

**6.01.32 Virtual Colonoscopy/Computed Tomography Colonography**

Original Policy Date: June 1, 2003 Effective Date: November 1, 2021

Section: 6.0 Radiology Page: Page 1 of 17

**Policy Statement**

Computed tomography colonography (CTC) may be considered **medically necessary** for **one or more** of the following:

- I. Conventional colonoscopy is indicated but there are contraindications or an incomplete colonoscopy (e.g. chronic anticoagulation, colonic stenosis, obstruction or significant anesthesia risk [ASA III or greater])
- II. Preferred by the patient for colon cancer screening and meets standard screening criteria

Except for the indications outlined in the policy statements above, CTC is considered **investigational**.

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

**Policy Guidelines**

Computed tomography colonography (CTC) outcomes described in the literature represent outcomes under ideal conditions. This generally involves a comprehensive colon cancer screening program that includes rapid access to optical colonoscopy when necessary and systematic follow-up and surveillance of patients who generally have a more complicated follow-up schedule than do patients undergoing optical colonoscopy. Therefore, to achieve outcomes described in the literature that are similar to optical colonoscopy, CTC needs to be offered as part of a comprehensive colon cancer screening program that optimizes follow-up of patients undergoing this procedure. Based on current evidence, a colon cancer screening strategy using CTC is likely to produce outcomes similar to those with optical colonoscopy.

**Coding**

There are category I CPT codes for this procedure:

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

**Description**

Computed tomography colonography (CTC), also known as virtual colonoscopy, is an imaging modality that has been investigated as an alternative to conventional endoscopic ("optical") colonoscopy. It has been most widely studied as an alternative screening technique for colon cancer, and for the diagnosis of colorectal cancer (CRC) in people with related symptoms and for other colorectal conditions.

**Related Policies**

- N/A

## 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

Multiple computed tomography devices, including multiple CTC devices, have been cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process. FDA product code: JAK

## Rationale

### Background

Computed tomography colonography (CTC), also known as virtual colonoscopy, is an imaging modality that uses thin-section helical computed tomography 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. Computed tomography colonography has been investigated as an alternative to conventional endoscopic ("optical") colonoscopy. While CTC 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.

### 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.

### Colon Cancer Screening

#### Clinical Context and Test Purpose

Diseases of the colon and rectum for which computed tomography colonography (CTC) may be considered as a diagnostic or screening tool include colorectal cancer (CRC) and precancerous conditions, diverticulosis and diverticulitis, and inflammatory bowel disease. The most widely studied use of CTC is as an alternative screening technique for colon cancer.

The purpose of CTC in patients who are asymptomatic and undergoing CRC screening is to prevent morbidity by detecting early colon cancers and detecting and removing cancer precursors such as polyps. The detection of cancer and removal of polyps ultimately requires an

optical colonoscopy. Computed tomography colonography is an imaging procedure that can identify cancers or polyps. The effectiveness and efficiency of CTC depend on its ability to identify cancer or polyps accurately so that all or most patients who have such lesions are appropriately referred for optical colonoscopy for diagnosis and treatment.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of CTC improve the net health outcome in patients who are asymptomatic and undergoing CRC screening?

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

### **Populations**

The relevant population of interest is individuals who are asymptomatic and eligible for CRC screening.

### **Interventions**

The test being considered is CTC.

### **Comparators**

The following tests are currently being used to make decisions about managing patients who are asymptomatic and undergoing CRC screening: optical colonoscopy, sigmoidoscopy, and fecal occult blood test (FOBT).

### **Outcomes**

The outcomes of interest are disease-specific morbidity and mortality. Beneficial outcomes relate to true-positive testing, which leads to the detection of disease that would be otherwise missed. Harmful outcomes result from false-negative testing, which may delay the diagnosis and management of CRC. Follow-up immediately after test results is of interest for CTC test accuracy and validity and test-related morbidity. Follow-up at 1 to 5 years is of interest for CRC outcomes for disease-specific mortality and morbidity.

### **Study Selection Criteria**

For the evaluation of the clinical validity of the CTC test, studies that meet the following eligibility criteria were considered:

- Reported on the accuracy of the technology
- Included a suitable reference standard
- Patient clinical characteristics were described
- Patient selection criteria were described.

### **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).

### **Review of Evidence**

#### **Systematic Reviews**

The diagnostic characteristics of CTC as a colon cancer screening test have been investigated in many studies in which patients referred for optical colonoscopy agreed first to undergo a CTC. Using a second-look unblinded colonoscopy aided by the results of the CTC as the reference standard, the diagnostic characteristics of CTC and the blinded colonoscopy can be calculated and compared. The sensitivity of CTC is a function of the size of the polyp; sensitivity is poorer for smaller polyps.

Lin et al (2016) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature on CRC screening, conducted for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force.<sup>1</sup> Reviewers identified 9 prospective diagnostic accuracy studies on CTC (N=6,497 patients). Seven studies involved CTC with bowel preparation, and 2 involved CTC without bowel preparation. Five studies, including both without bowel preparation, were rated by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force as good

quality and the remaining 4 were considered fair quality. In 4 studies of CTC with bowel preparation, the sensitivity to detect adenomas 6 mm or larger ranged from 73% to 98%, and the specificity ranged from 89% to 91%. The sensitivity of CTC to detect adenomas 10 mm or larger (7 studies) ranged from 67% to 94%, and the specificity ranged from 96% to 98%. Four (n=4821) of the 9 studies also provided data on colonoscopy. The sensitivity for adenomas 6 mm or larger ranged from 75% to 93%, and the sensitivity to detect adenomas 10 mm and larger ranged from 89% to 98%.

