BlueCross BlueShield Federal Employee Program.

FEP Medical Policy Manual

FEP 2.04.41 Noninvasive Techniques for the Evaluation and Monitoring of Patients With Chronic Liver Disease

Annual Effective Policy Date: January 1, 2024

Original Policy Date: December 2023

Related Policies:

None

Noninvasive Techniques for the Evaluation and Monitoring of Patients With Chronic Liver Disease

Description

Description

Noninvasive techniques to monitor liver fibrosis are being investigated as alternatives to liver biopsy in patients with chronic liver disease. There are 2 options for noninvasive monitoring: (1) multianalyte serum assays with algorithmic analysis of either direct or indirect biomarkers; and (2) specialized radiologic methods, including magnetic resonance elastography, multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), transient elastography, acoustic radiation force impulse imaging, and real-time transient elastography.

Multianalyte Assays

While many studies have been done on these individual markers, or on groups of markers in different populations of patients with liver disease, there has been interest in analyzing multiple markers using mathematical algorithms to generate a score that categorizes patients according to the biopsy score. It is proposed that these algorithms can be used as alternatives to liver biopsy in patients with liver disease. The following proprietary, algorithm-based tests are commercially available in the U.S.

There are 3 different FibroSURE tests available depending on the indication for use: HCV FibroSURE, ASH FibroSURE, and NASH FibroSURE.

HCV FibroSURE

The HCV FibroSURE uses a combination of 6 serum biochemical indirect markers of liver function plus age and sex in a patented algorithm to generate a measure of fibrosis and necroinflammatory activity in the liver that corresponds to the Metavir scoring system for stage (ie, fibrosis) and grade (ie, necroinflammatory activity). The measures are combined using a linear regression equation to produce a score between 0 and 1, with higher values corresponding to more severe disease. The biochemical markers include the readily available measurements of α_2-macroglobulin, haptoglobin, bilirubin, γ-glutamyl transpeptidase, ALT, and apolipoprotein AI. Developed in France, the test has been clinically available in Europe under the name FibroTest since 2003; it is exclusively offered by LabCorp in the U.S. as HCV FibroSURE.

ASH FibroSURE

ASH FibroSURE (ASH Test) uses a combination of 10 serum biochemical markers of liver function together with age, sex, height, and weight in a proprietary algorithm; the test is proposed to provide surrogate markers for liver fibrosis, hepatic steatosis, and ASH. The biochemical markers include α_2-macroglobulin, haptoglobin, apolipoprotein AI, bilirubin, γ-glutamyl transpeptidase, ALT, AST, total cholesterol, triglycerides, and fasting glucose. The test has been available in Europe under the name AshTest™ (BioPredictive); the test is exclusively offered by LabCorp in the U.S. as ASH FibroSURE.

NASH FibroSURE

NASH FibroSURE (NASH Test) uses a proprietary algorithm of the same 10 biochemical markers of liver function in combination with age, sex, height, and weight and is proposed to provide surrogate markers for liver fibrosis, hepatic steatosis, and NASH. The biochemical markers include α_2-macroglobulin, haptoglobin, apolipoprotein AI, bilirubin, γ-glutamyl transpeptidase, ALT, AST, total cholesterol, triglycerides, and fasting glucose. The test has been available in Europe under the name NashTest™ (BioPredictive); the test is exclusively offered by LabCorp in the U.S. as NASH FibroSURE.

FIBROSpect II

FIBROSpect II uses a combination of 3 markers that directly measure fibrogenesis of the liver, analyzed with a patented algorithm. The markers include hyaluronic acid, tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinase 1, and α_2-macroglobulin. FIBROSpect II is offered exclusively by Prometheus Laboratories. The measures are combined using a logistic regression algorithm to generate a FIBROSpect II index score, ranging from 1 to 100 (or sometimes reported between 0 and 1), with higher scores indicating more severe disease.

Enhanced Liver Fibrosis Test

The Enhanced Liver Fibrosis (ELF) test uses a proprietary algorithm to produce a score based on 3 serum biomarkers involved in matrix biology: hyaluronic acid, Procollagen III amino terminal peptide and tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinase 1. The manufacturer recommends the following cutoffs for interpretation for risk of development of cirrhosis or liver-related events in patients with NASH: <9.80 (lower risk) and ≥11.30 (higher risk).

