



Cohere Medical Policy – Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), Pelvis

Clinical Guidelines for Medical Necessity Review

Version: 2
Effective Date: October 30, 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.

©2024 Cohere Health, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

Other Notices:

HCPCS® and CPT® copyright 2024 American Medical Association. All rights reserved.

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.

HCPCS and CPT are registered trademarks of the American Medical Association.

Guideline Information:

Specialty Area: Diagnostic Imaging

Guideline Name: Cohere Medical Policy – Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), Pelvis

Date of last literature review: 6/25/2024

Document last updated: 10/30/2024

Type: ☒ Adult (18+ yo) | ☒ Pediatric (0-17yo)

Table of Contents

Important Notices	2
Table of Contents	3
Medical Necessity Criteria	4
Service: Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), Pelvis	4
Recommended Clinical Approach	4
Medical Necessity Criteria	4
Indications	4
Non-Indications	9
Level of Care Criteria	9
Procedure Codes (CPT/HCPCS)	10
Medical Evidence	11
References	13
Clinical Guideline Revision History/Information	17

Medical Necessity Criteria

Service: Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), Pelvis

Recommended Clinical Approach

The use of contrast and the type of magnetic resonance (MR) contrast (e.g., extracellular or hepatobiliary-specific) should be at the request of the ordering provider with guidance from the radiologist. The MR field of view should be limited to the area of interest and, in some cases, may not be the preferred imaging study.

Medical Necessity Criteria

Indications

→ **Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), pelvis** is considered appropriate if **ANY** of the following are **TRUE**¹⁻²:

- ◆ For evaluation of the prostate with **ANY** of the following:
 - Prostatitis when symptoms worsen despite treatment³⁻⁵; **OR**
 - For detection and surveillance of prostate cancer and **ANY** of the following:
 - Initial imaging including **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ Biopsy is planned, and digital rectal examination (DRE) has been performed; **OR**
 - ◆ Suspicious nodule on DRE, with or without prior biopsy; **OR**
 - ◆ The patient meets intermediate or high-risk criteria, including **ANY** of the following:
 - Clinical stage T2b or higher–T2c; **OR**
 - PSA greater than 10 ng/mL; **OR**
 - Gleason score greater than or equal to 7 on prior biopsy; **OR**

- Indeterminate, intermediate-risk lesion(s) (PIRADS-3) characterized on prior MRI with prostate cancer, surveillance (up to annual)⁶; **OR**
 - Indeterminate, low-risk lesion(s) (PIRADS-1 or PIRADS-2)
 - Known prostate cancer, low-risk, annual active surveillance as defined by **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ PSA less than 10 ng/dL **OR**
 - ◆ Low clinical tumor grade (cT1-cT2a); **OR**
 - ◆ Grade Group 1 (Gleason score less than or equal to 6)⁷; **OR**
 - Prostate cancer, post-treatment follow-up for **ANY** of the following indications:
 - ◆ Detectable and rising PSA; **OR**
 - ◆ Prior prostatectomy with detectable PSA; **OR**
 - Prostate cancer, metastatic with concern for progression; **OR**
- ◆ For the evaluation of the uterus, ovaries, or cervix, including **ALL** of the following:
 - Ultrasound has been performed; **AND**
 - **ANY** of the following:
 - Intrauterine pregnancy with the presence of **ANY** of the following on pelvic ultrasound:
 - ◆ Fetal anomalies⁸; **OR**
 - ◆ Placental attachment disorders (e.g., placenta accreta, placenta increta)⁹; **OR**
 - Follow-up to initial imaging study for further evaluation to characterize a uterine abnormality or lesion if pelvic ultrasound results are inconclusive^{2,10}; **OR**