In addition, the Lin et al (2016) systematic review evaluated evidence on harms and extracolonic findings associated with CTC. Eleven fair or good quality prospective studies (N=10,272 patients) suggested little or no risk of serious adverse events such as perforation. In contrast, reviewers estimated that, with optical colonoscopy, the risk of perforation was 4 in 10,000 procedures (95% confidence interval [CI], 2 to 5 in 10,000) and the risk of major bleeding was 8 in 10,000 procedures (95% CI, 5 to 14 in 10,000). Radiation exposure is a potential harm of CTC, but many of the studies did not report the extent of radiation exposure. Using data from 4 studies, reviewers estimated that the radiation dose of a full-screening CTC examination was 4.5 to 7 mSv. However, in more recent studies (i.e., published between 2004 and 2008), the estimated radiation dose was lower, at 1 to 5 mSv. Among studies reporting this outcome, extracolonic findings occurred in 27% to 69% of CTC examinations. Approximately 1% to 11% underwent diagnostic evaluation, and 3% required treatment. Extracolonic cancers occurred in about 0.5% of individuals undergoing CTC examinations.

Martin-Lopez et al (2014) published a meta-analysis that included 9 studies of CRC screening.<sup>2</sup> Studies conducted for the diagnosis of CRC or in elderly, high-risk, or symptomatic patients were excluded. The overall per-patient pooled sensitivity and specificity of CTC were 66.8% (95% CI, 62.7% to 70.8%) and 80.3% (95% CI, 77.7% to 82.8%), respectively. For colonoscopy, the pooled sensitivity was 92.5% (95% CI, 89.0% to 95%) and pooled specificity was 73.2% (95% CI, 67.7% to 78.1%). In the subgroup with larger lesions, the diagnostic accuracy of both approaches was less divergent. For lesions 10 mm or larger, CTC had a pooled sensitivity of 91.2% (95% CI, 86.5% to 94.6%) and a specificity of 87.3% (95% CI, 86.2% to 88.3%). The pooled sensitivity of colonoscopy for lesions 10 mm or larger was 92.9% (95% CI, 86.0% to 97.1%), and the specificity was 91.3% (95% CI, 89.9% to 92.5%).

### Randomized Controlled Trials

Regge et al (2017) reported on a controlled trial in which 5412 individuals were randomized to CTC (n=2674) or flexible sigmoidoscopy (n=2738).<sup>3</sup> The detection rate for advanced adenomas did not differ significantly between groups (p=.52). Detection rates were 133 (5.1%) in the CTC group and 127 (4.7%) in the flexible sigmoidoscopy group. Ten CRCs were identified in the CTC group and 9 in the flexible sigmoidoscopy group. No serious adverse events were reported.

Other large randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have compared the diagnostic accuracy of CTC with a different method of CRC screening. In the IJspeert et al (2016) trial, 8,844 individuals were invited to be screened, and 2,258 (26%) agreed to participate.<sup>4</sup> This included 982 (34%) of 2920 randomized to CTC and 1276 (22%) of 5924 randomized to standard colonoscopy. The analysis focused on the detection of high-risk sessile serrated polyps. Sessile serrated polyps were detected significantly more often in the colonoscopy examinations (n=55 [4.3%]) than in CTC examinations (n=8 [0.8%]). For the outcome of all sessile serrated polyps (high- and low-risk), significantly more were detected with the colonoscopy (n=83 [6.5%]) than with CTC (n=21 [2.1%]; p<.001). Adverse events were not discussed.

Sali et al (2016) compared reduced cathartic preparation CTC, full cathartic preparation CTC, fecal immunochemical test, and optical colonoscopy as primary screening tests for CRC.<sup>5</sup> The study invited 16,087 patients for a screening test, and 6,116 patients underwent a test. Patients with a positive fecal immunochemical test and patients with a colonic mass or a polyp larger than 6 mm on CTC underwent optical colonoscopy. The detection rates per participant for advanced neoplasia were 5.2% for the CTC groups (pooled data) versus 1.7% for the fecal

immunochemical test (relative risk [RR], 3.08; 95% CI, 2.19 to 4.32;  $p < .001$ ). The detection rates were similar between the 2 CTC groups: 5.5% for the reduced cathartic preparation and 4.9% for the full cathartic preparation (RR, 1.12; 95% CI, 0.67 to 1.88;  $p = .65$ ). The overall detection rates per participant for advanced neoplasia were 1.7% for the fecal immunochemical test, 5.5% for the reduced cathartic preparation CTC, 4.9% for the full cathartic preparation CTC, and 7.2% for optical colonoscopy.

