Policy Statement

I. Computer-assisted corneal topography is considered investigational to detect or monitor diseases of the cornea.

NOTE: Refer to Appendix A to see the policy statement changes (if any) from the previous version.

Policy Guidelines

There is a specific CPT code for computer-assisted corneal topography:

- 92025: Computerized corneal topography, unilateral or bilateral, with interpretation and report

Non-computer-assisted corneal topography should be considered inclusive to evaluation and management services. Non-computer-assisted corneal topography is considered part of the evaluation and management services of general ophthalmologic services (CPT codes 92002–92014), and therefore this service should not be billed separately. There is no separate CPT code for this type of corneal topography.

Description

Computer-assisted corneal topography (also called photokeratoscopy or videokeratography) provides a quantitative measure of corneal curvature. Measurement of corneal topography is being evaluated to aid the diagnosis of and follow-up for corneal disorders such as keratoconus, difficult contact lens fits, and pre- and postoperative assessment of the cornea, most commonly after refractive surgery.

Related Policies

- Corneal Collagen Cross-Linking
- Implantation of Intrastromal Corneal Ring Segments

Benefit Application

Benefit determinations should be based in all cases on the applicable contract language. To the extent there are any conflicts between these guidelines and the contract language, the contract language will control. 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.

Some state or federal mandates (e.g., Federal Employee Program [FEP]) prohibits plans from denying Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved technologies as investigational. In these instances, plans may have to consider the coverage eligibility of FDA-approved technologies on the basis of medical necessity alone.
Regulatory Status

A number of devices have been cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration through the 510(k) process. In 1999, the Orbscan® (manufactured by Orbtek, distributed by Bausch and Lomb) was cleared by the Food and Drug Administration. The second-generation Orbscan II is a hybrid system that uses both projective (slit scanning) and reflective (Placido) methods. The Pentacam® (Oculus) is one of a number of rotating Scheimpflug imaging systems produced in Germany. In 2005, the Pentacam HR was released with a newly designed high-resolution camera and improved optics. Food and Drug Administration product code: MXK.

Table 1. Corneal Topography Devices Clearing by the US Food and Drug Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Date Cleared</th>
<th>510(k) No.</th>
<th>Indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VX130 Ophthalmic Diagnostic Device</td>
<td>LUNEAU SAS</td>
<td>4/24/2017</td>
<td>K162067</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentacam AXL</td>
<td>OCULUS OPTIKGERATE GMBH</td>
<td>1/20/2016</td>
<td>K152311</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGOS</td>
<td>SANTEC CORPORATION</td>
<td>10/2/2015</td>
<td>K150754</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEGRO Oculyzer</td>
<td>WAVELIGHT AG</td>
<td>7/20/2007</td>
<td>K071183</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIDELBERG ENGINEERING SLITLAMP-OCT (SL-OCT) CM 3910 ROTATING DOUBLE SCHEIMPFLUG CAMERA</td>
<td>HEIDELBERG ENGINEERING</td>
<td>1/13/2006</td>
<td>K052935</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHFINDER</td>
<td>MASSIE RESEARCH LABORATORIES INC.</td>
<td>9/2/2004</td>
<td>K031788</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGDI (NEXT GENERATION DIAGNOSTIC INSTRUMENT)</td>
<td>BAUSCH &amp; LOMB</td>
<td>7/23/2004</td>
<td>K040913</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTACAM SCHEIMPFLUG CAMERA</td>
<td>OCULUS OPTIKGERATE GMBH</td>
<td>9/16/2003</td>
<td>K030719</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTERIOR EYE-SEGMENT ANALYSIS SYSTEM</td>
<td>NIDEK INC.</td>
<td>8/6/1999</td>
<td>K991284</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORBSCAN</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGIS PERFECT VISION GMBH</td>
<td>3/5/1999</td>
<td>K984443</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VX130 Ophthalmic Diagnostic Device</td>
<td>LUNEAU SAS</td>
<td>4/24/2017</td>
<td>K162067</td>
<td>To scan, map and display the geometry of the anterior segment of the eye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale

Background
Detection and Monitoring Diseases of the Cornea

Reproduction without authorization from Blue Shield of California is prohibited
Corneal topography describes measurements of the curvature of the cornea. An evaluation of corneal topography is necessary for the accurate diagnosis and follow-up of certain corneal disorders, such as keratoconus, difficult contact lens fits, and pre- and postoperative assessment of the cornea, most commonly after refractive surgery.

