Cohere Medical Policy - Magnetic Resonance Angiography (MRA), Lower Extremity

Clinical Guidelines for Medical Necessity Review

Version: 2
Effective Date: August 13, 2024

Important Notices

Notices & Disclaimers:

GUIDELINES ARE SOLELY FOR COHERE'S USE IN PERFORMING MEDICAL NECESSITY REVIEWS AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO INFORM OR ALTER CLINICAL DECISION-MAKING OF END USERS.

Cohere Health, Inc. ("**Cohere**") has published these clinical guidelines to determine the medical necessity of services (the "**Guidelines**") for informational purposes only, and solely for use by Cohere's authorized "**End Users**". These Guidelines (and any attachments or linked third-party content) are not intended to be a substitute for medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment directed by an appropriately licensed healthcare professional. These Guidelines are not in any way intended to support clinical decision-making of any kind; their sole purpose and intended use is to summarize certain criteria Cohere may use when reviewing the medical necessity of any service requests submitted to Cohere by End Users. Always seek the advice of a qualified healthcare professional regarding any medical questions, treatment decisions, or other clinical guidance. The Guidelines, including any attachments or linked content, are subject to change at any time without notice.

Other Notices:

Fee schedules, relative value units, conversion factors and/or related components are not assigned by the AMA, are not part of CPT, and the AMA is not recommending their use. The AMA does not directly or indirectly practice medicine or dispense medical services. The AMA assumes no liability for data contained or not contained herein.

Guideline Information:

Specialty Area: Diagnostic Imaging
Guideline Name: Cohere Medical Policy - Magnetic Resonance Angiography (MRA), Lower Extremity

Date of last literature review: 7/22/2024
Document last updated: 8/13/2024
Type: [**X**] Adult (18+ yo) | [**X**] Pediatric (0-17 yo)

Table of Contents

Medical Necessity Criteria

Service: Magnetic Resonance Angiography (MRA), Lower Extremity

Recommended Clinical Approach

Magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) is a noninvasive alternative to catheter angiography for evaluating vascular structures in the lower extremities. Magnetic resonance venography (MRV) images veins instead of arteries. MRA and MRV are less invasive than conventional X-ray digital subtraction angiography.[1]

Medical Necessity Criteria

Indications

➔ **Magnetic resonance angiography (MRA), lower extremity** is considered appropriate if **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**[1]:

- MRA-preferred indications including **ANY** of the following:
  - Arterial entrapment syndrome, when ultrasound is indeterminate or for pre-treatment planning; **OR**
  - Adventitial cystic disease[1]; **OR**
- Ultrasound and CT/CTA are contraindicated or inconclusive (e.g., body habitus for ultrasound, anaphylactic reaction due to IV contrast reaction, pregnancy, pediatric) with **ANY** of the following:
  - Neoplastic conditions (including masses or mass-like conditions) when the arterial blood supply needs to be evaluated (e.g., for treatment planning, treatment response, or prognostication); **OR**
  - Neoplastic invasion of arteries or veins; **OR**
  - Trauma-related conditions as indicated by **ANY** of the following[2]:
    - Expanding hematoma[3]; **OR**
    - Major blunt trauma and the patient is hemodynamically stable[4]; **OR**
    - Neurologic deficit of lower extremity in association with trauma[5]; **OR**
    - Known or suspected knee dislocation*[6]; **OR**
    - Vascular trauma to a lower extremity[7]; **OR**

- Vascular conditions, known or suspected, including **ANY** of the following:
    - Aneurysm, seen on ultrasound or where ultrasound is nondiagnostic; **OR**
    - Intramural hematoma; **OR**
    - Dissection; **OR**
    - Critical limb ischemia strongly suspected (e.g., sudden onset of a cold leg with pain, gangrene, rest pain)[8]; **OR**
    - Lower extremity ischemic symptoms when **ALL** of the following is **TRUE**:
        - **ANY** of the following:
            - Leg pain worsens with activity and is relieved with rest (claudication); **OR**
            - Non-healing lower extremity ulcers; **AND**
        - **ALL** of the following:
            - Limitation of performance of daily activities; **AND**
            - Expected mobility after treatment warrants revascularization; **AND**
            - Revascularization is planned[9]; **AND**
            - Abnormal ankle-brachial index (ABI) as evidenced by **ANY** of the following:
                - ABI is inconclusive or nondiagnostic; **OR**
                - ABI less than 0.9 or greater than 1.4 on at least one leg; **OR**
                - ABI less than 1.1 in patients with risk factors for atherosclerosis (e.g., personal history of diabetes or known cardiac disease)[10]; **AND**
            - Either low concern for aortic and iliac artery disease or aorta and iliac arteries previously imaged; **OR**
    - Determination of hemorrhage source (including non-surgical, spontaneous)[10]; **OR**
    - Localization and characterization of vascular malformation or fistula (e.g., assessing treatment