Weinberg et al (2018) compared CTC versus optical colonoscopy in 231 patients undergoing screening at 1 year post curative surgery for CRC.<sup>6</sup> All patients underwent CTC followed by optical colonoscopy. Compared with optical colonoscopy, CTC had a sensitivity of 44% (95% CI, 30.2% to 57.8%) and specificity of 85.8% (95% CI, 89.7% to 97%) for detecting lesions (all types) 6 mm or larger and a sensitivity of 76.9% (95% CI, 54% to 99.8%) and specificity of 89% (95% CI, 84.8% to 93.1%) for detection lesions (all types) 10 mm or larger. For serrated adenomas, CTC had a sensitivity of 60% (95% CI, 29.6% to 90.4%) and specificity of 76% (95% CI, 70.4% to 81.6%) for sizes 6 mm or larger and a sensitivity of 75% (95% CI, 32.6% to 100%) and specificity of 75.3% (95% CI, 69.7% to 80.9%) for sizes 10 mm or larger. The results with CTC were significantly different from the null hypothesis of 90% for sensitivities to detect all lesions or serrated adenomas 6 mm or larger and for specificities for serrated adenomas of all sizes ( $p < .05$  for all comparisons).

### Clinically Useful

A test is clinically useful if the 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 RCTs.

No RCTs comparing outcomes for patients undergoing CTC screening with patients who did not undergo CTC screening were identified.

### Chain of Evidence

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

A chain of evidence involves evaluating: (1) evidence that CTC is accurate and (2) evidence that CTC identifies appropriate patients with CRC who would not otherwise be screened. The clinical validity of CTC for screening for CRC has been demonstrated in systematic reviews and meta-analysis studies as well as several large RCTs. While modeling studies have reported that optical colonoscopy is likely more beneficial than CTC,<sup>7-13</sup> higher participation with CTC may ameliorate otherwise lower improvement in net health outcome compared with optical colonoscopy.

Compliance with recommendations for optical colonoscopy is suboptimal. As reported by Steele et al (2013), the screening rate is about 60% (in the prior 10 years) among people ages 50 to 75.<sup>14</sup> Computed tomography colonography has been proposed as an alternative colon cancer screening technique that may improve patient compliance compared with optical colonoscopy. A literature survey of studies that attempted to determine whether the availability of CTC would improve population screening rates found 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 CTC.

Stoop et al (2012) published an RCT that evaluated the impact of CTC on colon cancer screening rates.<sup>15</sup> This trial was performed in the Netherlands, and members of the general

population ages 50 to 75 years were randomized to an invitation for CTC or optical colonoscopy. The CTC protocol included a noncathartic preparation, consisting of an 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 CTC group was 34% (982/2920) compared with a rate of 22% (1276/5924) in the optical colonoscopy group ( $p < .001$ ). The diagnostic yield per-patient of advanced polyps was higher in the optical colonoscopy group, at 8.7 of 100 participants compared with 6.1 of 100 participants for CTC ( $p = .02$ ). However, the diagnostic yield of advanced neoplasia per invitee was similar, at 2.1 of 100 invitees for CTC and 1.9 of 100 invitees for optical colonoscopy ( $p = .56$ ). The data would suggest that the increased participation rates with CTC offset the advantages of optical colonoscopy and that overall outcomes would likely be similar between strategies. It is not known whether the different preparation regimens affected participation rates.

Zhu et al (2020) published a meta-analysis of 5 RCTs, including the trial by Stoop et al, exploring participation rates between CTC and colonoscopy.<sup>16</sup> The meta-analysis contained data on 15,974 invitees to participate in a screening test. The participation rate was 28.8% with CTC versus 20.8% with colonoscopy (RR, 1.26; 95% CI, 0.98 to 1.63;  $p = .070$ ). The subgroup analyses revealed a higher participation rate for the reduced or no cathartic preparation CTC compared with colonoscopy (RR, 1.70; 95% CI, 1.40 to 2.07;  $p < .001$ ).

### Section Summary: Colon Cancer Screening

There is variability in the diagnostic accuracy of CTC in the literature; this is likely due to improvements in technical reliability over time. Most studies have reported that the diagnostic accuracy for CTC is high and in the same range or slightly below optical colonoscopy for polyps greater than 10 mm.

No long-term comparative studies have directly reported on outcomes of CTC versus optical colonoscopy. The determination of comparative outcomes of CTC and optical colonoscopy is complex, due to the differing patterns of follow-up associated with each strategy.

A recent meta-analysis of 5 key randomized trials revealed similar participation rates with CTC versus colonoscopy, but reduced or no cathartic preparation CTC may improve participation rates. The improved screening rate may offset, or even outweigh, any benefit of optical colonoscopy on outcomes. However, similar screening rates may not be achieved with a cathartic preparation.

### Colon Cancer Diagnosis

#### Clinical Context and Test Purpose

The purpose of CTC in patients who have positive CRC screening or signs and symptoms of CRC is to identify disease.

Computed tomography colonography has not generally been employed as a test to identify disease in persons with positive cancer screening tests or symptoms because, compared with screening settings, the expected probability of disease is much higher. Findings on CTC require confirmation with colonoscopy; thus it would be inappropriate to use a noninvasive test if the probability of needing a confirmatory invasive test is high.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of CTC improve the net health outcome in patients who have positive CRC screening tests or signs or symptoms of CRC? The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

#### Populations

The relevant population of interest is individuals with positive CRC screening tests or signs or symptoms of CRC.



**Interventions**

The test being considered is CTC.

**Comparators**

The following tests are currently being used to make decisions about patients who have positive CRC screening or signs and symptoms of CRC: optical colonoscopy and standard care without a colonoscopy.