Assessing corneal topography is a part of the standard ophthalmologic examination of some patients. Corneal topography can be evaluated and determined in multiple ways. Computer-assisted corneal topography has been used for early identification and quantitative documentation of the progression of keratoconic corneas, and evidence is sufficient to indicate that computer-assisted topographic mapping can detect and monitor disease.

Various techniques and instruments are available to measure corneal topography: keratometer, keratoscope, and computer-assisted photokeratoscopy.

The keratometer (also referred to as an ophthalmometer), the most commonly used instrument, projects an illuminated image onto a central area in the cornea. By measuring the distance between a pair of reflected points in both of the cornea’s 2 principal meridians, the keratometer can estimate the radius of curvature of 2 meridians. Limitations of this technique include the fact that the keratometer can only estimate the corneal curvature over a small percentage of its surface and that estimates are based on the frequently incorrect assumption that the cornea is spherical.

The keratoscope reflects a series of concentric circular rings off the anterior corneal surface. Visual inspection of the shape and spacing of the concentric rings provides a qualitative assessment of topography.

A photokeratoscope is a keratoscope equipped with a camera that can provide a permanent record of the corneal topography. Computer-assisted photokeratoscopy is an alternative to keratometry or keratoscopy for measuring corneal curvature. This technique uses sophisticated image analysis programs to provide quantitative corneal topographic data. Early computer-based programs were combined with keratoscopy to create graphic displays and high-resolution, color-coded maps of the corneal surface. Newer technologies measure both curvature and shape, enabling quantitative assessment of corneal depth, elevation, and power.

**Literature Review**

Evidence reviews assess whether a medical test is clinically useful. A useful test provides information to make a clinical management decision that improves the net health outcome. That is, the balance of benefits and harms is better when the test is used to manage the condition than when another test or no test is used to manage the condition.

The first step in assessing a medical test is to formulate the clinical context and purpose of the test. The test must be technically reliable, clinically valid, and clinically useful for that purpose. Evidence reviews assess the evidence on whether a test is clinically valid and clinically useful. Technical reliability is outside the scope of these reviews, and credible information on technical reliability is available from other sources.

Promotion of greater diversity and inclusion in clinical research of historically marginalized groups (e.g., People of Color [African-American, Asian, Black, Latino and Native American]; LGBTQIA [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual]; Women; and People with Disabilities [Physical and Invisible]) allows policy populations to be more reflective of and findings more applicable to our diverse members. While we also strive to use inclusive language related to these groups in our policies, use of gender-specific nouns (e.g., women, men, sisters, etc.) will continue when reflective of language used in publications describing study populations.
Computer-Assisted Corneal Topography/Photokeratoscopy

Clinical Context and Test Purpose

The purpose of computer-assisted corneal topography/photokeratoscopy is to provide a diagnostic option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies, such as manual corneal topography measurements, in patients with disorders of corneal topography.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

**Populations**
The relevant population of interest is individuals with disorders of corneal topography.

**Interventions**
The test being considered is computer-assisted corneal topography/photokeratoscopy.

**Comparators**
Comparators of interest include manual corneal topography measurements.

**Outcomes**
The general outcomes of interest are test accuracy, other test performance measures, and functional outcomes.

Identifying clinically validity and usefulness requires short-term follow-up. Evaluating functional outcomes may require longer follow-up.

Study Selection Criteria
Below are selection criteria for studies to assess whether a test is clinically valid.

- The study population represents the population of interest. Eligibility and selection are described.
- The test is compared with a credible reference standard.
- If the test is intended to replace or be an adjunct to an existing test, it should also be compared with that test.
- Studies should report sensitivity, specificity, and predictive values. Studies that completely report true- and false-positive results are ideal. Studies reporting other measures (e.g., receiver operating characteristic, area under receiver operating characteristic, c-statistic, likelihood ratios) may be included but are less informative.
- Studies should also report reclassification of diagnostic or risk category.

Review of Evidence

Clinically Valid
A test must detect the presence or absence of a condition, the risk of developing a condition in the future, or treatment response (beneficial or adverse).

Martinez-Abad et al (2017) sought to determine whether 3 vector parameters, ocular residual astigmatism, topography disparity, and corneal topographic astigmatism (anterior and total), could serve to detect clinical and subclinical keratoconus.\(^3\) One hundred eighty eyes were studied in this retrospective comparative study: 61 eyes (38 patients) with keratoconus, 19 eyes (16 patients) with subclinical keratoconus, and a control group of 100 healthy eyes. All study participants underwent a thorough eye exam; further, software was used (iASSORT) to calculate ocular residual astigmatism, topography disparity, and corneal topographic astigmatism. Using a receiver operating characteristic curve analysis, the diagnostic capabilities of the 3 parameters were measured; to further assess diagnostic ability, a cutoff was determined that correlated to the highest sensitivity and specificity of the curve. Results showed that ocular residual astigmatism and topography disparity had good diagnostic capability to detect keratoconus (ocular residual astigmatism: cutoff,
1.255 diopters; sensitivity: 82%; specificity: 92%; and topography disparity: cutoff, 1.035 diopters; sensitivity, 78.5%; specificity, 86%). Corneal topographic astigmatism did not show potential as a diagnostic tool.

