Cohere Medical Policy - Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), Abdomen and Magnetic Resonance Cholangiopancreatography (MRCP)

Clinical Policy for Medical Necessity Review

Version: 4
Cohere Health UMC Approval Date: August 28, 2025
Last Annual Review: August 28, 2025
Revision: Not Applicable
Next Annual Review: August 28, 2026

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.

Policy Information:

Specialty Area: Diagnostic Imaging
Policy Name: Cohere Medical Policy - Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), Abdomen and Magnetic Resonance Cholangiopancreatography (MRCP)
Type: [**X**] Adult (18+ yo) | [**X**] Pediatric (0-17 yo)

Table of Contents

Medical Necessity Criteria

Service: Title Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), Abdomen and Magnetic Resonance Cholangiopancreatography (MRCP)

Cohere Health takes an evidence-based approach to reviewing imaging and procedure requests, meaning that sufficient clinical information must be provided at the time of submission to determine medical necessity. Documentation must include a recent and detailed history, physical examination related to the onset or change in symptoms, relevant lab results, prior imaging, and details of previous treatments. Advanced imaging or procedures should be requested after a clinical evaluation by the treating provider, which may include a referral to a specialist.

- When a specific clinical indication is not explicitly addressed in the Cohere Health medical policy, medical necessity will be determined based on established clinical best practices, as supported by evidence-based literature, peer-reviewed sources, professional society guidelines, and state or national recommendations, unless otherwise directed by the health plan.
- Requests submitted without clinical documentation, or those that do not align with the provided clinical information—such as mismatched laterality, body part, or CPT code—may be denied for lack of medical necessity due to insufficient or inconsistent clinical information.
- Repeat diagnostic testing due to technical issues—such as patient motion, incomplete exams, or incorrect imaging sequences—may not be considered medically necessary, as it is the responsibility of the imaging center to deliver appropriate, high-quality studies as originally authorized. Similarly, repeat imaging requested at a different facility based solely on provider preference may not be approved for medical necessity.
- When there are multiple diagnostic or therapeutic procedures requested simultaneously or within the past three months, each will be reviewed independently. Clinical documentation must clearly justify all of the following:
    - The medical necessity of each individual request

    - Why prior imaging or procedures were inconclusive or why additional/follow-up studies are needed
    - How the results will impact patient management or treatment decisions
- Requests involving adjacent or contiguous body parts may be considered not medically necessary if the documentation demonstrates that the patient's primary symptoms can be adequately assessed with a single study or procedure.
- Cohere Health evaluates imaging exams based on medical necessity, regardless of contrast use. If an initial non-contrast study is completed and the radiologist later determines that contrast is needed to clarify a finding, the original authorization number may be used—provided the contrast-enhanced exam is performed at the same imaging center and within the original request's validity period, unless otherwise directed by the health plan.

Description

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), abdomen is considered appropriate if **ALL** of the following are **TRUE**[1]:

- **ANY** of the following:
    - Ultrasound or computed tomography (CT) are contraindicated or inconclusive (e.g., body habitus for ultrasound, anaphylactic reaction due to IV contrast reaction, pregnancy, pediatric, etc.); **OR**
    - Radiology/ordering provider recommends MRI as the optimal imaging modality for specific clinical case; **AND**
- **ANY** of the following:
    - Signs and/or symptoms in a pregnant or pediatric patient for **ANY** of the following when an ultrasound is equivocal or non-diagnostic:
        - Suspected appendicitis; **OR**
        - Unexplained abdominal pain; **OR**

        - Suspected abdominal infection (e.g., abscess, diverticulitis, pyelonephritis); **OR**
    - Detection, screening, surveillance, and follow-up of malignancies or metastatic involvement in the abdomen for **ANY** of the following[2-4]:
        - To further characterize a lesion previously identified on another imaging study when that imaging study is inconclusive; **OR**
        - Metastases, known or suspected, including preoperative mapping for liver resection; **OR**
        - Known or suspected primary malignancies with an assessment of vascular and biliary invasion, including but not limited to **ANY** of the following[5]:
            - Rising alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) in a high-risk patient or patient with known hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC); **OR**
            - Elevated CA 19-9 level; **OR**
            - Painless jaundice; **OR**
            - Persistent hematuria; **OR**
            - Other biomarker/sign/symptom suggestive of underlying malignancy; **OR**
        - Tumor response to treatment (e.g., image-guided liver interventions or tumor ablation, chemoembolization, radioembolization, chemotherapy, radiotherapy, surgery)[6]; **OR**
        - Screening, follow-up, and surveillance of malignancies, and **ANY** of the following:
            - Increased risk of hepatocellular cancer due to **ANY** of the following:
                - Primary sclerosing cholangitis after age 20; **OR**
                - Cirrhosis or chronic viral hepatitis with inconclusive/limited ultrasound; **OR**
            - Rising alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) in a patient who is high-risk for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), as suggested by **ANY** of the following[7]:
                - Cirrhosis; **OR**
                - Chronic hepatitis B (CHB) viral infection; **OR**
                - Hepatitis C; **OR**
            - Elevated CA 19-9 or CEA levels and cancer is suspected; **OR**
            - Painless jaundice; **OR**
            - Other biomarker or paraneoplastic syndrome suggestive of underlying malignancy; **OR**