**Outcomes**

The outcomes of interest are disease-specific morbidity and mortality. Beneficial outcomes relate to true-positive testing, which leads to the detection of disease that would be otherwise missed. Harmful outcomes result from false-negative testing, which may delay the diagnosis and management of CRC. Follow-up immediately after test results is of interest for CTC test accuracy and validity, as well as treatment-related morbidity; follow-up at 1 to 5 years is of interest for CTC outcomes for disease-specific morbidity or mortality.

**Study Selection Criteria**

For the evaluation of the clinical validity of the CTC test, studies that meet the following eligibility criteria were considered:

- Reported on the accuracy of the technology
- Included a suitable reference standard
- Patient clinical characteristics were described
- Patient selection criteria were described.

**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).

**Review of Evidence****Systematic Reviews**

Several studies have evaluated the role of CTC in the diagnosis of CRC in patients with symptoms or positive findings on other screening modalities (e.g., FOBT). Plumb et al (2014) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies evaluating the performance of CTC for the diagnosis of colon cancer among subjects with positive FOBT.<sup>17</sup> Fecal occult blood testing is a recommended screening technique for CRC; positive tests are typically followed by a colonoscopy. In this meta-analysis, reviewers included only studies that used CTC in the evaluation of patients who had had a positive FOBT and compared colonography results with a reference test, conventional colonoscopy, segmental unblinded colonoscopy, or surgery with subsequent histopathology. Five articles were analyzed, representing 4 studies with 622 patients. Pooled per-patient sensitivity and specificity for adenomas 6 mm or larger or CRC were 88.8% (95% CI, 83.6% to 92.5%) and 75.4% (95% CI, 58.6% to 86.8%), respectively. Reviewers commented that data were limited on CTC for patients with a positive FOBT (only 4 studies) and based on the available evidence, CTC has a reasonably high sensitivity for detecting adenomas 6 mm or larger (88.8%; 95% CI, 83.6% to 92.5%) but a relatively low specificity (75.4%; 95% CI, 58.6% to 86.8%).

Bai et al (2020) performed a meta-analysis comparing diagnostic accuracy of CTC versus colonoscopy in patients at high risk for CRC.<sup>18</sup> The meta-analysis included 14 published articles with 3578 patients, who had symptoms suggestive of CRC or a family history of CRC, positive findings on FOBT, and CTC followed by colonoscopy. The reference standard for the lesion size was colonoscopy that utilized open biopsy forceps or histological evaluation. For detecting polyps 6 mm or larger with CTC, the results revealed a pooled sensitivity of 87% (95% CI, 83% to 90%) and specificity of 90% (95% CI, 86% to 93%). For detecting polyps 10 mm or larger with CTC, the results showed a pooled sensitivity of 91% (95% CI, 86% to 94%) and specificity of 98% (95% CI, 95% to 99%).

### Retrospective Studies

Simons et al (2013) evaluated the false-negative rate and sensitivity of CTC for CRC among patients who presented with symptoms of CRC.<sup>19</sup> The authors included 1855 consecutive patients who underwent CTC at a single-center. These data were linked to a comprehensive population-based cancer registry to determine if patients were diagnosed with CRC in the 2 years after their CTC. Fifty-three patients were diagnosed with CRC, of whom 40 patients had suspected CRC, 5 were diagnosed with large polyps that appeared malignant on histology, and 5 were diagnosed with an indeterminate mass on CTC. Two patients who developed cancer had not been diagnosed on CTC, and 1 patient who developed cancer had an incomplete colonography. The overall sensitivity of CTC was 94.3% (95% CI, 88% to 100%).

Plumb et al (2014) published findings of a retrospective study comparing results from CTC with optical colonoscopy in patients evaluated at a single-center who were indicated for CRC diagnostic assessment because of a positive FOBT.<sup>20</sup> This study was not included in the Plumb et al (2014) review (described above). Based on the institutional protocol, optical colonoscopy was preferred for individuals with a positive FOBT; however, CTC was substituted if the subject was unable to complete colonoscopic bowel preparation safely, was too frail or immobile to undergo colonoscopy (although potentially fit for necessary treatment), had another contraindication to colonoscopy, or had an incomplete colonoscopy. The study analyzed 2731 FOBT-positive patients screened with CTC as their first screening test. Of these, 1027 (37.6%) had CRC or polyps suspected (95% CI, 33.8% to 41.4%), and 911 underwent confirmatory testing. One hundred twenty-four (4.5%) were found to have CRC and 533 (19.5%) were found to have polyps, for an overall CRC- or polyp-detection rate of 24.1% (95% CI, 21.5% to 24.1%). The positive predictive value for CRC or polyps was 72.1% (95% CI, 66.6% to 77.6%). Colonoscopy data were available for 72,817 FOBT-positive patients who underwent colonoscopy as an initial screening test, among whom 9.0% had CRC, and 50.6% had polyps. The authors attributed the difference in CRC and polyp rates between the groups to underlying differences in risk between those referred for CTC and potential biases in the interpretation of screening guidelines.

