Wireless Capsule Endoscopy to Diagnose Disorders of the Small Bowel, Esophagus, and Colon
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NCD/LCD: N/A

Related Policies
None

Policy
Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, and Indemnity Medicare HMO BlueSM and Medicare PPO BlueSM Members

Wireless capsule endoscopy of the small bowel may be considered MEDICALLY NECESSARY for the following indications:
- Suspected small bowel bleeding, as evidenced by prior inconclusive upper and lower gastrointestinal (GI) endoscopic studies performed during the current episode of illness.
- Initial diagnosis in patients with suspected Crohn disease without evidence of disease on conventional diagnostic tests such as small bowel follow-through and upper and lower endoscopy.
- In patients with an established diagnosis of Crohn disease, when there are unexpected change(s) in the course of disease or response to treatment, suggesting the initial diagnosis may be incorrect and re-examination may be indicated.
- For surveillance of the small bowel in patients with hereditary GI polyposis syndromes, including familial adenomatosis polyposis and Peutz-Jeghers syndrome.

Other indications for wireless capsule endoscopy are considered INVESTIGATIONAL, including but not limited to:
- Evaluation of the extent of involvement of known Crohn disease or ulcerative colitis.
- Evaluation of the esophagus, in patients with gastroesophageal reflux or other esophageal pathologies.
- Evaluation of other GI diseases and conditions not presenting with GI bleeding, including but not limited to, celiac sprue, irritable bowel syndrome, Lynch syndrome, portal hypertensive enteropathy, small bowel neoplasm, and unexplained chronic abdominal pain.
- Evaluation of the colon including, but not limited to, detection of colonic polyps or colon cancer.
- Initial evaluation of patients with acute upper GI bleeding.
The patency capsule is considered INVESTIGATIONAL, including the use to evaluate patency of the GI tract before wireless capsule endoscopy.

**Prior Authorization Information**

**Inpatient**
- For services described in this policy, precertification/preauthorization IS REQUIRED for all products if the procedure is performed inpatient.

**Outpatient**
- For services described in this policy, see below for products where prior authorization might be required if the procedure is performed outpatient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outpatient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care (HMO and POS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial PPO and Indemnity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare HMO BlueSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare PPO BlueSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CPT Codes / HCPCS Codes / ICD Codes**

Inclusion or exclusion of a code does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member’s contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage as it applies to an individual member.

Providers should report all services using the most up-to-date industry-standard procedure, revenue, and diagnosis codes, including modifiers where applicable.

*The following codes are included below for informational purposes only; this is not an all-inclusive list.*

**The above medical necessity criteria MUST be met for the following codes to be covered for Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO and Indemnity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91110 Gastrointestinal tract imaging, intraluminal (eg, capsule endoscopy), esophagus through ileum, with physician interpretation and report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The following CPT code is considered investigational for Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, Indemnity, Medicare HMO Blue and Medicare PPO Blue:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0355T Gastrointestinal tract imaging, intraluminal (eg, capsule endoscopy), colon, with interpretation and report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description

Wireless Capsule Endoscopy

Wireless CE is performed using the PillCam Given Diagnostic Imaging System (previously called M2A), which is a disposable imaging capsule manufactured by Given Imaging. The capsule measures 11 by 30 mm and contains video imaging, self-illumination, and image transmission modules, as well as a battery supply that lasts up to 8 hours. The indwelling camera takes images at a rate of two frames per second as peristalsis carries the capsule through the gastrointestinal tract. The average transit time from ingestion to evacuation is 24 hours. The device uses wireless radio transmission to send the images to a receiving recorder device that the patient wears around the waist. This receiving device also contains localizing antennae sensors that can roughly gauge where the image was taken over the abdomen. Images are then downloaded onto a workstation for viewing and processing.

CE has been proposed as a method for identifying Crohn disease. There is no single criterion standard diagnostic test for Crohn disease; rather, diagnosis is based on a constellation of findings. Thus it is difficult to determine the diagnostic characteristics of various tests used to diagnose the condition and difficult to determine a single comparator diagnostic test to CE.

Summary

The wireless capsule endoscopy (CE) uses a noninvasive device to visualize segments of the gastrointestinal tract. Patients swallow a capsule that records images of the intestinal mucosa as it passes through the gastrointestinal (GI) tract. The capsule is collected after being excreted and images interpreted.

Patients With Suspected GI Disorders

For individuals who have suspected small bowel bleeding (previously referred to as obscure GI bleeding) who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes numerous case series evaluating patients with a nondiagnostic standard workup. The relevant outcomes are test validity, other test performance measures, symptoms, and change in disease status. The evidence has demonstrated that CE can identify a bleeding source in a substantial number of patients who cannot be diagnosed by other methods, with a low incidence of adverse events. Because there are few other options for diagnosing obscure small bowel bleeding in patients with negative upper and lower endoscopy, this technique will likely improve health outcomes by directing specific treatment when a bleeding source is identified. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected small bowel Crohn disease (CD) who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes case series. The relevant outcomes are test validity, other test performance measures, symptoms, and change in disease status. Although the test performance characteristics and diagnostic yields of the capsule for this indication are uncertain, the diagnostic yields are as good as or better than other diagnostic options, and these data are likely to improve health outcomes by identifying some cases of CD and directing specific treatment. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected celiac disease who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes case series and diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are test validity, other test performance measures, symptoms, and change in disease status. The diagnostic characteristics of CE are inadequate to substitute for other modalities or to triage patients to other modalities. For other conditions (eg, determining the extent of CD), direct evidence of improved outcomes or a strong indirect chain of evidence to improved outcomes is lacking. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of technology on net health outcomes.