- Screening of a patient with an increased risk of cancer due to **ANY** of the following:
  - Tuberous sclerosis if patient has known angiomyolipoma or renal cystic disease every 1-3 years[8]; **OR**
  - Von Hippel Lindau every other year[9]; **OR**
  - Peutz-Jeghers syndrome starting at age 18; **OR**
- Known mutation that increases susceptibility to pancreatic cancer, and **ANY** of the following[10]:
  - Autosomal dominant hereditary pancreatitis, starting at age 40, or 20 years after first developing pancreatitis, whichever is earlier[11]; **OR**
  - The patient has two or more first-degree or second-degree relatives with pancreatic cancer from the same side of the family, starting at age 50 or 10 years earlier than the youngest family member with pancreatic cancer[12]; **OR**
  - **ALL** of the following:
    - **ANY** of the following:
      - Pathogenic mutation (including but not limited to BRCA1, BRCA2, ATM, CDKN2A, MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, PALB2, PMS2, STK11, and TP53)[5]; **OR**
      - Familial pancreatic cancer (FPC); **OR**
      - Lynch syndrome; **AND**
    - **ANY** of the following intervals[13]:
      - MRI starting at age 50; **OR**
      - Starting at 10 years earlier than the youngest family member with pancreatic cancer; **OR**
  - Familial atypical multiple mole melanoma syndrome (FAMMM), and **ANY** of the following[13]:
    - MRI starting at age 40; **OR**
    - Starting at 10 years earlier than the youngest family member with pancreatic cancer; **OR**
- Evaluation of indeterminate adrenal mass, and **ALL** of the following[14,15]:
  - Asymptomatic; **AND**
  - At least 1.0 cm; **AND**
  - Mass does not contain fat (e.g., is not a myelolipoma) or mass measures more than 10 HU on CT, if performed; **AND**
  - Mass is not primarily calcified; **AND**
  - Discovered incidentally on previous imaging; **AND**

        - **ANY** of the following:
            - **ALL** of the following:
                - Patient has a history of cancer; **AND**
                - The lesion is between 1 and 4 cm; **OR**
            - If 1 to 4 cm with no prior imaging (other than imaging with incidental discovery, if non-diagnostic), or with a history of cancer, and **ANY** of the following:
                - **ALL** of the following:
                    - The mass is 1 to 2 cm; **AND**
                    - The request is for a 12-month follow-up since discovery; **OR**
                - The mass is 2 to 4 cm; **OR**
            - If 1 to 4 cm with prior imaging available, and **ANY** of the following:
                - Mass is new or enlarging with no history of cancer; **OR**
                - Follow-up of a stable mass for up to 1 year; **OR**
    - Ultrasound is equivocal or non-diagnostic, and **ANY** of the following is suspected:
        - Abdominal wall hernia (e.g., umbilical, ventral or incisional); **OR**
        - Groin hernia (e.g., femoral, inguinal); **OR**
        - Diaphragmatic hernia (e.g., traumatic, Bochdalek, or Morgagni); **OR**
        - Characterization and follow-up of intra-abdominal fluid collections; **OR**
    - Characterization of peritoneal or mesenteric abnormalities (e.g., carcinomatosis, omental infarct, or sarcoidosis); **OR**
    - Gastrointestinal tract evaluation, as indicated by **ANY** of the following[16]:
        - Refractory celiac disease (persistent symptoms despite maintaining a gluten-free diet for 12 months or more)[17]; **OR**
        - Suspected or known Crohn's disease when **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**[18]:
            - For initial diagnosis (MR enterography preferred) with persistent symptoms (e.g., moderate to severe abdominal pain, diarrhea, fatigue, or weight loss) and **ANY** of the following:
                - Positive family history of inflammatory bowel disease; **OR**
                - Endoscopic/colonoscopic findings suggestive of inflammatory bowel disease; **OR**
                - Elevated inflammatory markers (ESR, CRP, fecal lactoferrin, fecal calprotectin); **OR**