Sha et al (2020) compared the diagnostic performance of CTC versus colonoscopy for CRC at 2 hospitals in China.<sup>21</sup> The study enrolled 318 patients presenting with symptoms suggestive of CRC - abdominal pain, rectal bleeding, and/or change in bowel habits- and undergoing both CTC and colonoscopy. From the screened patients, 77 patients with polyps 10 mm and larger, or smaller than 10 mm but suspicious, underwent surgery and surgical pathology. Based on the surgical pathology, sensitivities were 96.1% for CTC and 83.1% for colonoscopy. The accuracies were 92.6% for CTC versus 92% for colonoscopy for polyps 10 mm or larger, and 95.9% for CTC versus 83.7% for colonoscopy for polyps smaller than 10 mm.

### Clinically Useful

A test is clinically useful if the 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 RCTs.

Several studies have evaluated the role of CTC for patients with symptoms suggestive of CRC. Atkin et al (2013) reported on the results of an unblinded RCT comparing colonoscopy with CTC in the evaluation of patients who had symptoms suggestive of CRC.<sup>22</sup> Given the challenges of conducting a trial that would be adequately powered to detect small differences between CTC and colonoscopy in CRC and large polyp detection, the authors used rates of the need for additional evaluation after CTC as a primary outcome, on the assumption that such rates would strongly affect the evaluation of the benefits of the procedure. The trial randomized patients ages 55 or older with symptoms suggestive of CRC in a 2:1 fashion to colonoscopy or CTC. Both



colonoscopy and CTC procedures were conducted with full bowel preparation. The trial's primary outcome was the proportion of patients who had an additional colonic investigation, defined as any subsequent examination of the colon until diagnosis (usually histologic confirmation of cancer or polyp) or until a patient was referred back to his or her physician. Additional diagnostic evaluation of the colon was required in 160 (30.0%) of 533 of those assigned to CTC compared with 86 (8.2%) of 1047 of those assigned to colonoscopy ( $p < .001$ ). The overall detection rate for CRC or large polyps did not differ between the groups (RR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.70 to 1.27;  $p = .69$ ).

### Chain of Evidence

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

Because the clinical validity of CTC for colon cancer diagnosis has not been established, a chain of evidence supporting the clinical utility of CTC for this population cannot be constructed.

### Section Summary: Computed Tomography Colonography for Colon Cancer Diagnosis

There is a relatively small number of studies of CTC for diagnosing CRC in patients with a positive screening test or with symptoms of CRC. A systematic review of CTC studies in patients with a positive FOBT identified only 4 studies and found a reasonably high sensitivity for detecting adenomas 6 mm or larger but relatively low specificity. Another meta-analysis of 14 articles found high sensitivity and specificity with CTC for detecting polyps, when confirmed by colonoscopy with open biopsy forceps or histological evaluation, especially for polyps 10 mm or larger. An RCT comparing CTC with colonoscopy in symptomatic patients found a significantly greater need for additional evaluation after CTC compared with colonoscopy. Because the prevalence of the disease is much higher in patients with positive screening tests or symptoms of CRC, going directly to colonoscopy is usually the preferred clinical strategy. Additional studies are needed to determine with certainty the diagnostic accuracy of CTC for diagnosis of CRC; however, for patients unable to undergo a colonoscopy, based on the available evidence, CTC may be a reasonable option.

### Summary of Evidence

For individuals who are asymptomatic and undergoing CRC screening who receive CTC, the evidence includes systematic reviews with meta-analysis, randomized and nonrandomized controlled trials, and modeling studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and treatment-related morbidity. The available evidence supports the conclusion that the diagnostic accuracy of CTC is in the same range or slightly below optical colonoscopy, with a moderate-to-high sensitivity and a high specificity for the detection of larger polyps and CRC. As a result, screening with CTC may provide similar diagnostic results to screening using conventional optical colonoscopy. Most modeling studies have reported that the overall benefits of a strategy that uses optical colonoscopy likely exceed the benefits of a strategy using CTC. However, these analyses assume equal participation rates in screening between the strategies. Participation in screening may be higher with CTC that has reduced or no cathartic preparation than with optical colonoscopy, and this may ameliorate or offset some improved outcomes associated with optical colonoscopy. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have positive CRC screening tests or signs or symptoms of CRC who receive CTC, the evidence includes systematic reviews with meta-analysis, an RCT, and cohort studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and treatment-related morbidity. Using CTC on patients with the suspected disease might be an inefficient testing strategy because CTC findings need to be confirmed with conventional colonoscopy. There are a small number of studies on CTC for diagnosis of CRC in patients with a positive screening test or with symptoms of CRC, and thus the diagnostic accuracy cannot be determined with certainty. Studies of patients with a positive FOBT have suggested a reasonably

high sensitivity for detection of adenomas 6 mm or larger but a relatively low specificity. There are fewer studies of patients with CRC symptoms; the RCT found that significantly more patients required additional evaluation after CTC than after conventional colonoscopy. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

### 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 College of Physicians

In 2019, the American College of Physicians updated its guidelines for colorectal cancer (CRC) screening.<sup>23</sup> The American College of Physicians recommends 1 of the following 3 strategies for adults aged 50 to 75 years:

- High-sensitivity guaiac-based fecal occult blood test or fecal immunochemical test every 2 years.
- Fecal immunochemical test every 2 years plus flexible sigmoidoscopy every 10 years.
- Colonoscopy every 10 years.

The guideline stated that computed tomography colonography (CTC) may result in incidental extracolonic findings in 40% to 70% of screening examinations that may lead to additional evaluations and overtreatment. Screening intervals are more frequent for CTC, and positive findings on CTC require follow-up with colonoscopy.

