

04-70450-03

Original Effective Date: 12/15/04

Reviewed: 02/23/23

Revised: 09/30/23

Subject: Computed Tomographic Angiography (CTA) Heart

THIS MEDICAL COVERAGE GUIDELINE IS NOT AN AUTHORIZATION, CERTIFICATION, EXPLANATION OF BENEFITS, OR A GUARANTEE OF PAYMENT, NOR DOES IT SUBSTITUTE FOR OR CONSTITUTE MEDICAL ADVICE. ALL MEDICAL DECISIONS ARE SOLELY THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PATIENT AND PHYSICIAN. BENEFITS ARE DETERMINED BY THE GROUP CONTRACT, MEMBER BENEFIT BOOKLET, AND/OR INDIVIDUAL SUBSCRIBER CERTIFICATE IN EFFECT AT THE TIME SERVICES WERE RENDERED. THIS MEDICAL COVERAGE GUIDELINE APPLIES TO ALL LINES OF BUSINESS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED IN THE PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS SECTION.

Position Statement	Billing/Coding	Reimbursement	Program Exceptions	Definitions	Related Guidelines
Other	References	Update			

DESCRIPTION:

Coronary computed tomographic angiography (CTA, CCTA) is a noninvasive imaging study that uses intravenously administered contrast material and high-resolution, rapid imaging computed tomography (CT) equipment to obtain detailed volumetric images of the coronary blood vessels. This guideline addresses the use of coronary computed tomographic angiography (CTA, CCTA) in the outpatient setting.

POSITION STATEMENT:

Computed tomographic angiography (CTA/CCTA) **meets the definition of medical necessity** for the following indications:

Evaluation in suspected coronary artery disease (CAD)

- An alternative to coronary angiography before valve surgery or transcatheter intervention
- Equivocal, borderline, or discordant stress imaging evaluation with continued symptoms concerning CAD
- Evaluation of coronary anomaly or aneurysm
- Evaluation of coronary artery bypass grafts
- Exercise ECG stress test with intermediate Duke Treadmill Score (- 10 to + 4) in whom stress echo cannot be performed
- High pretest probability as an alternative to coronary angiography
- Members with intermediate pretest probability of CAD in whom either exercise electrocardiogram (ECG) stress or stress echocardiogram cannot be performed

- Newly diagnosed clinical systolic heart failure (ejection fraction [EF] < 50%) without recent CAD evaluation in the presence of angina or an anginal equivalent
- Reduced ejection fraction (EF) (EF <40%) as an alternative to invasive coronary arteriography
- Repeat testing in member with new or worse symptoms since prior normal stress imaging.

Additional Information:

Stable individuals without known CAD fall into 2 categories (asymptomatic and symptomatic):

- Asymptomatic, for whom global risk of CAD events can be determined from coronary risk factors, using online cardiac risk calculator (see Reimbursement Information section).
- Symptomatic, for whom we estimate the pretest probability that their chest-related symptoms are due to clinically significant (> 50%) CAD.

Three Types of Chest Pain or Discomfort

- **Typical Angina (definite):** Defined as including all of the following characteristics:
 - Substernal chest pain or discomfort with characteristic quality and duration
 - Provoked by exertion or emotional stress
 - Relieved by rest and/or nitroglycerin.
- **Atypical angina (probable):** Chest pain or discomfort that lacks one of the characteristics of typical angina (definite).
- **Non-anginal Chest Pain:** Chest pain or discomfort that meets one or none of the typical angina (definite) characteristics.

Note: Once the type of chest pain has been established from the medical record, the pretest probability of CAD (meaning obstructive CAD defined as coronary arterial narrowing \geq 50%) is estimated from the below table (Table 1) (Diamond and Forrester Pre-Test Probability of Coronary Artery Disease by Age, Sex (gender) and Symptoms). Additional coronary risk factors could increase pretest probability.

Determination of Pretest Probability for Coronary Artery Disease (CAD)

Table 1: Determination of Pretest Probability for Coronary Artery Disease Based on Age, Sex, and Symptoms (Source: American College of Cardiology Criteria for Pretest Probability of Coronary Artery Disease (CAD)).