response, treatment planning) with **ANY** of the following:
    - ◆ Duplex ultrasound indeterminate or nondiagnostic; **OR**
    - ◆ High flow lesion suspected clinically or by imaging; **OR**
    - ◆ Preoperative planning; **OR**
  - Vasculitis, initial evaluation, when **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**[7]:
    - ◆ Biopsy proven; **OR**
    - ◆ Rheumatologic panel work-up including but not limited to erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) and C-reactive protein (CRP) is suggestive of vasculitis; **OR**
    - ◆ Requesting clinician specializes in rheumatology and outcome of the imaging is expected to change management and/or treatment plan; **OR**
- Pre and post-intervention evaluation when **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**:
  - Postoperative evaluation of the effectiveness of arterial or venous reconstruction or bypass; **OR**
  - Characterization of normal and variant vascular anatomy; **OR**
  - Determination of the patency, location, or integrity of grafts and other vascular devices (e.g., stents); **OR**
  - Planning autografts for musculoskeletal reconstruction; **OR**
  - Treatment of popliteal entrapment syndrome; **OR**
- Hemodialysis access evaluation, when duplex ultrasound inconclusive and fistulogram cannot be performed, for **ANY** of the following conditions:
  - Arteriovenous fistula (AVF) stenosis; **OR**
  - Occlusion; **OR**
  - Pseudoaneurysm; **OR**
  - Steal syndrome (cool and painful extremity); **OR**

◆ Repeat imaging of a specific area or structure using the same imaging modality (in the absence of an existing follow-up guideline) is considered appropriate when **ALL** of the following is

TRUE:

- There is documented clinical necessity; **AND**
- Prior imaging results of the specific area or structure, obtained using the same imaging modality, must be documented and available for comparison; **AND**
- **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**:
    - A change in clinical status, such as worsening symptoms or the emergence of new symptoms, that may influence the treatment approach; **OR**
    - The requirement for interval reassessment, which may alter the treatment plan; **OR**
    - One-time follow-up of a prior indeterminate finding to assess for interval change; **OR**
    - The need for re-imaging either before or after performing an invasive procedure.

➔ **Magnetic resonance venography (MRV), lower extremity** is considered appropriate if **ANY** of the following are **TRUE**:

- MRA-preferred indications including venous entrapment syndrome, when ultrasound is indeterminate or for pre-treatment planning; **OR**
- Ultrasound and CT/CTV are contraindicated or inconclusive (e.g., body habitus for ultrasound, anaphylactic reaction due to IV contrast reaction, pregnancy, pediatric) with **ANY** of the following:
    - Neoplastic conditions (including masses or mass-like conditions) when the arterial blood supply needs to be evaluated (e.g., for treatment planning, treatment-response, or prognostication); **OR**
    - Neoplastic invasion of arteries or veins; **OR**
    - Initial evaluation for a known venous leg ulcer, when ultrasound is indeterminate or non-diagnostic[11]; **OR**
    - Known or suspected acute or chronic deep venous thrombosis, when results would change management and ultrasound has been completed; **OR**
    - Known severe post-thrombotic changes incompletely evaluated by ultrasound[11]; **OR**
    - Evidence of severe venous reflux disease and **ALL** of the following[11]:

        - Duplex ultrasound evaluation indeterminate, incomplete, or non-diagnostic; **AND**
        - Surgical or endovascular intervention planned; **OR**
    - Pre and post-intervention evaluation when **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**:
        - Postoperative evaluation of the effectiveness of arterial or venous reconstruction or bypass; **OR**
        - Characterization of normal and variant vascular anatomy; **OR**
        - Determination of the patency, location, or integrity of grafts and other vascular devices (e.g., stents); **OR**
        - Planning autografts for musculoskeletal reconstruction; **OR**
        - Treatment of popliteal entrapment syndrome; **OR**
    - Repeat imaging of a specific area or structure using the same imaging modality (in the absence of an existing follow-up guideline) is considered appropriate when **ALL** of the following is **TRUE**:
        - There is documented clinical necessity; **AND**
        - Prior imaging results of the specific area or structure, obtained using the same imaging modality, must be documented and available for comparison; **AND**
        - **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**:
            - A change in clinical status, such as worsening symptoms or the emergence of new symptoms, that may influence the treatment approach; **OR**
            - The requirement for interval reassessment, which may alter the treatment plan; **OR**
            - One-time follow-up of a prior indeterminate finding to assess for interval change; **OR**
            - The need for re-imaging either before or after performing an invasive procedure.