Noninvasive Imaging Technologies

Noninvasive imaging technologies to detect liver fibrosis or cirrhosis among patients with chronic liver disease are being evaluated as alternatives to liver biopsy. The noninvasive imaging technologies include transient elastography (eg, FibroScan), magnetic resonance elastography, acoustic radiation force impulse (ARFI) imaging (eg, Acuson S2000), multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and real-time tissue elastography (eg, HI VISION Preirus). Noninvasive imaging tests have been used in combination with multianalyte serum tests such as FibroTest or FibroSURE with FibroScan.

Transient Elastography

Transient elastography (FibroScan) uses a mechanical vibrator to produce mild amplitude and low-frequency (50 Hz) waves, inducing an elastic shear wave that propagates throughout the liver. Ultrasound tracks the wave, measuring its speed in kilopascals, which correlates with liver stiffness. Increases in liver fibrosis also increase liver stiffness and resistance of liver blood flow. Transient elastography does not perform as well in patients with ascites, higher body mass index, or narrow intercostal margins. Although FibroScan may be used to measure fibrosis (unlike liver biopsy), it does not provide information on necroinflammatory activity and steatosis, nor is it accurate during acute hepatitis or hepatitis exacerbations.

Acoustic Radiation Force Impulse Imaging

ARFI imaging uses an ultrasound probe to produce an acoustic “push” pulse, which generates shear waves that propagate in tissue to assess liver stiffness. ARFI elastography evaluates the wave propagation speed (measured in meters per second) to assess liver stiffness. The faster the shear wave speed, the harder the object. ARFI technologies include Virtual Touch Quantification and Siemens Acuson S2000 system. ARFI elastography can be performed at the same time as a liver sonographic evaluation, even in patients with a significant amount of ascites.

Magnetic Resonance Elastography

Magnetic resonance elastography uses a driver to generate 60-Hz mechanical waves on the patient's chest wall. The magnetic resonance equipment creates elastograms by processing the acquired images of propagating shear waves in the liver using an inversion algorithm. These elastograms represent the shear stiffness as a pixel value in kilopascals. Magnetic resonance elastography has several advantages over ultrasound elastography, including: (1) the ability to analyze larger liver volumes; (2) the ability to analyze liver volumes of obese patients or patients with ascites; and (3) the ability to precisely analyze viscoelasticity using a 3-dimensional displacement vector.

Real-Time Tissue Elastography

Real-time tissue elastography is a type of strain elastography that uses a combined autocorrelation method to measure tissue strain caused by manual compression or a person's heartbeat. The relative tissue strain is displayed on conventional color B mode ultrasound images in real-time. Hitachi manufactures real-time tissue elastography devices, including the HI VISION Preirus. The challenge is to identify a region of interest while avoiding areas likely to introduce artifacts, such as large blood vessels, the area near the ribs, and the surface of the liver. Areas of low strain increase as fibrosis progresses and strain distribution becomes more complex. Various subjective and quantitative methods have been developed to evaluate the results. Real-time tissue elastography can be performed in patients with ascites or inflammation. This technology does not perform as well in severely obese individuals.

Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Multiparametric MRI combines proton density fat-fraction, T2*, and T1 mapping. Proton density fat-fraction provides an assessment of hepatic fat content and can be used to determine the grade of liver steatosis. T1 relaxation times are used to assess increases in extracellular fluid, which correlates with the extent of fibrosis and inflammation of the liver. Hepatic iron quantification is measured through T2* relaxation times as T1 relaxation times are decreased by excess iron in the liver tissue. LiverMultiScan® uses a clinical algorithm that accounts for an iron-corrected T1 value, based on the T2* relaxation time, and proton density fat-fraction to assess the presence of fat, inflammation, and fibrosis.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether the use of noninvasive techniques for detecting liver fibrosis compared with liver biopsy can improve the net health outcome in patients with chronic liver disease.

POLICY STATEMENT

A single FibroSURE multianalyte assay may be considered **medically necessary** for the evaluation of individuals with chronic liver disease.

FibroSURE multianalyte assays are considered **not medically necessary** for monitoring of individuals with chronic liver disease.