The following risk assessment may be used to determine pre-test probability of coronary artery disease:

Age (years)	Sex	Typical/Definite Angina Pectoris	Atypical/Probable Angina Pectoris	Non-anginal Chest Pain	Asymptomatic
≤ 39	Men	Intermediate	Intermediate	Low	Very low
	Women	Intermediate	Very low	Very low	Very low
40 – 49	Men	High	Intermediate	Intermediate	Low

	Women	Intermediate	Low	Very low	Very low
50 – 59	Men	High	Intermediate	Intermediate	Low
	Women	Intermediate	Intermediate	Low	Very low
≥ 60	Men	High	Intermediate	Intermediate	Low
	Women	High	Intermediate	Intermediate	Low
<p>Very low: Less than 5% pretest probability of CAD</p> <p>Low: Between 5% and 10% pretest probability of CAD</p> <p>Intermediate: Between 10% and 90% pretest probability of CAD</p> <p>High: Greater than 90% pretest probability of CAD</p>					

Adapted from: Wolk MJ, Bailey SR, Doherty JU et al.

ACCF/AHA/ASE/ASNC/HFSA/HRS/SCAI/SCCT/SCMR/STS 2013 Multimodality appropriate use criteria for the detection and risk assessment of stable ischemic heart disease. Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2014; 63(4): 380-406.

Taylor AJ, Cerqueira M, Hodgson JM, et al. ACCF/SCCT/ACR/AHA/ASE/ASNC/NASCI/SCAI/SCMR 2010 appropriate use criteria for cardiac computed tomography. Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2010;56(22):1864-1894.

Global Risk of Cardiovascular Disease (coronary disease (CAD))

Global risk of CAD is defined as the probability of manifesting cardiovascular disease over the next 10 years and refers to asymptomatic members without known cardiovascular disease. It should be determined using one of the cardiac risk calculators below. A high risk is considered greater than 20% risk of a cardiovascular event over the ensuing 10 years. High global risk by itself generally lacks scientific support as an indication for stress imaging. There are rare exemptions, such as members requiring IC antiarrhythmic drugs, who might require coronary risk stratification prior to initiation of the drug, when global risk is moderate or high.

CAD Risk—Low: 10-year absolute coronary or cardiovascular risk less than 10%.

CAD Risk—Moderate: 10-year absolute coronary or cardiovascular risk between 10% and 20%.

CAD Risk—High: 10-year absolute coronary or cardiovascular risk of greater than 20%.

Duke Treadmill Score

- The equation for calculating the Duke treadmill score (DTS) is, $DTS = \text{exercise time in minutes} - (5 \times \text{ST deviation in mm or } 0.1 \text{ mV increments}) - (4 \times \text{exercise angina score})$, with angina score being 0 = none, 1 = non limiting, and 2 = exercise-limiting.
- The score typically ranges from -25 to +15. These values correspond to low-risk (with a score of $\geq +5$), intermediate risk (with scores ranging from - 10 to + 4), and high-risk (with a score of ≤ -11) categories.

Online cardiac risk calculator and assessment tools

The links for the online cardiac risk calculator and assessment tools are to an outside source and is provided for your convenience. Use of the links and related calculator and assessment tools are subject to the terms and conditions of the website and is not warranted, maintained or affiliated with Florida Blue.

Framingham Risk Score Calculator

<http://www.medcalc.com/heartrisk.html>

Reynolds Risk Score

<http://www.reynoldsriskscore.org/>

Pooled Cohort Risk Assessment Equations

<http://clincalc.com/Cardiology/ASCVD/PooledCohort.aspx>

ACC/AHA Risk Calculator

<http://tools.acc.org/ASCVD-Risk-Estimator-Plus/#!/calculate/estimate/>

MESA Risk Calculator (With addition of coronary artery calcium score, for CAD-only risk)

<https://www.mesa-nhlbi.org/MESACHDRisk/MesaRiskScore/RiskScore.aspx>

BILLING/CODING INFORMATION:

CPT Coding:

75574	Computed tomographic angiography, heart, coronary arteries and bypass grafts (when present), with contrast material, including 3D image postprocessing (including evaluation of cardiac structure and morphology, assessment of cardiac function, and evaluation of venous structures, if performed)
-------	--

REIMBURSEMENT INFORMATION:

LOINC Codes:

The following information may be required documentation to support medical necessity: physician history and physical, physician progress notes, plan of treatment, laboratory studies and reason for computed tomographic angiography (CTA).

Documentation Table	LOINC Codes	LOINC Time Frame Modifier Code	LOINC Time Frame Modifier Codes Narrative
---------------------	-------------	--------------------------------	---

Physician history and physical	28626-0	18805-2	Include all data of the selected type that represents observations made six months or fewer before starting date of service for the claim
Attending physician progress note	18741-9	18805-2	Include all data of the selected type that represents observations made six months or fewer before starting date of service for the claim
Plan of treatment	18776-5	18805-2	Include all data of the selected type that represents observations made six months or fewer before starting date of service for the claim

PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS:

Federal Employee Plan (FEP): Follow FEP guidelines.

