <p>In Coding section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Added ICD-10 Diagnosis codes (<i>Effective October 1, 2014</i>) <p><u>Updated Reference section.</u></p>

REFERENCES

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). CT colonography ("virtual colonoscopy") for colon cancer screening. TEC Assessments 2004; Volume 19, Tab 6.
2. Mulhall BP, Veerappan GR, Jackson JL. Meta-analysis: computed tomographic colonography. *Ann Intern Med* 2005; 142(8):635-50.
3. Pickhardt PJ, Choi JR, Hwang I et al. Computed tomographic virtual colonoscopy to screen for colorectal neoplasia in asymptomatic adults. *N Engl J Med* 2003; 349(23-Jan):2191-200.
4. Cotton PB, Durkalski VL, Pineau BC et al. Computed tomographic colonography (virtual colonoscopy): a multicenter comparison with standard colonoscopy for detection of colorectal neoplasia. *JAMA* 2004; 291(14-Jan):1713-9.
5. Rockey DC, Paulson E, Niedzwiecki D et al. Analysis of air contrast barium enema, computed tomographic colonography, and colonoscopy: prospective comparison. *Lancet* 2005; 365(9456):305-11.
6. Johnson CD, Chen MH, Toledano AY et al. Accuracy of CT colonography for detection of large adenomas and cancers. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 359(12):1207-17.
7. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). CT colonography ("virtual colonoscopy") for colon cancer screening. TEC Assessments 2009; Volume 24, Tab 1.
8. de Haan MC, van Gelder RE, Graser A et al. Diagnostic value of CT-colonography as compared to colonoscopy in an asymptomatic screening population: a meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol* 2011; 21(8):1747-63.
9. Zalis ME, Blake MA, Cai W et al. Diagnostic accuracy of laxative-free computed tomographic colonography for detection of adenomatous polyps in asymptomatic adults: a prospective evaluation. *Ann Intern Med* 2012; 156(10):692-702.
10. Yucel C, Lev-Toaff AS, Moussa N et al. CT colonography for incomplete or contraindicated optical colonoscopy in older patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2008; 190(1):145-50.
11. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Special Report: critical appraisal of CT colonography cost-effectiveness analyses. TEC Assessments 2009; Volume 24, Number 2.
12. Hassan C, Pickhardt PJ, Laghi A et al. Computed tomographic colonography to screen for colorectal cancer, extracolonic cancer, and aortic aneurysm: model simulation with cost-effectiveness analysis. *Arch Intern Med* 2008; 168(7):696-705.
13. Hassan C, Zullo A, Laghi A et al. Colon cancer prevention in Italy: cost-effectiveness analysis with CT colonography and endoscopy. *Dig Liver Dis* 2007; 39(3):242-50.
14. Ladabaum U, Song K, Fendrick AM. Colorectal neoplasia screening with virtual colonoscopy: when, at what cost, and with what national impact? *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2004; 2(7):554-63.
15. Pickhardt PJ, Hassan C, Laghi A et al. Cost-effectiveness of colorectal cancer screening with computed tomography colonography: the impact of not reporting diminutive lesions. *Cancer* 2007; 109(11-Jan):2213-21.
16. Scherer R, Knudsen AB, Pearson S. Health Technology Assessment: Computed Tomographic Colonography (CTC). 2008. Available online at: http://www.hta.hca.wa.gov/documents/ctc_final_evidence.pdf. Last accessed April 2013.
17. Vijan S, Hwang I, Inadomi J et al. The cost-effectiveness of CT colonography in screening for colorectal neoplasia. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2007; 102(2):380-90.
18. Zauber A, Knudsen AB, Rutter C et al. Cost-effectiveness of CT colonography to screen for colorectal cancer. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2009.

19. Pickhardt PJ, Hassan C, Laghi A et al. CT colonography to screen for colorectal cancer and aortic aneurysm in the Medicare population: cost-effectiveness analysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2009; 192(5):1332-40.
20. Heitman SJ, Hilsden RJ, Au F et al. Colorectal cancer screening for average-risk North Americans: an economic evaluation. *PLoS Med* 2010; 7(11):e1000370.
21. Lansdorp-Vogelaar I, Knudsen AB, Brenner H. Cost-effectiveness of colorectal cancer screening. *Epidemiol Rev* 2011; 33(1):88-100.
22. Hanly P, Skally M, Fenlon H et al. Cost-effectiveness of computed tomography colonography in colorectal cancer screening: a systematic review. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2012; 28(4):415-23.
23. Stoop EM, de Haan MC, de Wijkerslooth TR et al. Participation and yield of colonoscopy versus non-cathartic CT colonography in population-based screening for colorectal cancer: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2012; 13(1):55-64.
24. Levin B, Lieberman DA, McFarland BACSCCAGUSM-STFACoRCCC et al. Screening and surveillance for the early detection of colorectal cancer and adenomatous polyps, 2008: a joint guideline from the American Cancer Society, the US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer, and the American College of Radiology. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2008; 58(3):130-60.
25. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Screening for colorectal cancer: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation. *Ann Intern Med* 2008; 149(9):627-37.
26. Pignone M, Sox HC. Screening guidelines for colorectal cancer: a twice-told tale. *Ann Intern Med* 2008; 149(9):680-2.
27. Rex DK, Kahi CJ, Levin B et al. Guidelines for colonoscopy surveillance after cancer resection: a consensus update by the American Cancer Society and US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2006; 56(3):160-7.
28. Rex DK, Lieberman D. ACG colorectal cancer prevention action plan: update on CT-colonography. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2006; 101(7):1410-3.
29. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Decision memo for screening computed tomography colonography (CTC) for colorectal cancer (CAG-00396N).

Other References:

1. Radiology Liaison Committee February 28, 2007 and Medical Advisory Committee April 19, 2007.
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Radiology Liaison Committee, February 2008.
3. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Medical Advisory Committee, April 2008.
4. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Radiology Liaison Committee, February 2009.
5. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Radiology Liaison Committee, February 2010.
6. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Medical Advisory Committee, April 2010.
7. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Board of Directors, May 2010.