



CLINICAL MEDICAL POLICY	
Policy Name:	Noninvasive Assessment of Liver Fibrosis in Chronic Hepatitis C
Policy Number:	MP-009-MD-DE
Responsible Department(s):	Medical Management
Provider Notice Date:	01/15/2019 07/15/2018
Issue Date:	02/18/2019; 08/15/2018
Effective Date:	02/18/2019; 08/15/2018; 12/01/2016
Annual Approval Date:	12/11/2019
Revision Date:	12/11/2018; 06/19/2018; 08/09/2017; 03/14/2017
Products:	Highmark Health Options Medicaid
Application:	All participating hospitals and providers
Page Number(s):	1 of 10

DISCLAIMER

Highmark Health Options medical policy is intended to serve only as a general reference resource regarding coverage for the services described. This policy does not constitute medical advice and is not intended to govern or otherwise influence medical decisions.

POLICY STATEMENT

Highmark Health Options may provide coverage under the medical surgical benefits of the Company's Medicaid and Medicare products for medically necessary diagnostic measures for liver disease. Diagnostic measures include: liver biopsy, noninvasive markers (e.g., FibroScan) and serological markers.

This policy is designed to address medical necessity guidelines that are appropriate for the majority of individuals with a particular disease, illness or condition. Each person's unique clinical circumstances warrant individual consideration, based upon review of applicable medical records.

The qualifications of the policy will meet the standards of the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) and the Delaware Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) and all applicable state and federal regulations.

PROCEDURES

1. The following diagnostic testing are considered medically necessary:
 - A. Liver Biopsy
 - B. Radiologic Testing
 - 1) FibroScan
 - 2) Acoustic Radiation Force Impulse (ARFI)

The following medical necessity criteria must be met for radiologic testing:

 - a. The patient has a suspected diagnosis of Hepatitis C virus and is a candidate for treatment; AND
 - b. Testing is being performed in order to distinguish hepatic cirrhosis from non-hepatic cirrhosis in persons with hepatitis C; AND
 - c. Is only performed every six months; AND
 - d. Cannot be performed within six months following a liver biopsy; AND
 - e. For the patient that is actively using alcohol or IV drugs, or has a history of abuse, there is documentation by the prescriber regarding the risks of alcohol or IV drug abuse and an offer of referral for substance abuse disorder treatment.
 - f. The patient must have a BMI less than 30 kilograms per square meter (kg/m²)
Note: Requests for FibroScan in the morbidly obese patient may be reviewed for individual consideration by a Medical Director.
 - C. Multi-Analyte Serological Testing
 - 1) FibroSure, FibroTest-ActiTest, FIBROSpect
 - 2) HepaScore
 - 3) APRI
2. Contraindications for imaging services
 - A. Morbid obesity (equal to or greater than BMI of 30)
Note: Requests for FibroScan in the morbidly obese patient may be reviewed for individual consideration by a Medical Director; OR
 - B. Ascites; OR
 - C. Pregnancy-per the manufacturer; OR
 - D. Presence of pacemaker-per the manufacturer; OR
 - E. Elevated alkaline phosphatase; OR
3. When services are not covered
For conditions and services other than those listed above as the scientific evidence has not been established. Services are considered not medically necessary.
4. Post-payment Audit Statement
The medical record must include documentation that reflects the medical necessity criteria and is subject to audit by Highmark Health Options at any time pursuant to the terms of your provider agreement.
5. Place of Service
The place of service for all diagnostic measurements listed is outpatient.

GOVERNING BODIES APPROVAL

On April 5th 2013, the FDA provided 510(k) clearance for the FibroScan® device as a commercially available transient elastography unit citing the high degree of reliability of measurement. FibroScan® is indicated for noninvasive measurement of shear wave speed at 50 Hz in the liver. The shear wave speed may be used as an aid to clinical management of patients with liver disease.

No Local or National Medicare Determinations were located.