Medicare Advantage products

No National Coverage Determination (NCD) was found at the time of the last guideline reviewed date.

DEFINITIONS:

No guideline specific definitions apply.

RELATED GUIDELINES:

[Computed Tomography to Detect Coronary Artery Calcification, 04-70450-02](#)

OTHER:

Other names used to report computed tomographic angiography (CTA) for coronary artery evaluation:

Cardiac Computed Tomography (CCT) (or CT Angiography)

Coronary angiography (CCTA)

Multi-detector row computed (computerized) tomography (MDCT)

Multi-slice spiral computed (computerized) tomography (MSCT)

REFERENCES:

1. American College of Radiology (ACR) Practice Guideline for the Performance and Interpretation of Computed Tomography Angiography (CTA), 10/01/05.
2. American Medical Association Clinical Examples in Radiology Vol. 1, Bulletin 2, 2005, pp.1-3.
3. Andreini D, Pontone G, Pepi M et al. Diagnostic accuracy of multidetector computed tomography coronary angiography in patients with dilated cardiomyopathy. Journal of American College of Cardiology 2007 May 22; 49(20): 2044 – 50.

4. Baumgartner H, Falk V, Bax JJ, De Bonis M et al. 2017 ESC/EACTS Guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease. *Eur Heart J*. 2017 Sep 21; 38(36):2739-2791.
5. Berman DS, Hachamovitch R, Shaw LJ et al. Roles of nuclear cardiology, cardiac computed tomography, and cardiac magnetic resonance: Noninvasive risk stratification and a conceptual framework for the selection of noninvasive imaging tests in patients with known or suspected coronary artery disease. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine* 2006; 47(7):1107 – 1118.
6. Braunwald E, Antman EM, Beasley JW et al. ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Unstable Angina and Non–ST-Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee on the Management of Patients with Unstable Angina). *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2000; 36(3): 970-1062.
7. Brignole M, Moya A, de Lange FJ et al. 2018 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of syncope. *Eur Heart J*. 2018 Jun 1;39(21):1883-1948.
8. Budoff MJ, Achenbach S, Blumenthal RS et al. Assessment of coronary artery disease by cardiac computed tomography: a scientific statement from the american heart association committee on cardiovascular imaging and intervention, council on cardiovascular radiology and intervention, and committee on cardiac imaging, council on clinical cardiology. *Circulation* 2006; 114; 1761-1791.
9. Budoff MJ, Cohen MC, Garcia MJ et al. ACCF/AHA Clinical Competence Statement on Cardiac Imaging with Computed Tomography and Magnetic Resonance. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2005; 46(2): 383 – 402.
10. Budoff MJ, Gopal A, Gul KM et al. Prevalence of obstructive coronary artery disease in an outpatient cardiac CT angiography environment. *International Journal of Cardiology* 2008; 129(1): 32-36.
11. Cademartiri F, Mollet N, Lemos PA et al. Usefulness of Multislice Computed Tomographic Coronary Angiography to Assess In-Stent Restenosis. *American Journal of Cardiology* 2005 Sept 15; 96(6): 799-802.
12. Chow GJ, Larose E, Bilodeau S et al. The ‘what, when, where, who and how?’ of cardiac computed tomography in 2009: guidelines for the clinician. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology* 2009; 25(3): 135 – 139.
13. Cole JH, Chunn VM, Morrow JA et al. Cost implications of initial computed tomography angiography as opposed to catheterization in patients with medley abnormal or equivocal myocardial perfusion scans. *Journal of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography* 2007; 1: 21 – 26.
14. Coles DR, Smail MA, Negus IS et al. Comparison of radiation doses from multislice computed tomography coronary angiography and conventional diagnostic angiography. *Journal of the American College Cardiology* 2006; 47(9): 1840 – 1845.
15. Datta J, White CS, Gikeson RC et al. Anomalous Coronary Arteries in Adults: Depiction at Multi-Detector Row CT Angiography. *Radiology* 2005; 235(3): 812 – 818.
16. Davis, W. Multi-Slice CT: 64 and Counting. *Medical Imaging*, 04/05.
17. Di Carli MF. CT coronary angiography: where does it fit? *The Journal of Nuclear Medicine* 2006; 47(9): 1397 – 1399.
18. Dogan H, Kroft LJM, Huisman MV et al. Right ventricular function in patients with acute pulmonary embolism: analysis with electrocardiography-synchronized multi-detector row CT. *Radiology* 2007; 242(1): 78-84.