        - Strong clinical suspicion despite normal endoscopy/colonoscopy and absence of other above criteria; **OR**
    - Follow-up for **ANY** of the following:
        - Acute exacerbation; **OR**
        - Concern for potential complications including abscess, perforation, fistula, or obstruction; **OR**
        - Concern for progression (e.g., increased calprotectin); **OR**
        - Monitoring response to therapy; **OR**
  - Other autoimmune enteritis with small bowel involvement; **OR**
  - Volvulus, internal hernias, incarceration; **OR**
- Conditions related to the hepatobiliary system (liver, bile ducts, gallbladder, and associated structures) and **ALL** of the following:
  - Ultrasound is indeterminate or abnormal; **AND**
  - Further imaging is needed; **AND**
  - **ANY** of the following:
    - Indeterminate liver lesion and **ANY** of the following[19]:
        - The lesion is greater than 1 cm; **OR**
        - The lesion is less than 1 cm with history of extrahepatic malignancy or chronic liver disease; **OR**
    - Abnormal liver function tests (LFTs), and **ANY** of the following[20]:
        - Moderate or severe aminotransferase increase; **OR**
        - Hyperbilirubinemia as indicated by jaundice, dark urine, or pale stools; **OR**
        - Elevated alkaline phosphatase with or without elevated gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase (GGT); **OR**
    - Right upper quadrant pain, and **ANY** of the following[21]:
        - Suspected biliary disease with indeterminate or negative ultrasound; **OR**
        - Suspected acalculous cholecystitis when nuclear medicine gallbladder scan is indeterminate or cannot be performed; **OR**
    - Autoimmune (e.g., autoimmune hepatitis, primary biliary cirrhosis); **OR**
    - Pre-operative or post-operative evaluation (e.g., liver resection, donor or transplant, hepatic shunt placement); **OR**
    - Non-invasive quantification of iron in **ANY** of the following:

        - Patients with hereditary hemochromatosis (non-C282Y homozygote) and serum transferrin greater than or equal to 45%[22]; **OR**
        - Patients with hereditary hemochromatosis (non-C282Y homozygote) and elevated serum ferritin[23]; **OR**
        - Annual screening of patients with potential iron overload due to repeated transfusion (e.g., sickle cell disease, thallasemia); **OR**
- Other pancreatic abnormalities as indicated by **ANY** of the following[23]:
    - Duct anomaly[24]; **OR**
    - Duct obstruction (e.g., calculi, stricture, or mass)[24]; **OR**
    - Fluid collections; **OR**
    - Pancreatic pseudocysts; **OR**
    - Indeterminate lesions; **OR**
    - Pancreatitis (acute or chronic), and **ANY** of the following[25,26]:
        - Diagnosis of acute pancreatitis is suspected with atypical signs and symptoms (equivocal amylase and lipase); **OR**
        - Concern for complications if greater than 48 to 72 hours have elapsed since the onset of symptoms (e.g., necrosis or abscess); **OR**
        - Known pancreatic or peripancreatic fluid collection with persistent abdominal pain, early satiety, nausea, vomiting, or signs of infection, greater than 4 weeks after onset of symptoms; **OR**
        - Ultrasound or other imaging study did not show clear etiology, such as a stone; **OR**
    - Indeterminate pancreatic cyst with **ALL** of the following:
        - The patient is asymptomatic; **AND**
        - The patient is a potential surgical candidate; **AND**
        - **ANY** of the following[24]: **OR**
            - The patient is under 65 years of age and requires **ANY** of the following[24]:
                - The cyst is less than 1.5 cm with **ANY** of the following:
                    - If the cyst is stable, **ANY** of the following:
                        - Annual imaging for five years following diagnosis; **OR**
                        - Imaging 7 years following diagnosis; **OR**
                        - Imaging 9 years following diagnosis; **OR**

        - Annual imaging if the cyst demonstrates interval growth; **OR**
    - The cyst is greater than 1.5 cm but less than 1.9 cm with **ALL** of the following:
        - Demonstrates interval growth; **AND**
        - **ANY** of the following:
            - Annual imaging for 5 years; **OR**
            - After completion of annual imaging (5 years following diagnosis), every other year for 4 years; **OR**
    - The cyst is greater than 2.0 cm but less than 2.5 cm with **ALL** of the following:
        - Demonstrates interval growth; **AND**
        - **ANY** of the following:
            - Imaging every 6 months for 2 years; **OR**
            - After completion of biannual imaging, annual imaging for 2 years; **OR**
            - After completion of annual imaging (4 years following diagnosis), every other year for 6 years; **OR**
- The patient is between 65 and 79 years of age with **ANY** of the following[24]:
    - Stable cyst with imaging every other year for 10 years; **OR**
    - The cyst remains less than 1.5 cm with **ALL** of the following:
        - Demonstrates interval growth; **AND**
        - Annual imaging for 10 years; **OR**
    - The cyst is larger than 1.5 cm but less than 1.9 cm, and **ALL** of the following:
        - Demonstrates interval growth; **AND**
        - **ANY** of the following:
            - Annual imaging for 5 years following diagnosis; **OR**
            - After completion of annual imaging, every other year for 4 years; **OR**
    - The cyst is greater than 2.0 cm but less than 2.5 cm with **ALL** of the following:
        - Demonstrates interval growth; **AND**
        - **ANY** of the following:
            - Imaging every 6 months for 2 years; **OR**
            - After completion of biannual imaging, annual imaging for 2 years; **OR**