CODING REQUIREMENTS

Procedure Codes

CPT Codes	Description
91200	Liver elastography, mechanically induced shear wave (e.g., vibration), without imaging, with interpretation and report

Diagnosis Codes

ICD-10 Codes	Description
B18.2	Chronic viral hepatitis C
B19.20	Unspecified viral hepatitis C without coma
B19.21	Unspecified viral hepatitis C with coma
K74.0	Hepatic fibrosis
K74.60	Unspecified cirrhosis of liver
K74.69	Other cirrhosis of liver
Z20.5	Contact with and (suspected) exposure to viral hepatitis
Z22.50	Carrier of unspecified viral hepatitis
Z22.52	Carrier of viral hepatitis C
Z68.20	Body mass index (BMI) 20.0-20.9
Z68.21	Body mass index (BMI) 21.0-21.9
Z68.22	Body mass index (BMI) 22.0-22.9
Z68.23	Body mass index (BMI) 23.0-23.9
Z68.24	Body mass index (BMI) 24.0-24.9
Z68.25	Body mass index (BMI) 25.0-25.9
Z68.26	Body mass index (BMI) 26.0-26.9
Z68.27	Body mass index (BMI) 27.0-27.9
Z68.28	Body mass index (BMI) 28.0-28.9
Z68.29	Body mass index (BMI) 29.0-29.9

REIMBURSEMENT

Participating facilities will be reimbursed per their Highmark Health Options contract.

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE

Chronic hepatitis C is one of the more serious types of hepatitis that is spread through exposure to infected blood. The most common form of transmission occurs from sharing needles and less often, sexual contact with an HV-infected partner, among persons who receive tattoos in unregulated settings, and among infants born to HCV-infected mothers. Other modes of transmission include contaminated medical products during transfusion or other medical procedures. In the United States, the World Health Organization has estimated that there are 3.2 million people living with chronic hepatitis C. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2016) reported that the number of acute hepatitis C virus (HCV) infections increased 3.5-fold from 2010 through 2016 (from 850 to 2,967 reported cases), rising annually throughout this period.

One of the outcomes of chronic hepatitis C is the development of hepatic fibrosis that eventually leads to cirrhosis, liver failure and hepatocellular carcinoma. It has been reported that of those people with chronic hepatitis C, approximately 15 - 25% will require liver transplant. With these statistics, it is essential that patients with chronic hepatitis C be diagnosed and monitored for liver fibrosis. In chronic hepatitis C, quantification of the degree of live fibrosis is important for prognosis and for treatment.

For some time, liver biopsy has been considered the gold standard for the evaluation of hepatic fibrosis and for initiating treatment (Castera and Bedossa, 2011). A liver biopsy has recognized limitations including sampling error and interobserver variability (Cohen and Afdhal, 2010). Due to limitations of liver biopsy, noninvasive diagnostic tools and procedures have been developed to measure liver fibrosis, monitor its progression and potential response to therapy. These measure include and are not limited to transient elastography (FibroScan), magnetic resonance elastography, and several serum biomarkers.

The technology is based on the noninvasive measurement of liver shear wave speed. A mechanical vibrator produces low-amplitude elastic waves that travel through the skin and intercostal space into the liver. Ultrasound is used to track the shear wave and to measure speed, which is then correlated with the elasticity of the liver. FibroScan can be expanded by sampling in different intercostal spaces.

The United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) suggests that noninvasive tests with good diagnostic accuracy are possible alternatives to liver biopsy for the diagnosis of fibrosis or cirrhosis and was given a Grade B recommendation (Moyer, 2014). In 2014, the VA published a clinical guideline regarding treatment considerations for chronic hepatitis C infection. The guideline authors indicate that although liver biopsy is currently considered the best method for staging fibrosis and grading inflammation, alternatives, such as non-invasive imaging and use of fibrosis markers, may be considered instead of a biopsy, with a cautious understanding of their inherent limitations. Castera et al (2015) reported that liver biopsy is now considered an imperfect gold standard and the procedure should be part of an integrated system with noninvasive testing and serum biomarkers.

Transient elastography (TE, FibroScan) is a novel non-invasive method that has been proposed for the assessment of hepatic fibrosis in patients with chronic liver diseases, by measuring liver stiffness. TE measures the velocity of a low-frequency elastic shear wave propagating through the liver. The wave velocity is indicative of tissue stiffness. The more stiff the tissue the faster the shear wave propagates. TE is a rapid and user-friendly technique that can be easily performed at the bedside or in the outpatient clinic with immediate results and good reproducibility. Limitations include failure in around 5% of cases, mainly in obese patients. So far, TE has been mostly validated in chronic hepatitis C, with diagnostic performance equivalent to that of serum markers for the diagnosis of significant fibrosis. Combining TE

with serum markers increases diagnostic accuracy and as a result, liver biopsy could be avoided for initial assessment in most patients with chronic hepatitis C. This strategy warrants further evaluation in other etiological types of chronic liver diseases. TE appears to be an excellent tool for early detection of cirrhosis and may have prognostic value in this setting. As TE has excellent patient acceptance it could be useful for monitoring fibrosis progression and regression in the individual case, but more data are awaited for this application. Guidelines are needed for the use of TE in clinical practice. This technology has been promoted as a noninvasive and painless alternative for a liver biopsy for monitoring liver health in patients with hepatitis.