19. Ehara M, Kawai M, Sumely JF et al. Diagnostic accuracy of coronary in-stent restenosis using 64-slice computed tomography. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2007; 49 (9): 951 – 959.
20. Ehara M, Surmely JF, Kawai M et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of 64-Slice Computed Tomography for Detecting Angiographically Significant Coronary Artery Stenosis in An Unselected Consecutive Patient Population: Comparison with Conventional Invasive Angiography. *Circulation Journal*, 2006 May; 70(5): 564 – 571.
21. Eisenberg C, Hulten E, Bittencourt MS et al. Use of CT angiography among patients with prior coronary artery bypass grafting surgery. *Cardiovasc Diagn Ther* 2017 Feb; 7(1):102-105.
22. Einstein AJ, Henzlova MJ, Rajagopalan S. Estimating risk of cancer associated with radiation exposure from 64-slice computed tomography coronary angiography. *The Journal of the American Medical Association* 2007; 298 (3): 317 – 323.
23. Einstein AJ, Moser KW Thompson RC et al. Radiation dose to patients from cardiac diagnostic imaging. *Circulation* 2007; 116: 1290 – 1305.
24. Ferencik M, Ropers D, Abbara S et al. Diagnostic accuracy of image postprocessing methods for the detection of coronary artery stenoses by using multidetector CT *Radiology* 2007; 243(3): 696 – 702.
25. Fletcher GF, Ades PA, Kligfield P et al. Exercise standards for testing and training: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2013 Aug 20;128(8):873-934.
26. Gallagher MJ, Raff GL. Use of multislice CT for the evaluation of emergency room patients with chest pain: the so-called “triple rule-out”. *Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions* 2008; 71(1): 92-99.
27. Garcia MJ, Lessick J, Hoffmann, MH et al. Accuracy of 16-Row Multidetector Computed Tomography for the Assessment of Coronary Artery Stenosis. *JAMA*, 2006; 296(4): 403 – 411.
28. Gasper T, Halon D, Lewis BS Diagnosis of Coronary in-stent restenosis with multidetector row spiral computed tomography. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2005; 46(8): 1573 – 1579.
29. Ghostine S, Caussin C, Daoud B et al. Non-invasive detection of coronary artery disease in patients with left bundle branch block using 64-slice computed tomography. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2006; 48: 1929 – 1934.
30. Gibbons RJ, Balady J, Bricker T et al. ACC/AHA 2002 guideline update for exercise testing: summary article: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on practice guidelines (committee to update the 1997 exercise testing guidelines). *Circulation* 2002; 106: 1883 – 1892.
31. Gibbons RJ, Eckel RH, Jacobs AK et al. The utilization of cardiac imaging. *Circulation* 2006; 113; 1715:1716.
32. Goldstein JA, Gallagher MJ, O'Neill WW et al. A randomized controlled trial of multi-slice coronary computed tomography for evaluation of acute chest pain. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2007; 49(8): 863 – 871.
33. Greenland P, Alpert JS, Beller GA et al. 2010 ACCF/AHA guideline for assessment of cardiovascular risk in asymptomatic adults: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2010 Dec 14;56(25):e50-103.