- Further evaluation of dysfunctional uterine bleeding when ultrasound was indeterminate; **OR**
- Known or suspected malignancies, including **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ Uterine, ovarian, or cervical cancer, including borderline tumors such as Brenner tumor and moles (gestational trophoblastic tumors); **OR**
 - ◆ Endometrial cancer, biopsy-proven, staging, and follow-up; **OR**
- ◆ Pelvic abnormalities as indicated by **ALL** of the following^{4,11}:
 - **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**:
 - Ultrasound has been performed and is indeterminate; **OR**
 - Ultrasound has been performed, and the patient requires further evaluation or surgical planning; **AND**
 - **ANY** of the following:
 - Abscess of the pelvis^{12,13}; **OR**
 - Endometriosis with involvement beyond the ovary¹⁰; **OR**
 - Pelvic organ prolapse¹⁴; **OR**
 - Uterine leiomyoma (fibroid) when an intervention is planned¹⁵; **OR**
 - Urethral stricture or mass; **OR**
 - Pelvic neoplasms; **OR**
 - Uterine or cervical abnormalities; **OR**
- ◆ Musculoskeletal imaging of the pelvis when plain radiograph is inconclusive, including **ANY** of the following:
 - Sacroiliac joint, including inflammatory arthropathies such as psoriatic arthritis or ankylosing spondylitis¹⁶; **OR**
 - Lumbosacral plexopathy¹⁷; **OR**
 - Potential bony infection (osteomyelitis)¹⁸; **OR**

- Septic arthritis¹⁸; **OR**
 - Characterization, staging, or follow-up of a bony lesion for suspected or known malignancy or metastatic disease¹⁹; **OR**
 - Ulcer or wound with clinical concern for soft tissue infection or osteomyelitis¹⁸; **OR**
 - Persistent athletic pubalgia or osteitis pubis after 3 months of conservative treatment¹⁹; **OR**
 - Trauma-related conditions including suspected traumatic or stress fracture with indeterminate CT²⁰⁻²²; **OR**
 - Avascular necrosis (AVN); **OR**
- ◆ Other evaluation of the pelvis when ultrasound is not appropriate or non-diagnostic, computed tomography (CT) is contraindicated or inconclusive, and **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**:
- Extension of an indicated abdominal MRI for complete evaluation of organs and structures such as ureters or bowel (e.g., MR enterography, MR urography) or for neoplastic staging; **OR**
 - Pouchitis³; **OR**
 - Fistula; **OR**
 - Lymphadenopathy; **OR**
 - Neoplastic conditions (including masses or mass-like conditions) not otherwise mentioned, including **ANY** of the following:
 - Single follow-up to initial indeterminate imaging study for further evaluation to characterize a mass; **OR**
 - Concern for bladder neoplasm based on prior imaging or clinical abnormalities (e.g., persistent hematuria) or laboratory findings^{4,11}; **OR**

- Follow-up to initial imaging study for further evaluation to characterize an abnormality/lesion related to an infection; **OR**
- For evaluation of **ANY** of the following miscellaneous pathologies when prior testing has failed:
 - Further work-up or characterization of initial abnormal findings on physical or clinical exam including **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ Lumbosacral plexopathy¹⁷; **OR**
 - ◆ Potential bony infection (osteomyelitis)¹⁸; **OR**
 - ◆ Septic arthritis¹⁸; **OR**
 - ◆ Ulcer or wound with clinical concern for infection¹⁸; **OR**
 - Peri-anal fissures; **OR**
 - Post-treatment follow-up/surveillance, including re-staging; **OR**
 - Pre-treatment for treatment planning, including staging (e.g. interventional radiology procedures, before biopsy, radiation, surgery); **OR**
- Follow-up to initial imaging study for further evaluation to characterize an abnormality/lesion related to congenital anomalies; **OR**
- ◆ Repeat imaging (defined as repeat request following recent imaging of the same anatomic region with the same modality) in the absence of established guidelines, will be considered reasonable and necessary if **ANY** of the following are true:
 - New or worsening symptoms, such that repeat imaging would influence treatment; **OR**
 - One-time clarifying follow-up of a prior indeterminate finding; **OR**
 - In the absence of change in symptoms, there is an established need for monitoring which would influence management.

Non-Indications

→ **Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), pelvis** may not be considered appropriate if **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**:

- ◆ The patient has undergone advanced imaging of the same body part and for the same indication within 3 months, without being on treatment¹⁹; **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.