Crossan et al. (2015) reviewed the cost-effectiveness of treating patients in the absence of liver biopsy using a variety of statistical models but generally found FibroScan was the most cost-effective tool. Patel and Wilder (2014) pointed to the high degree of accuracy by FibroScan for patients with cirrhosis but with the higher error rate by Metavir F2 or less.

In 2013, reported on a comprehensive assessment of transient elastography in the diagnosing of significant liver fibrosis in adults with chronic liver disease (Steadman et al., 2013). A meta-analysis of 57 studies reporting diagnostic performance of TE in HCV patients compared with liver biopsy. The authors rated the quality of the studies and nearly 80% were deemed high quality. The conclusion stated that TE was an accurate method for diagnosing liver fibrosis or cirrhosis and that the testing was less costly than standard liver biopsy.

In a prospective study, de Ledinghen et al. (2006) evaluated the accuracy of liver stiffness measurement for the detection of fibrosis and cirrhosis in HIV/hepatitis C virus (HCV)-coinfected patients and compared its accuracy with other non-invasive methods. These researchers studied 72 consecutive HIV patients with chronic hepatitis C who had a simultaneous liver biopsy and liver stiffness measurement by transient elastography (FibroScan; Echosens, Paris, France) for the assessment of liver fibrosis. Liver stiffness values ranged from 3.0 to 46.4 kPa. Liver stiffness was significantly correlated to fibrosis stage (Kendall tau-b = 0.48; $p < 0.0001$). The area under the receiver operating characteristic (AUROC) curve of liver stiffness measurement was 0.72 for $F \geq 2$ and 0.97 for $F = 4$. For the diagnosis of cirrhosis, AUROC curves of liver stiffness measurement were significantly higher than those for platelet count ($p = 0.02$), aspartate aminotransferase/ALT ratio ($p = 0.0001$), aspartate aminotransferase-to-Platelet Ratio Index ($p = 0.01$), and FIB-4 ($p = 0.004$). The authors concluded that liver stiffness measurement is a promising noninvasive method for the assessment of fibrosis in HIV-infected patients with chronic HCV infection. They also noted that its use for the follow-up of these patients should be further evaluated.

Foucher and colleagues (2006) assessed the accuracy of FibroScan for the detection of cirrhosis in patients with chronic liver disease. A total of 711 patients with chronic liver disease were studied. Etiologies of chronic liver diseases were hepatitis C virus or hepatitis B virus infection, alcohol, non-alcoholic steatohepatitis, other, or a combination of the above etiologies. Liver fibrosis was evaluated according to the METAVIR score. Stiffness was significantly correlated with fibrosis stage ($r = 0.73$, $p < 0.0001$). Areas under the receiver operating characteristic curve (95 % CI) were 0.80 (0.75 to 0.84) for patients with significant fibrosis ($F > 2$), 0.90 (0.86 to 0.93) for patients with severe fibrosis (F3), and 0.96 (0.94 to 0.98) for patients with cirrhosis. Using a cut off value of 17.6 kPa, patients with cirrhosis were detected with a positive predictive value and a NPV of 90 %. Liver stiffness was significantly correlated with clinical, biological, and morphological parameters of liver disease. With an NPV greater than 90 %, the cut off values for the presence of esophageal varices stage 2/3, cirrhosis Child-Pugh B or C, past history of ascites, hepatocellular carcinoma, and esophageal bleeding were 27.5, 37.5, 49.1, 53.7, and 62.7 kPa, respectively. The authors concluded that FibroScan is a promising non-invasive method for detection of cirrhosis in

patients with chronic liver disease. They noted that its use for the follow-up and management of these patients could be of great interest and should be evaluated further.