34. Hacker M, Jakobs T, Matthiesen F et al. Comparison of spiral multidetector CT angiography and myocardial perfusion imaging in the noninvasive detection of functionally relevant coronary artery lesions: first clinical experiences. *The Journal of Nuclear Medicine* 2005; 46(8): 1294 – 1300.
35. Halpern EJ. Triple-rule-out CT angiography for evaluation of acute chest pain and possible acute coronary syndrome. *Radiology* 2009; 252(2): 332 – 345.
36. Hamon M, Morello R, Riddell JW et al. Coronary Arteries: Diagnostic Performance of 16- versus 64-Section Spiral CT Compared with Invasive Coronary Angiography Meta-Analysis. *Radiology* 2007; 245(3): 720 – 731.
37. Hausleiter, J, Meyer T, Hermann F et al. Estimated radiation dose associated with cardiac CT angiography. *The Journal of the American Medical Association* 2009; 301(5): 500 – 507.
38. Hendel RC, Budoff MJ, Cardella JF et al. ACC/AHA/ACR/ASE/ASNC/HRS/NASCI/RSNA/SAIP/SCAI/SCCT/SCMR/SIR 2008 Key data elements and definitions for cardiac imaging: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association task force on clinical data standards (writing committee to develop clinical data standards for cardiac imaging). *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2009; 53: 91 – 124.
39. Hendel RC, Patel MR, Kramer CM et al. ACCF/ACR/SCCT/SCMR/ ASNC/NASCI/SCAI/SIR 2006 Appropriateness Criteria for Cardiac Computed Tomography and Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging-A Report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation Quality Strategic Directions Committee Appropriateness Criteria Working Group, American College of Radiology, Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography, Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance, American Society of Nuclear Cardiology, North American Society for Cardiac Imaging, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Interventional Radiology. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2006; 48(7): 1475 – 1497.
40. Henzlova MJ, Duvall WL, Einstein AJ et al. ASNC imaging guidelines for SPECT nuclear cardiology procedures: stress, protocols, and tracers. *J Nucl Cardiol.* 2016 Jun; 23(3):606-39.
41. Hlatky MA. Evaluating use of coronary computed tomography angiography in the emergency department (editorial comment). *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2009; 53(18): 1651 – 1652.
42. Hoffman MHK, Shi H, Schmitz B, et al. Noninvasive Coronary Angiography with Multislice Computed Tomography. *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* Vol 293, No. 20: 2471 – 2478.
43. Hoffman U, Nagurney JT, Moselewski F et al. Coronary multidetector computed tomography in the assessment of patients with acute chest pain. *Circulation* 2006; 114(21): 2251-2260.
44. Hoffmann U, Bamberg F, Chae Cu et al. Coronary computed tomography angiography for early triage of patients with acute chest pain: the ROMICAT (Rule Out Myocardial Infarction using Computer Assisted Tomography) trial. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2009; 53(18): 1642 – 1650.
45. Hoffmann U, Bamberg F, Chae Cu et al. Coronary computed tomography angiography for early triage of patients with acute chest pain: the ROMICAT (Rule Out Myocardial Infarction Using Computer Assisted Tomography) trial. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2009; 53(18): 1642 – 1650.

46. Hollander JE, Chang AM, Shofer FS et al. One-year outcomes following coronary computerized tomographic angiography for evaluation of emergency department patients with potential acute coronary syndrome. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2009; 16(8): 693 – 698.
47. Hurwitz LM, Reiman RE, Yoshizumi TT et al. Radiation dose from contemporary cardiothoracic multidetector CT protocols with an anthropomorphic female phantom: implications for cancer induction. *Radiology* 2007; 245(3): 742 – 750.
48. Jones CM, Athanasiou T, Dunne N et al. Multi-detector computed tomography in coronary artery bypass graft assessment: a meta-analysis. *Annals of Thoracic Surgery* 2007; 83(1): 341-348.
49. Khare RK, Courtney DM, Powell ES et al. Sixty-four-slice computed tomography of the coronary arteries: cost-effectiveness analysis of patients presenting to the emergency department with low-risk chest pain. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2008; 15(7): 623 – 632.
50. Kramer CM, Budoff MJ, Fayad ZA et al. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2007; 50(11): 1097 – 1114.
51. Kuettner A, Kopp AF, Schroeder S et al. Diagnostic accuracy of multidetector computed tomography coronary angiography in patients with angiographically proven coronary artery disease. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2004; 43: 831 – 839.
52. Ladapo JA, Hoffman U, Bamberg F et al. Cost-effectiveness of coronary MDCT in the triage of patients with acute chest pain. *American Journal of Roentgenology* 2008; 191: 455 – 463.
53. Leber A, et al. Accuracy of Multidetector Spiral Computed Tomography in Identifying and Differentiating the Composition of Coronary Atherosclerotic Plaques, *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, Vol. 43, No. 7:1241 – 1247, 2004.
54. Leber AW, Becker A, Knez A. Accuracy of 64-slice computed tomography to classify and quantify plaque volumes in the proximal coronary system: a comparative study using intravascular ultrasound. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2006; 47(3): 672 – 692.
55. Levin DC, Parker L, Sunshine JH et al. Cardiovascular imaging: who does it and how important is it to the practice of radiology? *American Journal of Roentgenology*; 178: 303 – 306.
56. Mark DB, Berman DS, Budoff MJ et al. ACCF/ACR/AHA/NASCI/SAIP/SCAI/SCCT 2010 Expert Consensus Document on Coronary Computed Tomographic Angiography: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation Task Force on Expert Consensus Documents. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2010; 55: 2663-2699.
57. Maruyama T, et al. Comparison of Visibility and Diagnostic Capability of Noninvasive Coronary Angiography by Eight-Slice Multidetector-Row Computed Tomography Versus Conventional Coronary Angiography, *The American Journal of Cardiology*, Vol. 93 No. 5, 03/01/04.
58. Matsumoto N, Sato Y, Yoda S et al. Prognostic value of non-obstructive CT low-dense coronary artery plaques detected by multislice computed tomography 2007; 71(12): 1898 – 1903.
59. Meijboom WB, Meijs MF, Schuijf JD et al. Diagnostic accuracy of 64-slice computed tomography coronary angiography: a prospective, multicenter, multivendor study. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2008; 52(25): 2135 – 2144.
60. Meijboom WB, van Mieghem CA, Mollet NR et al. 64-slice computed tomography coronary angiography in patients with high, intermediate, or low pretest probability of significant coronary artery disease. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2007; 50(15): 1469 – 1475.