#### American Cancer Society

In 2018, the American Cancer Society (ACS) updated its guidelines on CRC screening (Table 1).<sup>24</sup> The ACS made the following recommendations on colon cancer screening:

"The ACS recommends that adults aged 45 years and older with an average risk of colorectal cancer undergo regular screening with either a high-sensitivity stool-based test or a structural (visual) examination, depending on patient preference and test availability....The recommendation to begin screening at age 45 years is a qualified recommendation. The recommendation for regular screening in adults aged 50 years and older is a strong recommendation."

Computed tomography colonography was listed as an option for CRC screening (Table 1) and was acknowledged to have comparable sensitivity and specificity to a colonoscopy. Stated limitations associated with CTC included exposure to low-dose radiation as well as complications of full bowel preparation, including rare cases of bowel perforation. It remains unclear whether incidental detection of extracolonic findings during CTC provides net benefit or harm to patients.

**Table 1. Guidelines on Colorectal Cancer Screening Options**

Colorectal Cancer Screening Guidelines
Stool-based test
Fecal immunochemical test every 1 y
High-sensitivity, guaiac-based fecal occult blood test every 1 y
Multitarget stool DNA test every 3 y
Structural test
Colonoscopy every 10 y
Computer tomography colonography every 5 y

### American College of Gastroenterology

In 2017, the American College of Gastroenterology published recommendations of the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force of Colorectal Cancer made up of expert gastroenterologists from the American College of Gastroenterology, the American Gastroenterological Association, and the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy.<sup>25</sup> The panel recommended CRC screening beginning at age 50 with adjustments based on race and family history using a ranked-tiered CRC screening approach in Table 2. Considerations for recommending the tiered system of current CRC screening tests included performance, cost, patient acceptance, and the lack of randomized trial results that directly compare the effects of different tests on CRC incidence or mortality.

**Table 2. Colorectal Cancer Screening Tier Strategy**

Tier	Recommendation
Tier 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colonoscopy every 10 y</li> <li>• Annual fecal immunochemical test</li> </ul>
Tier 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computed tomography colonography every 5 y</li> <li>• Fecal immunochemical test-fecal DNA every 3 y</li> <li>• Flexible sigmoidoscopy every 10 y (or every 5 y)</li> </ul>
Tier 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capsule colonoscopy every 5 y</li> </ul>
Available tests not currently recommended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Septin 9</li> </ul>

In 2021, the American College of Gastroenterology released updated CRC screening guidelines.<sup>26</sup> The guidelines recommend CRC screening in average risk individuals between 50 to 75 years of age (strong recommendation; moderate quality of evidence) and suggest CRC screening in average risk individuals between 45 to 49 years of age (conditional recommendation; very low quality of evidence) to reduce the incidence of advanced adenoma, CRC, and mortality from CRC. The guideline recommends "colonoscopy and fecal immunochemical testing as the primary screening modalities for CRC screening" (strong recommendation; low quality of evidence). Flexible sigmoidoscopy, multitarget stool DNA testing, CTC, or colon capsule are suggested for consideration for individuals unable or unwilling to undergo a colonoscopy or fecal immunochemical testing (conditional recommendation; very low quality of evidence). The guidelines recommend that fecal immunochemical testing should be performed every year and colonoscopy every 10 years (strong recommendation; low quality of evidence) and suggest that a multitarget stool DNA test be performed every 3 years, flexible sigmoidoscopy every 5 to 10 years, CTC every 5 years, and colon capsule every 5 years (conditional recommendation; very low quality of evidence).

### American College of Radiology

In 2018, the American College of Radiology updated its 2014 appropriateness criteria on imaging tests for CRC screening.<sup>27,28</sup> While CTC was not recommended for screening of patients at high-risk for CRC, it was appropriate for screening in the following populations:

- Average-risk individual, >50 years old
- Moderate-risk individual with a first-degree family history of cancer or adenoma
- Average-, moderate-, or high-risk individual with incomplete colonoscopy.

Computed tomography colonography was also appropriate for CRC detection in moderate-risk individuals, and in average-risk individuals after positive fecal screening tests (fecal occult blood test or fecal immunochemical test).

### National Comprehensive Cancer Network

Per the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN), colonoscopy is "the most complete screening procedure and is considered the current gold standard for assessing the severity of detecting neoplasia for other screening modalities. The general consensus is that a 10-year interval is appropriate for most average risk individuals who had a high-quality normal

colonoscopy..."<sup>29</sup>. Regarding CTC, the NCCN guideline states that CTC "is evolving as a promising technique for CRC screening. CT colonography has the advantages of being noninvasive and not requiring sedation. The risk of test-related complications is also very low....CT colonography may be cost-effective when compared to colonoscopy. However, a positive finding requires a colonoscopy, and extracolonic findings - which are present in up to 16% of patients - pose a dilemma."

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

In 2021, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) updated its recommendations on CRC screening.<sup>30</sup> The recommendations included the following:

Adults 50 to 75 years old:

"The USPSTF recommends screening for colorectal cancer in all adults aged 50 to 75 years." (Grade A)

Adults 45 to 49 years old:

"The USPSTF recommends screening for CRC in adults aged 45 to 49 years." (Grade B)

Adults 76 to 85 years old:

"The USPSTF recommends that clinicians selectively offer screening for CRC in adults aged 76 to 85 years. Evidence indicates that the net benefit of screening all persons in this age group is small. In determining whether this service is appropriate in individual cases, patients and clinicians should consider the patient's overall health, prior screening history, and preferences."