Non-Indications

- ➔ **Magnetic resonance angiography (MRA), lower extremity** is not considered appropriate if **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**:
    - The patient has undergone advanced imaging of the same body part within 3 months without undergoing treatment or developing new or worsening symptoms; **OR**
    - If contrast is used, history of anaphylactic allergic reaction to

gadolinium contrast media with detailed guidelines for use in patients with renal insufficiency; **OR**

- The patient has metallic clips on vascular aneurysms; **OR**
- Incompatible implantable devices (e.g., pacemakers, defibrillators, cardiac valves); **OR**
- Metallic foreign body in orbits/other critical area(s) or within the field of view and obscuring area of concern; **OR**
- Evaluation of lower extremity arterial perfusion, such as for claudication, when there may be a concern for aorta or iliac disease and aorta and iliac have not been imaged.

*NOTE: MRI in patients with claustrophobia should be requested at the discretion of the ordering provider.
**NOTE: MRI in pregnant patients should be requested at the discretion of the ordering provider and obstetric care provider.

Level of Care Criteria

Inpatient or Outpatient

Procedure Codes (CPT/HCPCS)

CPT/HCPCS Code	Code Description
73725	Magnetic resonance angiography (MRA), lower extremity, with or without contrast material(s)
C8912	Magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) with contrast, lower extremity
C8913	Magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) without contrast, lower extremity
C8914	Magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) without contrast followed by with contrast, lower extremity

Medical Evidence

Nassar et al. (2022) reviewed imaging modalities for preoperative planning. Computed tomography angiography (CTA) and magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) can generate detailed 3D images of vascular structures and surrounding anatomy, with applications in preoperative planning for breast, head, neck, and extremity reconstructions. While MRA eliminates the need for radiation exposure, it is less precise than CTA in detecting perforators smaller than 1 mm and contraindicated in specific patient groups. For assessing venous anatomy, the most effective modalities include duplex ultrasound, MRV, and the outflow phase of conventional angiography. While MR scanners and software continue to advance, the general preference is for strength 1.5-T scanners in reconstructive applications. Lower-strength scanners allow enhanced fat suppression, contributing to more precise imaging of vascular structures.[12]

Tamura and Nakahara (2014) conducted a retrospective study to assess pelvic and deep vein thrombosis (DVT) in the lower extremities with magnetic resonance venography (MRV) before surgical intervention for varicose veins. Time-of-flight MRV evaluated the 72 patients enrolled in the study before stripping varicose veins of the lower extremities. A total of 63.9% were female, with a mean age of 65.2 plus or minus 10.2 years; 55.6% of patients had bilateral varicose leg veins; 2.8% of patients had DVT; and 4.2% were diagnosed with iliac vein thrombosis. The remaining patients could undergo the stripping procedure in the saphenous veins. The study concluded that non-contrast MRV helps evaluate the lower extremity venous system.[13]

Koelemay et al. (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of 34 studies (1090 patients) that reports a high accuracy for assessing arteries in the lower extremities using MRA. Three-dimensional (3D) gadolinium-enhanced MRA demonstrated enhanced diagnostic accuracy compared to 2D MRA. The estimated thresholds for equal sensitivity and specificity were 94% and 90% for 3D gadolinium-enhanced MRA and 2D MRA, respectively. Recent investigations specifically examined the diagnostic capabilities of lower extremity 3D gadolinium-enhanced MRA compared to digital subtraction angiography.[14]

Ersoy et al. (2008) report on the precision of 3D MRA in assessing bypass grafts and detecting recurrent issues within the graft lumen is comparable to its accuracy in native arteries. Foot and calf MRA exhibit sensitivity and specificity exceeding 80% and 90%, respectively. In contrast to digital subtraction angiography, gadolinium-enhanced MRA generates a 3D dataset

that can create displays reminiscent of multilane digital subtraction angiography after reformatting. These displays emphasize pertinent information for prognosis and treatment planning, such as arterial wall inflammation, plaque composition, and mural and intramural thrombus formation.[15]