61. Meijer AB, O YL, Geleijns J et al. Meta-analysis of 40-and 64-MDCT angiography for assessing coronary artery stenosis. *American Journal of Roentgenology* 2008; 191(6): 1667 – 1675.
62. Meyer TS, Martinoff S, Hadamitzky M et al. Improved noninvasive assessment of coronary artery bypass grafts with 64-slice computed tomographic angiography in an unselected patient population. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2007; 49(9): 946 – 950.
63. Miller JM, Rochitte CE, Dewey M et al. Diagnostic performance of coronary angiography by 64-row CT. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 2008; 359(22): 2324 – 2336.
64. Min JK. Coronary CTA versus cardiac catheterization: where do we stand today? *Supplement To Applied Radiology* 2006, 32 – 40.
65. Mintz GS. IVUS in PCI guidance. *Expert Analysis American College of Cardiology* 2016.
66. Mollet N, et al. Multislice Spiral Computed Tomography Coronary Angiography in Patients with Stable Angina Pectoris. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, Vol. 43, No. 12:2265 – 2270, 2004.
67. Moss AJ, Williams MC, Newby DE et al. The updated NICE guidelines: cardiac CT as the first-line test for coronary artery disease. *Curr Cardiovasc Imaging Rep.* 2017;10(5):15.
68. Mowatt G, Cook JA, Hillis GS et al. 64-Slice computed tomography angiography in the diagnosis and assessment of coronary artery disease: systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Cardiac Society* 2008; 94(11): 1386 – 1393.
69. Newburger JW, Takahashi M, Burns JC. Kawasaki Disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2016 Apr 12; 67(14):1738-49.
70. Nikolaou K, Knez A, Rist C et al. Accuracy of 64-MDCT in the diagnosis of ischemic heart disease. *American Journal of Roentgenology* 2006; 187: 111 – 117.
71. Ong TK, Chin SP, Liew Ck et al. Accuracy of 64-row multidetector computed tomography in detecting coronary artery disease in 134 symptomatic patients: influence of calcification. *American Heart Journal* 2006; 151(6): 1323. el-6.
72. Patel MR, Calhoon JH, Dehmer GJ et al. ACC/AATS/AHA/ASE/ASNC/SCAI/SCCT/STS 2017 Appropriate Use Criteria for Coronary Revascularization in Patients With Stable Ischemic Heart Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Appropriate Use Criteria Task Force, American Association for Thoracic Surgery, American Heart Association, American Society of Echocardiography, American Society of Nuclear Cardiology, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *J Nucl Cardiol.* 2017 Oct;24(5):1759-1792.
73. Patel MR, Hurwitz LM, Orlando L et al. Noninvasive imaging for coronary artery disease: a technology assessment for the Medicare Coverage Advisory Commission. *American Heart Journal* 2007; 153(2): 161 – 174.
74. Peebles C. Computed Tomographic Coronary Angiography: How Many Slices Do You Need? *Heart* 2006 May; 92(5): 582-584 [Editorial].
75. Pelech AN. Coronary Artery Anomalies. *E-Medicine Specialties (Pediatrics/Cardiology)*, 08/18/06.
76. Poon et al. Consensus update on the appropriate usage of cardiac computed tomographic angiography. *The Journal of Invasive Cardiology* 2007; 19(11): 484 – 490.