Corpechot and associates (2006) assessed the diagnostic performance of liver stiffness measurement (LSM) for the determination of fibrosis stage in chronic cholestatic diseases. A total of 101 patients with primary biliary cirrhosis (PBC n = 73) or primary sclerosing cholangitis (PSC n = 28) were prospectively enrolled in a multi-center study. All patients underwent liver biopsy (LB) and LSM. Histological and fibrosis stages were assessed on LB by two pathologists. LSM was performed by FibroScan. Efficiency of LSM for the determination of histological and fibrosis stages were determined by a ROC curve analysis. Analysis failed in 6 patients (5.9 %) because of unsuitable LB (n = 4) or LSM (n = 2). Stiffness values ranged from 2.8 to 69.1 kPa (median of 7.8 kPa). LSM was correlated to both fibrosis (Spearman's rho = 0.84, p < .0001) and histological (0.79, p < .0001) stages. These correlations were still found when PBC and PSC patients were analyzed separately. Areas under ROC curves were 0.92 for fibrosis stage (F) > or = 2, 0.95 for F > or = 3 and 0.96 for F = 4. Optimal stiffness cutoff values of 7.3, 9.8, and 17.3 kPa showed F > or = 2, F > or = 3 and F = 4, respectively. LSM and serum hyaluronic acid level were independent parameters associated with extensive fibrosis on LB. The authors concluded that FibroScan is a simple and reliable non-invasive means for assessing biliary fibrosis. They stated that it should be a promising tool to assess anti-fibrotic therapies in PBC or PSC.

The Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) performed an evaluation on FibroScan for non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis (Murtagh and Foster, 2006). It stated that the diagnostic performance of FibroScan is good for identifying severe fibrosis or cirrhosis, but it is less accurate for milder presentations. It concluded that FibroScan is a promising technology, but large multi-center studies comparing a range of emerging non-invasive fibrosis staging technologies are needed. An earlier assessment by the French Committee for Evaluation and Diffusion of Innovative Technologies (CEDIT, 2004) reached similar conclusions, stating that the absence of conclusive evidence concerning the diagnostic value of FibroScan argues against its immediate dissemination. More recently, an assessment by the French National Authority for Health (HAS, 2007) concluded that additional studies are necessary to evaluate the comparative cost-effectiveness of different methods of assessing liver fibrosis (e.g., FibroTest, FibroScan, and biopsy). A technology assessment by the Malaysian Ministry of Health (Darus, 2008) reached similar conclusions about the need for additional research for the FibroScan.

In 2007, de Franchis et al. reported that transient elastography (FibroScan) might be of value for the non-invasive diagnosis of cirrhosis; however, its reproducibility needs to be further validated. Furthermore, Berrutti et al (2007) noted that FibroScan is a new, non-invasive method to evaluate liver stiffness and, consequently, the degree of liver fibrosis. Since its use in the clinical setting is of great interest, further studies should define the exact role of this procedure.

It has been noted that the test is not recommended for people with pacemakers or for pregnant women, and inaccurate or unobtainable readings are more common in people who are obese, older, have ascites (a build-up of fluid between the abdominal wall and organs) or have features of metabolic syndrome (Kemp, W. & Roberts 2013). This is due to the fact that the FibroScan technique requires adequate visualization of the liver to obtain readings. Being obese or with the presence of ascites, the vibration wave cannot penetrate resulting in unreliable or failure of readings.

Acoustic Radiation Force Impulse elastography (AFRI) is an ultrasound test that utilizes a probe to produce an acoustic push pulse, which generates shear waves that propagate in tissue to assess liver stiffness. This test evaluates the wave propagation speed to assess liver stiffness, the faster the shear wave speed, the harder the object.

Serum fibrosis biomarkers consists of direct and indirect serum testing and risk scoring based on combining indirect and direct markers. The American Association of Liver Disease and the Infectious Disease Society of American published an update in September 2015 of the practice guidance for testing, managing and treating adults infected with hepatitis C. The recommendation for staging patients with chronic liver disease states: “The most efficient approach to fibrosis assessment is to combine direct biomarkers and vibration controlled transient liver elastography”.

Metavir Scoring: is a standardized measure of fibrosis and inflammation seen on a liver biopsy. The fibrosis score ranges from 0 to 4, and the inflammation activity score is measured from 0 to 3.

Fibrosis score:

F0 = no fibrosis

F1 = portal fibrosis without septa

F2 = portal fibrosis with few septa

F3 = numerous septa without cirrhosis

F4 = cirrhosis

Activity score:

A0 = no activity

A1 = mild activity

A2 = moderate activity

A3 = severe activity

The fibrosis score is particularly useful because patients with higher fibrosis scores are more likely to progress to cirrhosis and HCC and may warrant earlier treatment.

POLICY SOURCE(S)

Castera I, Fornis X, Alberti A. Noninvasive evaluation of liver fibrosis using transient elastography. *J Hepatol*. 2008 May; 48(5):835-47. Doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.02.008. Epub 2008 Feb 26. Accessed on March 10, 2016.