*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
72195	Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (e.g., proton), pelvis; without contrast material(s)
72196	Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (e.g., proton), pelvis;

	with contrast material(s)
72197	Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (e.g., proton), pelvis; without contrast material(s) followed by contrast material(s) and further sections

Medical Evidence

Almansouri et al. (2024) performed a systematic review to analyze the role of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and computed tomography (CT) for pelvic fractures. Twelve studies were analyzed involving 1,798 patients (52% female). Two of the studies were prospective, and the remaining ten were retrospective. Diagnosing and managing pelvic fractures necessitates a personalized approach considering patient characteristics, injury mechanisms, and hemodynamic status. The authors note that MRI demonstrates superior sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy in identifying acute pelvic fractures, mainly concealed sacral fractures. MRI is also effective in detecting occult pelvic fractures and soft tissue anomalies. However, despite its diagnostic benefits, MRI is unlikely to replace CT as the initial gold standard due to factors such as shorter emergency department time and contraindications for MRI, especially in elderly patients. CT scanning remains preferred for initial diagnosis, aiding in the determination of emergent angiographic embolization needs and facilitating surgical planning in cases of pelvic fractures.²⁴

Manti et al. (2022) conducted a prospective study that included 72 patients with symptoms indicative of endometriosis who underwent evaluation to plan surgical treatment. The mean age of the patients was 35.5 years (range: 20–46 years). Pelvic endometriosis was pathologically confirmed in 56 (77.7%) of the 72 patients. Among them, 22 patients (39.3%) underwent video laparoscopy (VLS), and 16 (72.2%) of those underwent surgery. MRI demonstrated high sensitivity and specificity for detecting various types of pelvic endometriosis. MRI allows the localization of lesions with highly fibrotic components that may not be recognizable with other imaging methods or visible during video laparoscopy.²⁵

Hernando et al. (2022) reviewed quantitative diffusion MRI of the abdomen and pelvis, which involves employing multiple diffusion encodings and mapping diffusion parameters. Diffusion MRI allows the ability to gauge tissue microstructure sensitivity. In contrast to qualitative diffusion-weighted MRI,

the quantitative approach enhances the standardization of tissue characterization, which is crucial for disease detection, staging, and treatment monitoring. Challenges include acquisition artifacts, limitations in signal modeling, and biological variability. Technical performance concerns include addressing physiologic motion (respiratory, peristaltic, and pulsatile), handling image distortions, and managing a low signal-to-noise ratio. Currently, multi-center studies focus on validation through systematic assessments to assess reproducibility.²⁶

References

1. American College of Radiology (ACR), Society of Abdominal Radiology (SAR), Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR). ACR–SAR–SPR practice parameter for the performance of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the abdomen (excluding the liver). Updated 2020. Accessed June 4, 2024.
<https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Abd.pdf>.
2. American College of Radiology (ACR), Society of Abdominal Radiology (SAR), Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR). ACR–SAR–SPR practice parameter for the performance of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the soft-tissue components of the pelvis. Updated 2020. Accessed June 4, 2024.
<https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-SoftTissue-Pel.pdf>.
3. Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging, Levy AD, Liu PS, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – anorectal disease. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2021 Nov;18(11S):S268–S282. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2021.08.009. PMID: 34794588.
4. Expert Panel on Urological Imaging, Akin O, Woo S, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – pre-treatment detection, surveillance, and staging of prostate cancer. Updated 2022. Accessed June 4, 2024.
<https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/69371/Narrative/>.
5. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology – prostate cancer early detection (version 2.2024). Updated March 6, 2024. Accessed June 9, 2024.
https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate_detection.pdf.
6. Kang Z, Margolis DJ, Wang S, et al. Management strategy for prostate imaging reporting and data system category 3 lesions. *Curr Urol Rep*. 2023 Dec;24(12):561–570. doi: 10.1007/s11934-023-01187-0. PMID: 37936016.
7. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology – prostate cancer (version 4.2024). Updated May 17, 2024. Accessed July 2, 2024.

https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate_detection.pdf.