77. Raff GL, Chinnaiyan KM, Share DA et al. Radiation dose from computed tomography before and after implementation of radiation dose-reduction techniques. *The Journal of the American Association* 2009; 301(22): 2340 – 2348.
78. Raff GL, Gallagher MJ, O'Neil WW et al. Diagnostic accuracy of noninvasive coronary angiography using 64-slice spiral computed tomography. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2005; 46(3): 552-557.
79. Roper D, Pohle FK, Kuettner A et al. Diagnostic accuracy of noninvasive coronary angiography in patients after bypass surgery using 64-slice spiral computed tomography with 330-ms gantry rotation. *Circulation* 2006; 114: 2334 – 2341.
80. Ropers E, et al. Detection of Coronary Artery Stenoses with Thin-Slice Multi-Detector Spiral Computed Tomography and Multiplanar Reconstruction. *Circulation*, 107:664 – 668, 2003.
81. Rubinshetein R, Jalon D, Gaspar T et al. Usefulness of 64-slice cardiac computed tomographic angiography for diagnosing acute coronary syndromes and predicting clinical outcome in emergency department patients with chest pain of uncertain origin. *Circulation* 2007; 115: 1762 – 1768.
82. Rubinshtein R, Halon DA, Gaspar T et al. Impact of 64-slice cardiac computed tomographic angiography on clinical decision-making in emergency department patients with chest pain of possible myocardial ischemic origin. *American Journal of Cardiology* 2007; 100(10): 1522 – 1526.
83. Schoepf U, et al. Multidetector – Row CT of the Heart, *Radiologic Clinics of North America* Vol. 42 No. 3, 05/04.
84. Schuijf JD, Bax JJ, Shaw LJ et al. Meta-analysis of comparative diagnostic performance of magnetic resonance imaging and multislice computed tomography for noninvasive coronary angiography. *American Heart Journal* 2006 Feb; 151(2): 404 – 411.
85. Schuijf JD, Pundziute G, Jukema JW et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of 64-Slice Multislice Computed Tomography in the Noninvasive Evaluation of Significant Coronary Artery Disease. *American Journal of Cardiology* 2006; 98(2): 145 – 148.
86. SCOT-HEART investigators. CT coronary angiography in patients with suspected angina due to coronary heart disease (SCOT-HEART): an open-label, parallel-group, multicentre trial. *Lancet*. 2015 Jun 13; 385(9985):2383-91.
87. Shen WK, Sheldon RS, Benditt DG et al. A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. 2017 ACC/AHA/HRS guideline for the evaluation and management of patients with syncope: A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. *Heart Rhythm*. 2017 Aug;14(8):e155-e217.
88. Stein PD, Beemath A, Kayali F et al. Multidetector computed tomography for the diagnosis of coronary artery disease: a systematic review. *American Journal of Medicine* 2006 March; 119(3): 203 – 216.
89. Stein PD, Yaekoub Ay, Matta F et al. 64-slice CT for diagnosis of coronary artery disease: a systematic review. *The American Journal of Medicine* 2008; 121(8): 715 – 725.
90. Takakuwa KM, Halpern EJ, Gingold EL et al. Radiation dose in a “triple rule-out” coronary CT angiography protocol of emergency department patients using 64-MDCT: the impact of ECG-based tube current modulation on age, sex, and body mass index. *American Journal of Roentgenology* 2009; 192(4):866 – 872.

91. Taylor AJ, Cerqueira M, Hodgson JM et al. ACCF/SCCT/ACR/AHA/ASE/ASNC/NASCI/SCAI/SCMR 2010 Appropriate Use Criteria for Cardiac Computed Tomography. A Report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation Appropriate Use Criteria Task Force, the Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography, the American College of Radiology, the American Heart Association, the American Society of Echocardiography, the American Society of Nuclear Cardiology, the North American Society for Cardiovascular Imaging, the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and the Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance. Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2010; 56 (22): 1864-1894.
92. Tobis J, Azarbal B, Slavin L. Assessment of intermediate severity coronary lesions in the catheterization laboratory. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2007 Feb 27; 49(8):839-848.U.S. Preventive Services Task Force-Screening for Coronary Heart Disease, 02/04.
93. Vanhoenacker PK, Heijenbrok-Kal MH, Van Heste R et al. Diagnostic performance of multidetector CT angiography for assessment of coronary artery disease: meta-analysis. Radiology 2007; 244(2): 419 – 28.
94. White RD, Patel MR, Abbara S et al. 2013 ACCF/ACR/ASE/ASNC/SCCT/SCMR appropriate utilization of cardiovascular imaging in heart failure: an executive summary: a joint report of the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Committee and the ACCF Appropriate Use Criteria Task Force. J Am Coll Radiol. 2013 Jul;10(7):493-500.
95. Wolk MJ, Bailey SR, Doherty JU et al. ACCF/AHA/ASE/ASNC/HFSA/HRS/SCAI/SCCT/SCMR/STS 2013 Multimodality Appropriate Use Criteria for the Detection and Risk Assessment of Stable Ischemic Heart Disease A Report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation Appropriate Use Criteria Task Force, American Heart Association, American Society of Echocardiography, American Society of Nuclear Cardiology, Heart Failure Society of America, Heart Rhythm Society, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography, Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2013; 63 (4): 380-406.
96. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/HFSA Focused Update of the 2013 ACCF/AHA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Failure Society of America. Circulation. 2017 Aug 8;136(6): e137-e161.