        - After completion of annual imaging, every other year for 6 years; **OR**
    - The patient is 80 years or older with **ANY** of the following[24]:
        - The cyst is 2.5 cm or smaller at **ANY** of the following intervals:
            - Every other year for 2 years; **OR**
            - After completion of biannual imaging, **ANY** of the following:
                - If the cyst is stable, biannual imaging for 2 more years; **OR**
                - The cyst demonstrates interval growth but is still 2.5 cm or smaller, then **ANY** of the following:
                    - Annual imaging until size stabilizes; **OR**
                    - Annual imaging until the patient is no longer a surgical candidate; **OR**
        - The cyst is greater than 2.5 cm with **ALL** of the following:
            - The cyst demonstrates low-risk features (e.g., no mural nodule, no peripheral calcifications, no wall thickening, normal caliber pancreatic duct); **AND**
            - Imaging every other year for 4 years until size stablizes; **OR**
    - The patient is under 80 years of age, and **ALL** of the following[24]:
        - The cyst is greater than 2.5 cm; **AND**
        - The cyst demonstrates low-risk features (e.g., no mural nodule, no peripheral calcifications, no wall thickening, normal caliber pancreatic duct); **AND**
        - **ANY** of the following:
            - Imaging every 6 months for 2 years; **OR**
            - If stable at completion of biannual imaging, then image every year for 2 years; **AND**
            - After completion of annual imaging, then every other year for 3 years; **OR**
- Conditions related to the kidney and urinary system, as indicated by **ANY** of the following[27-29]:
    - An ultrasound of the kidneys has been performed for the present condition; **AND**
    - Further workup is required; **AND**
    - **ANY** of the following:

- Renal cysts, classification of Bosniak IIF or above, and **ANY** of the following intervals[30]:
  - Imaging 6 months after discovery, **OR**
  - Imaging 1 year after discovery; **OR**
  - Imaging annually for 5 years after discovery; **OR**
- Solid, indeterminate renal mass less than 1 cm, and **ANY** of the following[30]:
  - Imaging 3-6 months after discovery; **OR**
  - Imaging 1 year after discovery; **OR**
  - Imaging annually after discovery until greater than 1 cm; **OR**
- Annual follow-up of a solid indeterminate renal mass greater than 1 cm; **OR**
- Renal angiomyolipoma evaluation at **ANY** of the following intervals[30]:
  - Every 5 years when 2 to 3 cm; **OR**
  - Every 2 years when 3 to 4 cm; **OR**
  - Up to annually when greater than 4 cm; **OR**
- Characterization of other indeterminate lesions detected with other imaging modalities; **OR**
- Known polycystic kidney disease (PKD) with concerning signs/symptoms (e.g., pain, concern for rupture, infection, hemorrhage)[31]; **OR**
- Anatomic abnormalities, congenital or acquired (e.g., horseshoe kidney, ectopic insertion of the ureter, retroperitoneal fibrosis); **OR**
- The patient is pregnant with concern for pyelonephritis and **ANY** of the following:
  - Ultrasound is equivocal; **OR**
  - Ultrasound cannot be performed; **OR**
- Infectious/inflammatory disease (e.g., pyelonephritis), and **ANY** of the following[32,33]:
  - High risk for complicated pyelonephritis, (e.g., history of renal stones or renal obstruction, diabetes, immunocompromised, advanced age, vesicoureteral reflux,); **OR**
  - Concern for complications (e.g., abscess, obstruction, or lack of response to treatment); **OR**
  - Recurrent pyelonephritis; **OR**
- Before a planned procedure or intervention; **OR**