**Section Summary: Clinically Valid**

One study has been identified evaluating computer-assisted corneal topography as a clinically valid solution for diagnosing disorders of corneal topography. Authors concluded that topography disparity and ocular residual astigmatism, 2 vector parameters that could serve to detect clinical and subclinical keratoconus, were beneficial tools for detecting the disorder.

**Clinically Useful**

A test is clinically useful if use of the results informs management decisions that improve the net health outcome of care. The net health outcome can be improved if patients receive correct therapy, more effective therapy, or avoid unnecessary therapy or testing.

**Direct Evidence**

Direct evidence of clinical utility is provided by studies that have compared health outcomes for patients managed with and without the test. Because these are intervention studies, the preferred evidence would be from randomized controlled trials.

**Contact Lens Fitting**

In a study of computer-assisted corneal topography, Bhatoa et al (2010) assessed the design of gas-permeable contact lens in 30 patients with keratoconus who were recruited in 2005 and 2006. The report indicated that the subjects were consecutive, although patients whose topographic plots could not be used were excluded (number not described). The fit of the new lens was compared with the fit of the patient’s habitual lens (randomized order on the same day). Clinical evaluation showed a good fit (no or minor modification needed) for more than 90% of the computer-designed lens. However, the progression of keratoconus caused a bias favoring the most recently fitted lens, confounding comparison between the new computer-designed lens and the patient’s habitual lens. Trial design and reporting limitations limit conclusions that can be drawn from this study.

Weber et al (2016) reported on a prospective, observational study evaluating the association between computer-assisted corneal topography measurements (Pentacam) and scleral contact lens fit. The study included 47 patients (63 eyes) with a variety of indications for scleral contact lenses, most commonly (n=24 eyes) keratoconus. Pentacam measurements correlated with a subset of the scleral contact lens parameters (corneal astigmatism, anterior chamber depth, and corneal height; p<.001, not adjusted for multiple comparisons) for the group as a whole.

DeNaeyer et al (2017) investigated the use of the sMap3DTM system (Precision Ocular Metrology), which measures the surface of the eye for patients in need of a scleral contact lens fitting. The sMap3D captures a series of images to produce a single, wide-field topographic “stitched” image of all captured images. To create these images, the patient is asked to provide several “gazes” (gaze up, gaze down, gaze straight). Twenty-five eyes (23 patients) were examined using the sMap3D. The “stitched” image produced by the sMap3D was then compared with the single captured straight-gaze image. At a diameter of 10 mm from the corneal center, both straight-gaze image and the sMap3D-stitched image displayed 100% coverage of the eye. However, at 14 mm, the straight-gaze image only mapped 68% of the eye; at 15 mm, 53%; at 16 mm, 39%, and at 20 mm, 6%. For the stitched image produced by sMap3D, coverage was: at 14 mm, 98%; at 15 mm, 96%; at 16 mm, 93%; and at 20 mm, 32%. While there was a significant drop off in coverage between 16 mm and 20 mm for the sMap3D image, the stitched image was considerably more accurate than the straight-gaze image. Tables 2 and 3 provide a summary of the above study characteristics and results.

Bandlitz et al (2017) studied the profile of the limbal sclera in 8 meridians by using spectral domain optical coherence tomography and a confocal scanning laser ophthalmoscope. The objective of this study...
study was to evaluate the relationship between central corneal radii, corneal eccentricity, and scleral radii to improve soft and scleral contact lenses. The limbal scleral radii of 30 subjects were measured. Eight meridians, each 45° apart, were scanned, and it was determined that corneal eccentricity and scleral radii did not correlate in any of the meridians. The authors concluded that the independence between meridians might prove useful in fitting soft and scleral contact lenses.

Table 2. Summary of Key Study Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Treatment 1</th>
<th>Treatment 2</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weber et al (2016)⁵</td>
<td>Prospective, observational</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Patients with a variety of indications for scleral contact lenses (N =47 patients, 63 eyes)</td>
<td>Pentacam derived topography variables for SCL fit</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeNaeyer et al (2017)⁶</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Patients presenting for scleral lens fitting (N =23 patients, 25 eyes)</td>
<td>sMap3D stitched imaging</td>
<td>Straight-gaze imaging</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA: not applicable; NR: not reported; RGP: rigid gas permeable; SCL: scleral contact lens; U.K.: United Kingdom; U.S.: United States.