COMMITTEE APPROVAL:

This Medical Coverage Guideline (MCG) was approved by the Florida Blue Medical Policy and Coverage Committee on 02/23/23.

GUIDELINE UPDATE INFORMATION:

12/15/04	New Medical Coverage Guideline.
02/15/06	Revised investigational rationales deleted “a lack of” and change to “insufficient evidence”. Added screening for coronary artery disease (CAD) to when services are not covered. Added the word “evaluation” to coronary artery bypass graft patency and coronary artery aneurysm (when services are not covered). Added the wording “delineation of” to congenital coronary artery anomaly (when services are not covered). Added delineation of coronary artery anatomy to when services are not covered. Added

	CPT “T” codes: 0146T, 0147T, 0148T, and 0149T (tag investigational-MPF), and updated references. Revised name of MCG, deleted “for coronary artery evaluation” – Computed Tomographic Angiography (CTA).
04/01/06	HCPCS update, deleted S8093.
05/15/06	Added 0145T, 0150T, and 0151T.
03/15/07	Scheduled review. Added “for Coronary Artery Evaluation” to the title of the MCG. Revised the descriptor section, to update the information regarding computed tomographic angiography (CTA) and multidetector row helical CT (MDCT) and multislice CT (MSCT). Revised WHEN SERVICES ARE COVERED, added coverage statement for evaluation for evaluation of anomalous coronary arteries. Revised WHEN SERVICES ARE NOT COVERED, added investigational statement for all other indications. Deleted CPT code: 0145T, 0150T, and 0151T from the BILLING/CODING INFORMATION section. Added program exception for Medicare Advantage products. Added cardiac computed tomography (CCT) to OTHER section, and updated references.
06/15/07	Reformatted guideline.
07/01/07	Updated Program Exception section.
01/01/08	HCPCS update. Revised 0146T, 0147T, 0148T, and 0149T descriptor.
01/21/08	Updated Program Exceptions.
03/15/08	Scheduled review. Revised position statement. Updated billing/coding information section, added ICD-9 diagnosis coronary artery anomaly 746.85. Updated reimbursement information section, and updated references.
11/05/08	Updated Program Exceptions.
05/21/09	Removed Federal Employee Plan (FEP) from Florida Blue Radiology Management program exception statement. Added FEP program exception statement: FEP is excluded from the National Imaging Associates (NIA) review; follow FEP guidelines.
06/25/09	Updated Florida Blue Radiology Management program exception; added BlueSelect.
01/01/10	Annual HCPCS coding update: deleted 0146T, 0147T, 0148T, 0149T, and 0151T; added 75572, 75573, and 75574. Revised Florida Blue Radiology Management program exception section, and updated the references.
05/15/10	Updated guideline name, deleted “for coronary artery evaluation”. Revised description. Expanded medical necessity indications; added criteria, and updated references.
06/15/11	Annual review: maintain position statements. Updated references.
10/01/11	Revision; formatting changes.
06/15/12	Scheduled review; added indications for computed tomography, heart. Deleted ICD-9 codes (Medicare). Updated references.
12/15/12	Updated Medicare program exception. Added Computed Tomography to Detect Coronary Artery Calcification, 04-70450-02 to related guidelines section.
01/01/14	Review/revision. Added “of the heart and coronary arteries” to computed tomographic angiography (CTA).
05/15/18	Revision; revised position statement. Updated references.
11/15/19	Revised description and position statements; added evaluation in suspected coronary artery disease (CAD). Updated references.

03/15/20	Review/revision. Revised position statement: for exercise electrocardiogram, deleted usually typical or atypical angina; for evaluation of coronary artery bypass grafts revise and expanded criteria. Added definition of coronary artery disease and global risk of cardiovascular disease. Reformatted reimbursement information; moved information (anginal equivalent, Duke treadmill score, online cardiac risk calculator and assessment tools) to position statement. Updated references.
05/15/22	Review/update. Revised and expanded criteria. Updated description, program exception and references.
07/01/22	Revision to Program Exceptions section.
09/30/23	Review: position statements and references updated.