- Further evaluation of unexplained hydronephrosis when detected on ultrasound; **OR**
- Renal transplant complication; **OR**
- Gross hematuria; **OR**
- Microscopic hematuria (3 or more RBC/high power field)[11] with risk factors (e.g., male, smoker, age >35, occupational chemical exposure, history of pelvic irradiation, chronic urinary tract infection) and **ALL** of the following:
  - No recent vigorous exercise; **AND**
  - No acute cystitis; **AND**
  - No current or recent menstruation; **AND**
  - No known renal parenchymal disease; **AND**
  - The patient is not pregnant; **OR**

- Splenic abnormalities as indicated by **ANY** of the following[34,35]:
  - Characterization of indeterminate lesions detected with ultrasound or CT; **OR**
  - Detection and characterization of suspected diffuse or infiltrative processes (e.g., hematologic malignancy, sickle cell disease, sarcoidosis) affecting the spleen; **OR**
- Preoperative, postoperative, or pre-treatment evaluation for **ANY** of the following:
  - Post-surgical complications (including minimally invasive and interventional procedures) involving the hepatobiliary system (bile ducts, gallbladder, and associated structures)[6] if CT or ultrasound are non-diagnostic or contraindicated; **OR**
- Non-localized, acute abdominal pain and **ALL** of the following[36,37]:
  - **ANY** of the following:
  - Fever, with or without recent surgery; **OR**
  - Neutropenic or immunocompromised; **OR**
  - The patient is greater than or equal to 75 years of age; **OR**
  - Abnormal laboratory evaluation (e.g., UA, WBC, LFTs, amylase, lipase, urine pregnancy, etc.); **OR**
- Further characterization of complex congenital anomalies (e.g., obstructive gastrointestinal defects)[38]; **OR**
- Repeat imaging (defined as a repeat request following recent imaging of the same anatomic region with the same or similar modality) will be considered reasonable and necessary if **ALL** of the following are **TRUE**:
  - There are no established guidelines; **AND**

        - **ANY** of the following:
            - There are new or worsening symptoms not addressed in the guidelines, such that repeat imaging would influence treatment; **OR**
            - There is need for a 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.

Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) is considered appropriate if **ANY** of the following is **TRUE**:

- Evidence of biliary obstruction or involvement, including **ANY** of the following[39-41]:
    - Biliary duct dilation on ultrasound or CT requiring further evaluation; **OR**
    - Jaundice; **OR**
    - Laboratory or biochemical markers, including increased alkaline phosphatase, gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase, or conjugated (direct) bilirubinemia; **OR**
- Known or suspected abnormalities of the pancreatic and biliary ducts, including **ANY** of the following[42,43]:
    - Acute pancreatitis, and **ANY** of the following[44]:
        - Diagnosis of acute pancreatitis is suspected with atypical signs and symptoms (equivocal amylase and lipase); **OR**
        - Concern for complications if greater than 48 to 72 hours have elapsed since the onset of symptoms (e.g., necrosis or abscess); **OR**
        - Known pancreatic or peripancreatic fluid collection with persistent abdominal pain, early satiety, nausea, vomiting, or signs of infection, greater than 4 weeks after onset of symptoms;
    - Chronic pancreatitis, and **ALL** of the following[45]:
        - Absence of pancreatic calcifications; **AND**
        - High clinical suspicion of chronic pancreatitis; **OR**
    - Pancreatic duct anomalies**; OR**
    - Cystic lesions in the pancreas[24]; **OR**
    - Biliary and/or pancreatic duct stones; **OR**
    - Evaluation of bile duct dilation or stricture; **OR**
- Unexplained right upper quadrant pain when ultrasound is negative or equivocal and biliary disease is suspected[21]; **OR**
- Assessment of post-liver transplant biliary complications; **OR**

- When ERCP is unsuccessful or contraindicated, or therapeutic ERCP is unlikely to be needed[39-41]; **OR**
- Delineation of ductal anatomy before liver transplantation; **OR**
- Detection and anatomic delineation of bile leaks; **OR**
- Detection, staging, and post-treatment follow-up of bile duct and gallbladder cancer; **OR**
- Evaluation of suspected congenital abnormalities of the gallbladder or bile ducts; **OR**
- Follow-up after hepato-biliary or pancreatic surgery or intervention; **OR**
- Repeat imaging (defined as a repeat request following recent imaging of the same anatomic region with the same or similar modality) will be considered reasonable and necessary if **ALL** of the following are **TRUE**:
    - There are no established guidelines; **AND**
    - **ANY** of the following:
        - There are new or worsening symptoms not addressed in the guidelines, such that repeat imaging would influence treatment; **OR**
        - There is need for a 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), abdomen or magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) are 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[46]; **OR**
- Abdominal lymphadenopathy if there is prior imaging demonstrating that the node(s) have been stable for more than one year.[47,48]