8. Expert Panel on GYN and OB Imaging, Sussman BL, Chopra P, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – second and third trimester screening for fetal anomaly. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2021 May;18(5S):S189–S198. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2021.02.017. PMID: 33958112.
9. Expert Panel on Women’s Imaging, Poder L, Weinstein S, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – placenta accreta spectrum disorder. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2020 May;17(5S):S207–S214. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2020.01.031. PMID: 32370965.
10. Expert Panel on Women’s Imaging, Wall DJ, Reinhold C, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – female infertility. Updated 2019. Accessed June 4, 2024. <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/3093336/Narrative/>.
11. Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging, Garner HW, Wessell DE, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – soft tissue masses. Published 2022. Accessed June 4, 2024.
12. Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging, Scheirey CD, Fowler KJ, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – acute nonlocalized abdominal pain. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2018 Nov;15(11S):S217–S231. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2018.09.010. PMID: 30392591.
13. Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging, Kambadakone AR, Santillan CS, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – right lower quadrant pain. Updated 2022. Accessed June 4, 2024. <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/69357/Narrative/>.
14. Expert Panel on GYN and OB Imaging, Khatri G, Bhosale PR, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – pelvic floor dysfunction in females. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2022 May;19(5S):S137–S155. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2022.02.016. PMID: 35550798.
15. Expert Panel on GYN and OB Imaging, Ascher SM, Wasnik AP, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – fibroids. Updated 2022. Accessed June 4, 2024. <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/3188532/Narrative/>.
16. Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging, Czuczman GJ, Mandell JC, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – inflammatory back pain: Known or suspected axial spondyloarthritis: 2021 update. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2021 Nov;18(11S):S340–S360. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2021.08.003. PMID: 34794593.

17. Expert Panel on Neurological and Musculoskeletal Imaging, Boulter DJ, Job J, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – plexopathy: 2021 update. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2021 Nov;18(11S):S423–S441. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2021.08.014. PMID: 34794598.
18. Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging, Pierce JL, Perry MT, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – suspected osteomyelitis, septic arthritis, or soft tissue infection (excluding spine and diabetic foot): 2022 update. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2022 Nov;19(11S):S473–S487. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2022.09.013. PMID: 36436971.
19. Wasser EJ, Prevedello LM, Sodickson A, Mar W, Khorasani R. Impact of a real-time computerized duplicate alert system on the utilization of computed tomography. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2013;173(11):1024–1026. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.543. PMID: 23609029.
20. Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging, Stanborough R, Demertzis JL, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – malignant or aggressive primary musculoskeletal tumor–staging and surveillance: 2022 update. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2022 Nov;19(11S):S374–S389. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2022.09.015. PMID: 36436964.
21. Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging, Ross AB, Lee KS, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – acute hip pain–suspected fracture. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2019 May;16(5S):S18–S25. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2019.02.028. PMID: 31054744.
22. Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging, Bencardino JT, Stone TJ, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – stress (fatigue/insufficiency) fracture, including sacrum, excluding other vertebrae. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2017 May;14(5S):S293–S306. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2017.02.035. PMID: 28473086.
23. Expert Panel on Neurological Imaging, Hutchins TA, Peckham M, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria – low back pain: 2021 update. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2021 Nov;18(11S):S361–S379. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2021.08.002. PMID: 34794594.
24. Almansouri 2nd DH, Elsherbini AI, Alharthi M, et al. The role of MRI and CT scan in classification and management of pelvic fractures: A systematic review. *Cureus*. 2024 Jan 13;16(1):e52215. doi: 10.7759/cureus.52215. PMID: 38347986; PMCID: PMC10861139.

25. Manti F, Battaglia C, Bruno I, et al. The role of magnetic resonance imaging in the planning of surgical treatment of deep pelvic endometriosis. *Front Surg*. 2022 Jun 28;9:944399. doi: 10.3389/fsurg.2022.944399. PMID: 35836610; PMCID: PMC9273906.
26. Hernando D, Zhang Y, Pirasteh A. Quantitative diffusion MRI of the abdomen and pelvis. *Med Phys*. 2022 Apr;49(4):2774–2793. doi: 10.1002/mp.15246. PMID: 34554579; PMCID: PMC8940741.

Clinical Guideline Revision History/Information

Original Date: August 2, 2024		
Review History		
Version 2	10/30/2024	Edited repeat imaging criteria language.