"The

- (Grade C)

Regarding evidence of efficacy for CT colonography, the USPSTF stated:

- "Evidence available that CT colonography has reasonable accuracy to detect CRC and adenomas;
- No direct evidence evaluating effect of CT colonography on CRC mortality;
- Limited evidence about the potential benefits or harms of possible evaluation and treatment of incidental extracolonic findings, which are common. Extracolonic findings detected in 1.3% to 11.4% of examinations; <3% required medical or surgical treatment."

The USPSTF also noted that "more studies evaluating the direct effectiveness of screening with CT colonography on CRC mortality are needed, as well as more studies that report on long-term consequences of identifying extracolonic findings on CRC screening."

### Medicare National Coverage

In 2009, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services published a noncovered national decision memo on CTC screening.<sup>31</sup>

### Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

No ongoing clinical trials were identified.

## References

1. Lin JS, Piper MA, Perdue LA, et al. Screening for Colorectal Cancer: Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*. Jun 21 2016; 315(23): 2576-94. PMID 27305422
2. Martin-Lopez JE, Beltran-Calvo C, Rodriguez-Lopez R, et al. Comparison of the accuracy of CT colonography and colonoscopy in the diagnosis of colorectal cancer. *Colorectal Dis*. Mar 2014; 16(3): O82-9. PMID 24299052
3. Regge D, Iussich G, Segnan N, et al. Comparing CT colonography and flexible sigmoidoscopy: a randomised trial within a population-based screening programme. *Gut*. Aug 2017; 66(8): 1434-1440. PMID 27196588

4. IJspeert JE, Tutein Nolthenius CJ, Kuipers EJ, et al. CT-Colonography vs. Colonoscopy for Detection of High-Risk Sessile Serrated Polyps. *Am J Gastroenterol*. Apr 2016; 111(4): 516-22. PMID 27021193
5. Sali L, Mascacchi M, Falchini M, et al. Reduced and Full-Preparation CT Colonography, Fecal Immunochemical Test, and Colonoscopy for Population Screening of Colorectal Cancer: A Randomized Trial. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. Feb 2016; 108(2). PMID 26719225
6. Weinberg DS, Pickhardt PJ, Bruining DH, et al. Computed Tomography Colonography vs Colonoscopy for Colorectal Cancer Surveillance After Surgery. *Gastroenterology*. Mar 2018; 154(4): 927-934.e4. PMID 29174927
7. 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:Tab 2.
8. Scherer R, Knudsen AB, Pearson SD. Health Technology Assessment: Computed Tomographic Colonography (CTC). Olympia, WA: Health Technology Assessment Program, Washington State Health Authority; 2008.
9. 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.
10. Heitman SJ, Hilsden RJ, Au F, et al. Colorectal cancer screening for average-risk North Americans: an economic evaluation. *PLoS Med*. Nov 23 2010; 7(11): e1000370. PMID 21124887
11. Lansdorp-Vogelaar I, Knudsen AB, Brenner H. Cost-effectiveness of colorectal cancer screening. *Epidemiol Rev*. 2011; 33: 88-100. PMID 21633092
12. Hassan C, Pickhardt PJ, Pickhardt P, et al. Computed tomographic colonography to screen for colorectal cancer, extracolonic cancer, and aortic aneurysm: model simulation with cost-effectiveness analysis. *Arch Intern Med*. Apr 14 2008; 168(7): 696-705. PMID 18413551
13. 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*. Oct 2012; 28(4): 415-23. PMID 23006522
14. Steele CB, Rim SH, Joseph DA, et al. Colorectal cancer incidence and screening - United States, 2008 and 2010. *MMWR Suppl*. Nov 22 2013; 62(3): 53-60. PMID 24264490
15. 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*. Jan 2012; 13(1): 55-64. PMID 22088831
16. Zhu H, Li F, Tao K, et al. Comparison of the participation rate between CT colonography and colonoscopy in screening population: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Br J Radiol*. Jan 2020; 93(1105): 20190240. PMID 31651188
17. Plumb AA, Halligan S, Pendse DA, et al. Sensitivity and specificity of CT colonography for the detection of colonic neoplasia after positive faecal occult blood testing: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol*. May 2014; 24(5): 1049-58. PMID 24519111
18. Bai W, Yu D, Zhu B, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of computed tomography colonography in patients at high risk for colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Colorectal Dis*. Nov 2020; 22(11): 1528-1537. PMID 32277562
19. Simons PC, Van Steenbergen LN, De Witte MT, et al. Miss rate of colorectal cancer at CT colonography in average-risk symptomatic patients. *Eur Radiol*. Apr 2013; 23(4): 908-13. PMID 23085864
20. Plumb AA, Halligan S, Nickerson C, et al. Use of CT colonography in the English Bowel Cancer Screening Programme. *Gut*. Jun 2014; 63(6): 964-73. PMID 23955527
21. Sha J, Chen J, Lv X, et al. Computed tomography colonography versus colonoscopy for detection of colorectal cancer: a diagnostic performance study. *BMC Med Imaging*. May 18 2020; 20(1): 51. PMID 32423413
22. Atkin W, Dadswell E, Wooldrage K, et al. Computed tomographic colonography versus colonoscopy for investigation of patients with symptoms suggestive of colorectal cancer (SIGGAR): a multicentre randomised trial. *Lancet*. Apr 06 2013; 381(9873): 1194-202. PMID 23414650