*NOTE: The referring professional and radiologist should discuss the risks and benefits of contrast media administration, including possible prophylaxis, in patients with chronic or worsening kidney disease or severe renal failure.
**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
74181	Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (e.g., proton), abdomen; without contrast material(s)
74182	Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (e.g., proton), abdomen; with contrast material(s)
74183	Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (e.g., proton), abdomen, without contrast material(s), followed by contrast material(s) and further sequences
S8037	Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP)

Medical Evidence

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.[49]

Staubli et al. (2022) performed a randomized control trial (RCT) comparing intraoperative cholangiography (IOC) and magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) in patients suspected of having common bile duct stones (CBDS). It was a multicenter randomized controlled trial conducted across five hospitals. Patients were randomly assigned to receive either IOC followed by laparoscopic cholecystectomy (LC) with potential endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) or MRCP followed by ERCP and LC if deemed necessary. The primary focus was on the LOS, with secondary measures encompassing cost, stone detection, and complication rates. The findings indicated that IOC was more effective in diagnosing CBDS than MRCP. Although the median LOS was slightly shorter in the IOC group, this variance did not reach statistical significance. No significant cost difference was observed between the two approaches. However, CBDS were more frequently detected in the IOC group. Complication rates did not exhibit disparity between the two methods. The study concluded that while IOC and MRCP are viable options, IOC stands out for its notably higher diagnostic yield in detecting CBDS. (Clinicaltrials.gov Identifier: NCT02351492).[50]

Suzuki et al. conducted an RCT to evaluate the diagnostic precision of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) and MRCP in detecting choledocholithiasis cases initially overlooked on CT scans. Patients suspected of having CBDS were divided into two groups: one receiving EUS and the other MRCP. Initially, those diagnosed with CBDS or sludge underwent ERCP, while CBDS-negative patients underwent a second diagnostic procedure, either MRCP or EUS, which

differed from the initial one. The main focus was on the accuracy of diagnosis, with secondary interests in diagnostic capabilities, CBDS detection rates and characteristics during the second examination, and adverse event occurrence. Overall, EUS may provide higher diagnostic ability than MRCP; however, the authors did not note significant differences in recommending one procedure.[51]

Timmerhuis et al. (2021) performed a systematic review of available guidelines for diagnosing a disrupted pancreatic duct in patients with acute pancreatitis. Eight studies were included with five distinct diagnostic modalities in 142 severe acute pancreatitis patients. Endoscopic ultrasound and ERCP reported a sensitivity of 100%. A sensitivity of 83% was reported with MRCP, with or without secretin. A combined cohort of secretin-enhanced MRCP and standard MRCP showed a sensitivity of 92%. Amylase measurements in drain fluid exhibited a sensitivity of 100% and specificity of 50% compared to ERCP. The authors concluded that various diagnostic modalities effectively diagnose disrupted pancreatic ducts in acute pancreatitis patients. Considering the invasiveness of alternative modalities, secretin-enhanced MRCP is recommended as the initial diagnostic approach.[52]

References

1. American College of Radiology (ACR). ACR practice parameter for performing and interpreting magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (resolution 8). Updated 2022. https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Perf-Interpret.pdf
2. Purysko AS, Nikolaidis P, Khatri G, et al. Post-treatment follow-up and active surveillance of clinically localized renal cell carcinoma. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2021. http://www.acr.org
3. Ganeshan D, Khatri G, Ali N, et al. Staging of renal cell carcinoma. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2022. http://www.acr.org
4. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology: Wilms tumor (nephroblastoma) (ver. 1.2023). Published March 14, 2023. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/wilms_tumor.pdf
5. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology: Pancreatic adenocarcinoma (ver. 1.2024). Published December 13, 2023. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/pancreatic.pdf
6. American College of Radiology (ACR). ACR–SAR–SPR practice parameter for the performance of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the liver (resolution 27). Updated 2020. https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Liver.pdf
7. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology: Hepatocellular carcinoma (ver. 1.2025). Updated March 20, 2025. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/hcc.pdf
8. Krueger DA, Northrup H; International Tuberous Sclerosis Complex Consensus Group. Tuberous sclerosis complex surveillance and management: recommendations of the 2012 International Tuberous

Sclerosis Complex Consensus Conference. *Pediatr Neurol*. 2013;49(4):255-265. doi:10.1016/j.pediatrneurol.2013.08.002