Castera L, Bedossa P. How to assess liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C: serum markers or transient elastography vs. liver biopsy? *Liver Int* [Internet]. 2011 Jan [cited 2012 Jan 12]; 31 Suppl 1:13-7. Accessed on March 16, 2016.

Castera L, Chan H, Arrese M. EASL-ALEH clinical practice guidelines: non-invasive tests for evaluation of liver disease severity and prognosis. *J Hepatology* 2015 July; 63:237-264. Accessed on April 5, 2016.

Caster L, Foucher J, Bernard PG, et al. Pitfalls of liver stiffness measurement: a 5 year prospective study of 13,369 examinations, *Hepatology* 2010; 51:828-35. Accessed on March 16, 2016.

American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases, Infectious Disease Society of American Recommendations for Managing, and Treating Hepatitis C, March 21, 2014. Accessed March 10, 2016.

Carey E, Carey WD. Noninvasive tests for liver disease, fibrosis and cirrhosis: Is liver biopsy obsolete? *Cleve Clin J Med*. 2010 Aug; 77(8):519-27. Accessed on March 10, 2016

Chung RT, Davis GL, Jensen DM, et al., Hepatitis C guidance: AASLD-IDSa recommendation for testing, managing, and treating adults infected with hepatitis C virus, *Hepatology*. 2015 Sep; 62(3):932-54. Accessed on April 14, 2016.

Cosgrove D, Piscaglia F, Bamber J, Correas JM, Gilja OH, Klauser AS, Sporea I, Calliada F, Canstisani V, D'Onofrio M, Drakonaki EE, Fink M, Friedrich-Rust M, Fromageau J, Havre RF, Jenssen C, Ohlinger R, Saftoiu A, Schaefer F, Dietrich CF; EFSUMB. EFSUMB guidelines and recommendations on the clinical use of ultrasound elastography. Part 2: Clinical applications. *Ultraschall Med*. 2013 Jun; 34(3):238-53.

Crossan c, Tsochatatzid EA, Longworth L, Gurusamy K, Rodriguez-Peralvarez M, Mantzoukis K, O'Brien J, Thalassinos E, Papastergiou V, Burroughs A. Cost-effectiveness of noninvasive methods for assessment and monitoring of liver fibrosis and cirrhosis with chronic liver disease: systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess*. 2015 Jan; 19(9):1-409, v-vi. Accessed on March 16, 2016.

Department of the Veterans Affairs, National Hepatitis C Resource Center Program and the Office of Public Health. Chronic hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection: treatment considerations. March 2014. Accessed on April 14, 2016.

Friedrich-Rust M, Lupsor M, de Knecht R, Dries V, Buggisch P, Gebel M, Maier B, Herrmann E, Sagir A, Zachoval R, Shi Y, Schneider MD, Badea R, Rifai K, Poynard T, Zeusem S, Sarrasin C. Point shear wave elastography by acoustic radiation force impulse quantification in comparison to transient elastography for the noninvasive assessment of liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C; A prospective international multicenter study. *Ultraschall Med*. 2015 Jun; 36(3):239-247.

Gara N, Zhao X, Kleiner DE, Liang TJ, Hoofnagle JH, Ghany MG. Discordance among transient elastography, aspartate aminotransferase to platelet ratio index, and histologic assessment of liver fibrosis in patients with chronic hepatitis C. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2013 Mar; 11(3):303-8.e1. Accessed on March 10, 2016.

Ghany MG, Nelson DR, Strader DB, Thomas DL, Seeff LB; American Association for Study of Liver Diseases. An update on treatment of genotype 1 chronic hepatitis C virus infection: 2011 practice guideline by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. *Hepatology*. 2011 Oct; 54(4):1433-44. Accessed on March 10, 2016

Moyer VA; U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Screening for hepatitis C virus infection in adults: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013 Sep3; 159(5):349-57. Accessed on March 10, 2016.

Tice JA, Ollendorf DA, Pearson SD. The Comparative Clinical Effectiveness and Value of Simeprevir and Sofosbuvir in the Treatment of Chronic Hepatitis C Infection. California Technology Assessment Forum and Institute for Clinical and Economic Review, April 15, 2014. Accessed on March 10, 2016

Wilder J, Patel K. The clinical utility of FibroScan® as a noninvasive diagnostic test for liver disease. *Med Devices (Auckl)*. 2014 May 3; 7:107-14. Accessed on March 10, 2016.