23. Qaseem A, Crandall CJ, Mustafa RA, et al. Screening for Colorectal Cancer in Asymptomatic Average-Risk Adults: A Guidance Statement From the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med.* Nov 05 2019; 171(9): 643-654. PMID 31683290
24. Wolf AMD, Fontham ETH, Church TR, et al. Colorectal cancer screening for average-risk adults: 2018 guideline update from the American Cancer Society. *CA Cancer J Clin.* Jul 2018; 68(4): 250-281. PMID 29846947
25. Rex DK, Boland CR, Dominitz JA, et al. Colorectal Cancer Screening: Recommendations for Physicians and Patients From the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Gastroenterology.* Jul 2017; 153(1): 307-323. PMID 28600072
26. Shaukat A, Kahi CJ, Burke CA, et al. ACG Clinical Guidelines: Colorectal Cancer Screening 2021. *Am J Gastroenterol.* Mar 01 2021; 116(3): 458-479. PMID 33657038
27. Yee J, Kim DH, Rosen MP, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria colorectal cancer screening. *J Am Coll Radiol.* Jun 2014; 11(6): 543-51. PMID 24793959
28. Moreno C, Kim DH, Bartel TB, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria (R) Colorectal Cancer Screening. *J Am Coll Radiol.* May 2018; 15(5S): S56-S68. PMID 29724427
29. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology. Colorectal cancer screening. Version 2.2021. April 13, 2021. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/colorectal\\_screening.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/colorectal_screening.pdf). Accessed July 26, 2021
30. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Final Recommendation Statement. Colorectal Cancer: Screening. May 18, 2021; <https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf/recommendation/colorectal-cancer-screening>. Accessed July 26, 2021.
31. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Decision memo for screening computed tomography colonography (CTC) for colorectal cancer (CAG-00396N). May 12, 2009; [https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-decision-memo.aspx?NCAId=220&TAId=58&NcaName=Screening+Computed+Tomography+Colonography+\(CTC\)+for+Colorectal+Cancer](https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-decision-memo.aspx?NCAId=220&TAId=58&NcaName=Screening+Computed+Tomography+Colonography+(CTC)+for+Colorectal+Cancer). Accessed July 26, 2021.
32. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association. Medical Policy Reference Manual, No. 6.01.32 (September 2021).

### Documentation for Clinical Review

**Please provide the following documentation:**

- History and physical and/or consultation notes including:
  - Anesthesiologist pre-operative assessment
  - Reason for the need for testing/colonoscopy
  - Reason a conventional colonoscopy is not indicated or that the patient refuses colonoscopy

**Post Service (in addition to the above, please include the following):**

- Procedure report

### 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.*



Type	Code	Description
CPT®	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
HCPCS	None	

## Policy History

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

Effective Date	Action
06/01/2003	BCBSA Medical Policy adoption
06/01/2004	Policy Review
12/07/2006	BCBSA Medical Policy adoption
05/08/2009	Policy Title Revision, Medically Necessary criteria added
06/26/2009	Policy Revision
01/15/2010	Coding Update
04/01/2011	Policy revision with position change
09/30/2014	Policy title change from CT Colonography (Virtual Colonoscopy) Policy revision with position change
11/01/2016	Policy revision without position change
11/01/2017	Policy revision without position change
11/01/2018	Policy revision without position change
11/01/2019	Policy revision without position change
06/01/2020	Administrative update. Policy statement, guidelines and literature updated.
11/01/2020	Annual review. No change to policy statement. Literature review updated.
11/01/2021	Annual review. Policy statement, guidelines and literature updated.

## 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 (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).

*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 <i>Blue font: Verbiage Changes/Additions</i>
<p><b>Virtual Colonoscopy/Computed Tomography Colonography 6.01.32</b></p> <p><b>Policy Statement:</b>                      Computed tomography colonography (CTC) may be considered <b>medically necessary</b> for <b>one or more</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Conventional colonoscopy is indicated but there are contraindications (e.g. chronic anticoagulation, colonic stenosis or significant anesthesia risk (ASA III or greater)</li> <li>II. Preferred by the patient for colon cancer screening and meets standard screening criteria</li> </ul> <p>Except for the indications outlined in the policy statements above, CTC is considered <b>investigational</b>.</p>	<p><b>Virtual Colonoscopy/Computed Tomography Colonography 6.01.32</b></p> <p><b>Policy Statement:</b>                      Computed tomography colonography (CTC) may be considered <b>medically necessary</b> for <b>one or more</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Conventional colonoscopy is indicated but there are contraindications <i>or an incomplete colonoscopy</i> (e.g. chronic anticoagulation, colonic stenosis, <i>obstruction</i> or significant anesthesia risk [ASA III or greater])</li> <li>II. Preferred by the patient for colon cancer screening and meets standard screening criteria</li> </ul> <p>Except for the indications outlined in the policy statements above, CTC is considered <b>investigational</b>.</p>