9. Binderup LM, Smerdel M, Borgwadt L, et al. von Hippel-Lindau disease: Updated guideline for diagnosis and surveillance. *Eur J Med Genet*. 2022;65(8):104538. doi:10.1016/j.ejmg.2022.104538
10. Sawhney MS, Calderwood AH, Thosani NC, et al. ASGE guideline on screening for pancreatic cancer in individuals with genetic susceptibility: summary and recommendations. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2022;95(5):817-826. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2021.12.001
11. Biller LH, Wolpin BM, Goggins M. Inherited pancreatic cancer syndromes and high-risk screening. *Surg Oncol Clin N Am*. 2021;30(4):773-786. doi:10.1016/j.soc.2021.06.002
12. Aslanian HR, Lee JH, Canto MI. AGA Clinical practice update on pancreas cancer screening in high-risk individuals: Expert review. *Gastroenterology*. 2020;159(1):358-362. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2020.03.088
13. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines: Genetic/familial high-risk assessment: Breast, ovarian, and pancreatic (ver. 3.2024). Published February 12, 2024. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/genetics_bop.pdf
14. Mody RN, Remer EM, Nikolaidis P, et al. Adrenal mass evaluation. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2021. http://www.acr.org
15. Mayo-Smith WW, Song JH, Boland GL, et al. Management of incidental adrenal masses: A white paper of the ACR Incidental Findings Committee. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2017;14(8):1038-1044. doi:10.1016/j.jacr.2017.05.001
16. Garcia EM, Pietryga JA, Kim DH, et al. Hernia. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2022. http://www.acr.org
17. Green PHR, Paski S, Ko CW, et al. AGA clinical practice update on management of refractory celiac disease: Expert review. Gastroenterology. 2022 Nov;163(5):1461-1469. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2022.07.086

18. Kim DH, Chang KJ, Fowler KJ, et al. Crohn disease. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2019. http://www.acr.org
19. Chernyak V, Horowitz JM, Kamel IB, et al. Liver lesion - initial characterization. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2020. http://www.acr.org
20. Arif-Tiwari H, Porter KK, Kamel IB, et al. Abnormal liver function tests. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). New 2023. http://www.acr.org
21. Russo GK, Zaheer A, Kamel IR, et al. Right upper quadrant pain. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2022. http://www.acr.org
22. Kowdley KV, Brown KE, Ahn J, Sundaram V. ACG Clinical Guideline: Hereditary Hemochromatosis. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2019;114(8):1202-1218. doi:10.14309/ajg.0000000000000315
23. Hill DV, Tirkes T. Advanced MR imaging of the pancreas. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2020 Aug;28(3):353-367. doi:10.1016/j.mric.2020.03.003
24. Megibow AJ, Baker ME, Morgan DE, et al. Management of incidental pancreatic cysts: A white paper of the ACR Incidental Findings Committee. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2017 Jul;14(7):911-923. doi:10.1016/j.jacr.2017.03.010
25. Parakh A, Tirkes T. Advanced imaging techniques for chronic pancreatitis. *Abdom Radiol (NY)*. 2020 May;45(5):1420-1438. doi: 10.1007/s00261-019-02191-0
26. Hart PA, Conwell DL. Chronic pancreatitis: Managing a difficult disease. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2020 Jan;115(1):49-55. doi:10.14309/ajg.0000000000000421
27. Wang ZJ, Nikolaidis P, Khatri G, et al. Indeterminate renal mass. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2020. http://www.acr.org
28. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology: Kidney cancer (ver. 2.2024). Published January 3, 2024. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/kidney.pdf

29. Campbell SC, Clark PE, Chang SS, et al. Renal mass and localized renal cancer: Evaluation, management, and follow-up: AUA Guideline: Part I. *J Urol*. 2021 Aug;206(2):199-208. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000001911.
30. Herts BR, Silverman SG, Hindman NM, et al. Management of the incidental renal mass on CT: A white paper of the ACR Incidental Findings Committee. *J Am Coll Radio*l. 2018;15(2):264-273. doi:10.1016/j.jacr.2017.04.028
31. Torres VE, Ahn C, Barten TRM, et al. KDIGO 2025 clinical practice guideline for the evaluation, management, and treatment of autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease (ADPKD): executive summary. *Kidney Int*. 2025;107(2):234-254. doi:10.1016/j.kint.2024.07.010
32. Smith AD, Nikolaidis P, Khatri G, et al. Acute pyelonephritis. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2022. http://www.acr.org
33. Pierce JL, Perry MT, Wessell DE, et al. Suspected osteomyelitis, septic arthritis, or soft tissue infection (excluding spine and diabetic foot). ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Updated 2022. http://www.acr.org
34. Pouvreau P, Bouyer T, Fosse P, et al. Management of splenic incidentalomas, a new evidence-based algorithm. *Surg Open Dig Adv*. 2024;13:100127. doi:10.1016/j.soda.2024.100127
35. Kim N, Auerbach A, Manning MA. Algorithmic approach to the splenic lesion based on radiologic-pathologic correlation. *Radiographics*. 2022;42(3):683-701. doi:10.1148/rg.210071
36. Scheirey CD, Fowler KJ, Therrien JA, et al. Acute nonlocalized abdominal pain. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Revised 2018. http://www.acr.org
37. Yew KS, George MK, Allred HB. Acute abdominal pain in adults: Evaluation and diagnosis. *Am Fam Physician*. 2023;107(6):585-596
38. Berrocal T, Lamas M, Gutieérrez J, Torres I, Prieto C, del Hoyo ML. Congenital anomalies of the small intestine, colon, and rectum. *Radiographics*. 1999;19(5):1219-1236. doi:10.1148/radiographics.19.5.g99se041219