For individuals who have unexplained chronic abdominal pain who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes case series and diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are test validity, other test performance measures, symptoms, and change in disease status. The diagnostic characteristics of CE are inadequate to substitute for other modalities or to triage patients to other modalities. For other
conditions (eg, determining the extent of CD), direct evidence of improved outcomes or a strong chain of evidence to improved outcomes is lacking. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of technology on net health outcomes.

**Patients With Confirmed GI Disorders**
For individuals who have an established diagnosis of CD who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes diagnostic accuracy studies and a systematic review. The relevant outcomes are test validity, other test performance measures, symptoms, and change in disease status. A 2017 systematic review of 11 studies in patients with established CD found a similar diagnostic yield with CE and with radiography. Because there is evidence that the diagnostic yields are as good as or better than other diagnostic options, there is indirect evidence that CE is likely to improve health outcomes by identifying some cases of CD and directing specific treatment. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have ulcerative colitis who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes case series and diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are test validity, other test performance measures, symptoms, and change in disease status. Several diagnostic accuracy studies have compared CE with colonoscopy to assess disease activity in patients with ulcerative colitis. Two of 3 studies were small (ie, <50 patients) and thus data on diagnostic accuracy are limited. Direct evidence of improved outcomes and a strong chain of evidence to improved outcomes are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of technology on net health outcomes.

For individuals who have esophageal disorders who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes case series and diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are test validity, other test performance measures, symptoms, and change in disease status. Other available modalities are superior to CE. The diagnostic characteristics of CE are inadequate to substitute for other modalities or to triage patients to other modalities. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of technology on net health outcomes.

For individuals who have hereditary GI polyposis syndromes who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes case series and diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are test validity, other test performance measures, symptoms, and change in disease status. The data are insufficient to determine whether evaluation with CE would improve patient outcomes. Further information on the prevalence and natural history of small bowel polyps in Lynch syndrome patients is necessary. At present, surveillance of the small bowel is not generally recommended as a routine intervention for patients with Lynch syndrome. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of technology on net health outcomes.

For individuals who have portal hypertensive enteropathy who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes case series and diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are test validity, other test performance measures, symptoms, and change in disease status. Systematic reviews of studies of CE’s diagnostic performance for this indicated have reported limited sensitivity and specificity. Due to insufficient data on diagnostic accuracy, a chain of evidence on clinical utility cannot be constructed. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of technology on net health outcomes.

**Acute Upper GI Bleeding**
For individuals who have acute upper GI tract bleeding who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes a randomized controlled trial and several cohort studies. The relevant outcomes are test validity, and other test performance measures, symptoms, hospitalizations, and resource utilization. The use of CE in the emergency department setting for suspected upper GI bleeding is intended to avoid unnecessary hospitalization or immediate endoscopy. Controlled studies are needed to assess further the impact of CE on health outcomes compared with standard management. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of technology on net health outcomes.
Colon Cancer Screening
For individuals who are screened for colon cancer who receive wireless CE, the evidence includes diagnostic accuracy studies and systematic reviews. The relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, and other test performance measures. Studies of CE in screening populations are necessary to determine the diagnostic characteristics of the test in this setting. Studies of diagnostic characteristics alone are insufficient evidence to determine the efficacy of CE for colon cancer screening. Because diagnostic performance is worse than standard colonoscopy, CE would need to be performed more frequently than standard colonoscopy to have comparable efficacy. Without direct evidence of efficacy in a clinical trial of colon cancer screening using CE, modeling studies using established mathematical models of colon precursor incidence and progression to cancer could provide estimates of efficacy in preventing colon cancer mortality. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of technology on net health outcomes.

Patency Capsule for Patients with Bowel Stricture
For individuals who are scheduled to undergo CE for known or suspected small bowel stricture who receive a patency capsule, the evidence includes case series. The relevant outcomes are test validity, symptoms, change in disease status, and treatment-related morbidity, the available studies have reported that CE following a successful patency capsule test results in high rates of success with low rates of adverse events. The capsule is also associated with adverse events. Because of the lack of comparative data to other diagnostic strategies, it is not possible to determine whether the use of the patency capsule improves the net health outcome. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of technology on net health outcomes.

Policy History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2018</td>
<td>New references added from BCBSA National medical policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2017</td>
<td>New references added from BCBSA National medical policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2015</td>
<td>New references added from BCBSA National medical policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2014</td>
<td>Updated Coding section with ICD10 procedure and diagnosis codes, effective 10/2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2014</td>
<td>BCBSA National medical policy review. New investigational indications described. Effective 2/1/2014. Removed CPT code 91112 as it does not meet the intent. Removed ICD-9 diagnosis codes as they are not in the LCD (L22531) 280.9, 456.0, 456.2, 537.83, 555.1, 555.2, 555.9, and added 569.86 as this is in the LCD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information Pertaining to All Blue Cross Blue Shield Medical Policies**
Click on any of the following terms to access the relevant information:
- Medical Policy Terms of Use
- Managed Care Guidelines
- Indemnity/PPO Guidelines
- Clinical Exception Process
- Medical Technology Assessment Guidelines
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