Table 3. Summary of Key Study Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Agreement Levels between Techniques</th>
<th>Correlations between SCL Parameters and ACD and Hm</th>
<th>Eye Coverage at 10, 14, 16, and 20 mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhatoa et al (2010)⁴</td>
<td>74% to 100%</td>
<td>p&lt;.001, each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber et al (2016)⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeNaeyer et al (2017)⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight-gaze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%, 68%, 39%, 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stitched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%, 98%, 93%, 32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACD: anterior chamber depth; Hm: Pentacam-measured corneal height; SCL: scleral contact lens.

Corneal Astigmatism Measurements for Toric Intraocular Lens Implantation

Lee et al (2012) reported on a prospective comparative study of 6 methods for measuring corneal astigmatism to guide toric intraocular lens implantation.⁸ Astigmatism was evaluated in 257 eyes (141 patients) using manual keratometry, auto keratometry, partial coherence interferometry (IOLMaster®), ray-tracing aberrometry (iTrace®), scanning-slit topography (Orbscan), and Scheimpflug imaging (Pentacam). Each instrument’s measurements were masked to the results for the other instruments. The study found no significant difference between instruments, indicating no advantage to computerized corneal topography over manual keratometry.

De Sanctis et al (2017) reported on corneal astigmatism in patients seeking toric intraocular lens implantation.⁹ The authors compared 2 methods for measuring corneal astigmatism: (1) corneal astigmatism total corneal refractive power, which uses a ray-tracing method that sends light through the cornea; and (2) corneal astigmatism simulated keratometry, which is a surface-based exterior measurement that measures the steep radius of the anterior cornea. Both methods relied on
the camera system (Pentacam HR) to calculate vector differences. Of 200 patients, 77 (60 eyes) remained for intraocular lens implantation. For a patient to qualify for toric intraocular lens implantation, corneal astigmatism had to be greater than 1 diopter. Using corneal astigmatism total corneal refractive power, 17 eyes were found with greater than 1 diopter; using corneal astigmatism simulated keratometry, 13 eyes were found with greater than 1 diopter. However, of the 77 intraocular lens implantation candidates, the corneal astigmatism simulated keratometry method assessed 17 patients to have corneal astigmatism less than or equal to 1 diopter. Moreover, the corneal astigmatism simulated keratometry method found 13 of 123 patients who were not candidates for implantation to have astigmatism greater than 1 diopter. This difference suggested potential issues with patient selection criteria.

**Chain of Evidence**

Indirect evidence on clinical utility rests on clinical validity. As the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

A chain of evidence would demonstrate that computer-assisted corneal topography can identify individuals with disorders of corneal topography who would not otherwise be identified, that treatments are available for these patients that would not otherwise be given to patients with disorders of corneal topography, and that these treatments improve health outcomes. Therefore, a chain of evidence cannot be created for clinical utility.

**Section Summary: Clinically Useful**

Direct evidence for the clinical usefulness of computer-assisted corneal topography in diagnosing those with disorders of corneal topography is lacking. A chain of evidence for clinical validity provides a chain of evidence on clinical usefulness of this testing.

**Supplemental Information**

The purpose of the following information is to provide reference material. Inclusion does not imply endorsement or alignment with the evidence review conclusions.

**Practice Guidelines and Position Statements**

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in ‘Supplemental Information if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

**American Academy of Ophthalmology**

A 1999 American Academy of Ophthalmology (AAO) assessment indicated that computer-assisted corneal topography evolved from the need to measure corneal curvature and topography more comprehensively and accurately than keratometry and that corneal topography is used primarily for refractive surgery. The corneal astigmatism simulated keratometry AAO assessment indicated several other potential uses: (1) to evaluate and manage patients following penetrating keratoplasty, (2) to plan astigmatic surgery, (3) to evaluate patients with unexplained visual loss and document visual complications, and (4) to fit contact lenses. However, the corneal astigmatism simulated keratometry AAO assessment noted the lack of data supporting the use of objective measurements (as opposed to subjective determinants, like subjective refraction) of astigmatism.

**U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations**

Not applicable.

**Medicare National Coverage**

There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.
Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
A search of ClinicalTrials.gov in January 2023 did not identify any ongoing or unpublished trials that would likely influence this review.
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Documentation for Clinical Review
- No records required

Coding

This Policy relates only to the services or supplies described herein. Benefits may vary according to product design; therefore, contract language should be reviewed before applying the terms of the Policy.