References

1. American College of Radiology (ACR), North American Society for Cardiovascular Imaging (NASCI), Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR). ACR–NASCI–SPR practice parameter for the performance of body magnetic resonance angiography (MRA). Published 2020. Accessed July 31, 2024. https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Body-MRA.pdf.
2. Brian R, Bennett DJ, Kim WC, et al. Computed tomography angiography is associated with low added utility for detecting clinically relevant vascular injuries among patients with extremity trauma. *Trauma Surg Acute Care Open*. 2021 Dec 20;6(1):e000828. doi: 10.1136/tsaco-2021-000828. PMID: 34993352; PMCID: PMC8689162.
3. Fox N, Rajani RR, Bokhari F, et al. Evaluation and management of penetrating lower extremity arterial trauma: An Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma practice management guideline. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2012 Nov;73(5 Suppl 4):S315-20. doi: 10.1097/TA.0b013e31827018e4. PMID: 23114487.
4. Expert Panel on Major Trauma Imaging, Shyu JY, Khurana B, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria - major blunt trauma. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2020 May;17(5S):S160-S174. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2020.01.024. PMID: 32370960.
5. Dreizin D, Smith EB, Champ K, et al. Roles of trauma CT and CTA in salvaging the threatened or mangled extremity. *Radiographics*. 2022 Mar-Apr;42(2):E50-E67. doi: 10.1148/rg.210092. PMID: 35230918; PMCID: PMC8906352.
6. Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging, Taljanovic MS, Chang EY, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria - acute trauma to the knee. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2020 May;17(5S):S12-S25. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2020.01.041. PMID: 32370956.
7. Expert Panels on Vascular Imaging, Francois CJ, Skulborstad EP, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria - nonatherosclerotic peripheral arterial disease. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2019 May;16(5S):S174-S183. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2019.02.026. PMID: 31054743.
8. Expert Panel on Vascular Imaging, Browne WF, Sung J, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria - sudden onset of cold, painful leg: 2023 update. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2023 Nov;20(11S):S565-S573. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2023.08.012. PMID: 38040470.
9. Expert Panel on Vascular Imaging, Azene EM, Steigner ML, Aghayev A, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria - lower extremity arterial

claudication-imaging assessment for revascularization: 2022 update. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2022 Nov;19(11S):S364-S373. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2022.09.002. PMID: 36436963; PMCID: PMC9876734.
10. Gerhard-Herman MD, Gornik HL, Barrett C, et al. 2016 AHA/ACC guideline on the management of patients with lower extremity peripheral artery disease: A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2017 Mar 21;135(12):e726-e779. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000471. PMID: 27840333; PMCID: PMC5477786.
11. Expert Panels on Interventional Radiology and Vascular Imaging, Rochon PJ, Reghunathan A, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria - lower extremity chronic venous disease. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2023 Nov;20(11S):S481-S500. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2023.08.011. PMID: 38040466.
12. Nassar AH, Maselli AM, Manstein S, et al. Comparison of various modalities utilized for preoperative planning in microsurgical reconstructive surgery. *J Reconstr Microsurg*. 2022 Mar;38(3):170-180. doi: 10.1055/s-0041-1736316. PMID: 34688218.
13. Tamura K, Nakahara H. MR venography for the assessment of deep vein thrombosis in lower extremities with varicose veins. *Ann Vasc Dis*. 2014;7(4):399-403. doi: 10.3400/avd.oa.14-00068. Epub 2014 Dec 25. PMID: 25593625; PMCID: PMC4293190.
14. Koelemay MJ, Lijmer JG, Stoker J, et al. Magnetic resonance angiography for the evaluation of lower extremity arterial disease: A meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2001;285(10):1338-1345. doi: 10.1001/jama.285.10.1338. PMID: 11255390.
15. Ersoy H, Rybicki FJ. MR angiography of the lower extremities. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2008;190(6):1675-1684. doi: 10.2214/AJR.07.2223. PMID: 18492924. Erratum in: *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2008 Dec;191(6):1874.

Clinical Guideline Revision History/Information

Original Date: March 18, 2022		
Review History		
Version 2	8/13/2024	Annual review and policy restructure.