Foucher J, Chanteloup E, Vergniol J, Castera L, Le Bail B, Adhoute X, Couzigou P, de Ledinghen V. Diagnosis of cirrhosis by transient elastography (FibroScan): a prospective study. *Gut* 2006; 55:403-408. Accessed on March 10, 2016.

Murtagh J, Foster V. Transient elastography (FibroScan) for non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis. *Issues in Emerging Health Technologies: Issue 90*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH); September 2006. Accessed March 10, 2016.

Corpechot C, El Naggar A, Poujol-Robert A, et al. Assessment of biliary fibrosis by transient elastography in patients with PBC and PSC. *Hepatology*. 2006; 43(5):1118-1124. Accessed on March 10, 2016

Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH). Diagnosis and Monitoring of Liver Fibrosis in Patients with Chronic Hepatitis C: A Review of the Clinical Evidence and Cost Effectiveness. Rapid Response Report: Summary with Critical Appraisal. Ottawa, ON: CADTH; March 8, 2012. Accessed on March 16, 2016.

Cohen EB, Afdhal NH. Ultrasound-based hepatic elastography: origins, limitations, and applications. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2010; 44:637-645. Accessed on March 11, 2016.

Kemp, W & Roberts, S. 2013. FibroScan and transient elastography. *Australian Family Physician*, vol.42, 7/01, pp. 468-471. Accessed on March 11, 2016

Hayes, Inc. Noninvasive assessment of hepatic fibrosis: ultrasound-based elastography. Oct 2017. Accessed on November 21, 2017.

Brener S. Transient elastography for assessment of liver fibrosis and steatosis: An evidence-based analysis. Ontario Health Technology Assessment Series. Toronto, ON: Health Quality Ontario (HQO); 2015; 15(18).

American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases (AASLD) and the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA). Recommendations for testing, managing and treating hepatitis C. Alexandria, VA; AASLD; updated May 12, 2104. Accessed on November 21, 2017.

United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Website. 510(k) summary: Echosens' FibroScan system. April 15, 2013. Accessed on November 21, 2017.

Pennsylvania Department of Human Services. Managed Care Operations Memorandum. MCOPS Memo #102015-012. Technology Assessment Group (TAG) Coverage Decisions. October 23, 2015.

Steadman R, Myers RP, Keggett L, Lorenzetti D, Noseworthy T, Clement F. (2013). A health technology assessment of transient elastography in adult liver disease. *Canadian Journal of Gastroenterology*, 273(3), 149-158. Accessed September 26, 2018.

Myers RP, et al. Feasibility and diagnostic performance of the FibroScan XL probe for liver stiffness measurement in overweight and obese patients. *Hepatology* 55.1 (2012): 199-208. Accessed on September 27, 2018.

Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *Surveillance for Viral Hepatitis-United States, 2016*.

Policy History

Date	Activity
09/06/2016	QI/UM Committee approval
12/01/2016	Provider effective date
02/07/2017	Format Changes; Page 1-Added Related Policy Number; Page 3-Added Operational Guidelines and Policy History box; Contraindication criteria format updated—Page 2;
03/14/2017	QI/UM Review Committee Approval
08/09/2017	Added Disclaimer Statement in opening of medical policy. EHS Revisions: Issue Date added to opening policy box; Operational Guidelines updated: Non-covered services are to deny as not medically necessary. Added 'Informational' to header announcing Attachment D; Added the following ICD-10 diagnosis codes per the policy guidelines: Z68.20, Z68.21, Z68.22, Z68.23, Z68.24, Z68.25, Z68.26, Z68.27, Z68.28, & Z68.29.
06/19/2018	Clinical Review: no changes; Revisions: Added statement to Contraindications related to imaging services; Updated references; Deleted unrelated procedure codes: 47000, 47001, 47100, 82172, 82247, 82977, 83010, 83519, 83520, 83883, 84450, 84460 & 88342; Removed CPT code 0346T
06/19/2018	QI UM Committee Review Approval
08/15/2018	New Provider Effective Date
12/11/2018	Annual Review: Clarified criteria regarding BMI in the Procedure section; removed the word 'Covered' from the procedure and diagnosis code tables in Attachments B & C; deleted procedure code 0346T as it is noncovered; removed hyperlinks from all sources in the Reference section; updated Summary of Literature and references
12/11/2018	QI/UM Committee Review Approval
02/18/2019	Provider effective date