The following codes are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Policy Statements are intended to provide member coverage information and may include the use of some codes for clarity. The Policy Guidelines section may also provide additional information for how to interpret the Policy Statements and to provide coding guidance in some cases.
### CPT Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPT*</td>
<td>92002</td>
<td>Ophthalmological services: medical examination and evaluation with initiation of diagnostic and treatment program; intermediate, new patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT*</td>
<td>92004</td>
<td>Ophthalmological services: medical examination and evaluation with initiation of diagnostic and treatment program; comprehensive, new patient, 1 or more visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT*</td>
<td>92012</td>
<td>Ophthalmological services: medical examination and evaluation, with initiation or continuation of diagnostic and treatment program; intermediate, established patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT*</td>
<td>92014</td>
<td>Ophthalmological services: medical examination and evaluation, with initiation or continuation of diagnostic and treatment program; comprehensive, established patient, 1 or more visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPCS</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Computerized corneal topography, unilateral or bilateral, with interpretation and report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy History

This section provides a chronological history of the activities, updates and changes that have occurred with this Medical Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/31/2015</td>
<td>BCBSA Medical Policy adoption</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2016</td>
<td>Policy revision without position change</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2017</td>
<td>Policy revision without position change</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2018</td>
<td>Policy revision without position change</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2019</td>
<td>Policy revision without position change</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/2023</td>
<td>Policy reactivated. Previously archived from 05/01/2020 to 05/31/2023.</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definitions of Decision Determinations

**Medically Necessary:** Services that are Medically Necessary include only those which have been established as safe and effective, are furnished under generally accepted professional standards to treat illness, injury or medical condition, and which, as determined by Blue Shield, are: (a) consistent with Blue Shield medical policy; (b) consistent with the symptoms or diagnosis; (c) not furnished primarily for the convenience of the patient, the attending Physician or other provider; (d) furnished at the most appropriate level which can be provided safely and effectively to the patient; and (e) not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of the Member’s illness, injury, or disease.

**Investigational/Experimental:** A treatment, procedure, or drug is investigational when it has not been recognized as safe and effective for use in treating the particular condition in accordance with generally accepted professional medical standards. This includes services where approval by the federal or state governmental is required prior to use, but has not yet been granted.

**Split Evaluation:** Blue Shield of California/Blue Shield of California Life & Health Insurance Company (Blue Shield) policy review can result in a split evaluation, where a treatment, procedure, or drug will be considered to be investigational for certain indications or conditions, but will be deemed safe and
effective for other indications or conditions, and therefore potentially medically necessary in those instances.

**Prior Authorization Requirements and Feedback (as applicable to your plan)**

Within five days before the actual date of service, the provider must confirm with Blue Shield that the member’s health plan coverage is still in effect. Blue Shield reserves the right to revoke an authorization prior to services being rendered based on cancellation of the member’s eligibility. Final determination of benefits will be made after review of the claim for limitations or exclusions.

Questions regarding the applicability of this policy should be directed to the Prior Authorization Department at (800) 541-6652, or the Transplant Case Management Department at (800) 637-2066 ext. 3507708 or visit the provider portal at [www.blueshieldca.com/provider](http://www.blueshieldca.com/provider).

We are interested in receiving feedback relative to developing, adopting, and reviewing criteria for medical policy. Any licensed practitioner who is contracted with Blue Shield of California or Blue Shield of California Promise Health Plan is welcome to provide comments, suggestions, or concerns. Our internal policy committees will receive and take your comments into consideration.

For utilization and medical policy feedback, please send comments to: MedPolicy@blueshieldca.com

*Disclaimer: This medical policy is a guide in evaluating the medical necessity of a particular service or treatment. Blue Shield of California may consider published peer-reviewed scientific literature, national guidelines, and local standards of practice in developing its medical policy. Federal and state law, as well as contract language, including definitions and specific contract provisions/exclusions, take precedence over medical policy and must be considered first in determining covered services. Member contracts may differ in their benefits. Blue Shield reserves the right to review and update policies as appropriate.*
### Appendix A

| POLICY STATEMENT |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| **BEFORE**        | **AFTER**         |
| Reactivated Policy| Corneal Topography/Computer-Assisted Corneal Topography/Photokeratoscopy 9.03.05 |
| Policy Statement: | Policy Statement: |
| N/A               | I. Computer-assisted corneal topography is considered **investigational** to detect or monitor diseases of the cornea. |
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