39. Griffin N, Charles-Edwards G, Grant LA. Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography: The ABC of MRCP. *Insights Imaging*. 2012 Feb;3(1):11-21. doi:10.1007/s13244-011-0129-9

40. Boraschi P, Donati F, Cervelli R, et al. Secretin-stimulated MR cholangiopancreatography: Spectrum of findings in pancreatic diseases. *Insights Imaging*. 2016 Dec;7(6):819-829. doi:10.1007/s13244-016-0517-2

41. Arif-Tiwari H, Porter KK, Kamel IB, et al. Abnormal liver function tests. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). New 2023. http://www.acr.org

42. Chamokova B, Bastati N, Poetter-Lang S, et al. The clinical value of secretin-enhanced MRCP in the functional and morphological assessment of pancreatic diseases. *Br J Radiol*. 2018 Apr;91(1084):20170677. doi: 10.1259/bjr.20170677

43. Giljaca V, Gurusamy KS, Takwoingi Y, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound versus magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography for common bile duct stones. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015 Feb 26;2015(2):CD011549. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011549

44. Porter KK, Zaheer A, Kamel IB, et al. Acute pancreatitis. ACR appropriateness criteria [Internet] American College of Radiology (ACR). Revised 2019. http://www.acr.org

45. Singh VK, Yadav D, Garg PK. Diagnosis and management of chronic pancreatitis: a review. *JAMA*. 2019;322(24):2422-2434. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.19411

46. 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

47. Gaddey HL, Riegel AM. Unexplained Lymphadenopathy: Evaluation and Differential Diagnosis. *Am Fam Physician*. 2016;94(11):896-903

48. Heller MT, Harisinghani M, Neitlich JD, Yeghiayan P, Berland LL. Managing incidental findings on abdominal and pelvic CT and MRI, part 3: White paper of the ACR Incidental Findings Committee II on splenic and nodal findings. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2013;10(11):833-839. doi:10.1016/j.jacr.2013.05.020

49. 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

50. Staubli SM, Kettelhack C, Oertli D, et al. Efficacy of intraoperative cholangiography versus preoperative magnetic resonance cholangiography in patients with intermediate risk for common bile duct stones. *HPB (Oxford)*. 2022 Nov;24(11):1898-1906. doi:10.1016/j.hpb.2022.05.1346

51. Suzuki M, Sekino Y, Hosono K, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound versus magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography for the diagnosis of computed tomography-negative common bile duct stone: Prospective randomized controlled trial. Dig Endosc. 2022 Jul;34(5):1052-1059. doi:10.1111/den.14193

52. Timmerhuis HC, van Dijk SM, Verdonk RC, et al. Various modalities accurate in diagnosing a disrupted or disconnected pancreatic duct in acute pancreatitis: A systematic review. *Dig Dis Sci*. 2021 May;66(5):1415-1424. doi:10.1007/s10620-020-06413-0

Policy Revision History/Information

Original Date: August 2, 2024		
Review History		
Version 2	10/30/2024	Edited repeat imaging criteria language.
Version 3	2/20/2025	Modified policy based on physician feedback to provide avenue to approval in the scenario where MRI/MRCP is the appropriate first-line imaging. Added references.
Version 4	08/28/2025	Annual review. Aligned indications and references with the most recent guidelines from ACR and NCCN, including both MRI and MRCP sections (wording changes and restructuring). Expanded indications for pancreatic cysts, pancreatitis, abnormal liver function tests, internal hernias, renal masses and diseases, Crohn's disease, and mesenteric ischemia. Aligned a few sections with Cohere Medical Policy - CT, Abdomen/Pelvis, including indications in the gastrointestinal, hepatobiliary, urinary, and abdominal pain sections. Removed relative contraindications (contrast allergy, metallic clips, incompatible implantable devices, metallic foreign body).