Other multianalyte assays with algorithmic analyses are considered **not medically necessary** for the evaluation or monitoring of individuals with chronic liver disease.

Transient elastography (FibroScan) imaging may be considered **medically necessary** for the evaluation of individuals with chronic liver disease.

Transient elastography (FibroScan) imaging is considered **not medically necessary** for monitoring of individuals with chronic liver disease.

The use of other noninvasive imaging, including but not limited to magnetic resonance elastography, multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging, acoustic radiation force impulse imaging (eg, Acuson S2000), or real-time tissue elastography, is considered **not medically necessary** for the evaluation or monitoring of individuals with chronic liver disease.

POLICY GUIDELINES

Multianalyte assays with algorithmic analyses use the results from multiple assays of various types in an algorithmic analysis to determine and report a numeric score(s) or probability. The results of individual component assays are not reported separately.

BENEFIT APPLICATION

Experimental or investigational procedures, treatments, drugs, or devices are not covered (See General Exclusion Section of brochure).

Both FibroSURE and FIBROSpect are offered exclusively by reference laboratories, where the global charge will reflect the cost of the underlying laboratory analysis, and then, in addition, the charge associated with the use of the proprietary algorithm to analyze the data.

State or federal mandates (eg, Federal Employee Program) may dictate that certain U.S. Food and Drug Administration approved devices, drugs, or biologics may not be considered investigational, and thus these devices may be assessed only by their medical necessity.

FDA REGULATORY STATUS

In 2008 Acuson S2000™ Virtual Touch (Siemens AG), which provides ARFI imaging, was cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process (K072786).

In 2009, AIXPLORER Ultrasound System (SuperSonic Imagine), which provides shear wave elastography, was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process (K091970).

In 2010, Hitachi HI VISION™ Preirus™ Diagnostic Ultrasound Scantier (Hitachi Medical Systems America), which provides real-time tissue elastography, was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process (K093466).

In 2013, FibroScan (EchoSens), which uses transient elastography, was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process (K123806).

In June 2015, LiverMultiScan (Perspectum), which is a magnetic resonance diagnostic device software application, was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process (K143020).

In February 2017, ElastQ Imaging shear wave elastography (Royal Phillips) was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process (K163120).

In August 2021, ADVIA Centaur ELF™ test (Siemens Healthcare) was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 513(f)(2) De Novo review pathway (DEN190056). In 2018, the device had been granted a Breakthrough Device designation.

FDA product codes: IYO, LNH, QQB.

RATIONALE

Summary of Evidence

Multianalyte Serum Assays

For individuals who have chronic liver disease who receive FibroSURE serum panels, the evidence includes systematic reviews of more than 30 observational studies (>5000 patients). Relevant outcomes are test validity, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. FibroSURE has been studied in populations with viral hepatitis, nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), and alcoholic liver disease (ALD). There are established cutoffs, although they were not consistently used in validation studies. Given these limitations and the imperfect reference standard, it is difficult to interpret performance characteristics. However, for the purposes of deciding whether a patient has severe fibrosis or cirrhosis, FibroSURE results provide data sufficiently useful to determine therapy. Specifically, FibroSURE has been used as an alternative to biopsy to establish eligibility regarding the presence of fibrosis or cirrhosis in several randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that showed the efficacy of hepatitis C virus (HCV) treatments, which in turn demonstrated that the test can identify patients who would benefit from therapy. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have chronic liver disease who receive multianalyte serum assays for liver function assessment other than FibroSURE, the evidence includes a number of observational studies and systematic reviews of those studies. Relevant outcomes are test validity, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. Studies have frequently included varying cutoffs, some of which were standardized and others not validated. Cutoff thresholds have often been modified over time, may be specific to certain patient populations, and in some cases, guideline recommendations differ from cutoffs designated by manufacturers and those utilized in studies. A comparison of transient elastography to various serum-based tests found that the former was superior in detecting fibrosis, and a meta-analysis of 4 studies found higher multianalyte scores associated with an increased risk of mortality relative to lower scores, but the evidence is limited by the small number of included studies and high heterogeneity and imprecision for some estimates. Given these limitations and the imperfect reference standard, it is difficult to interpret performance characteristics. There is no direct

evidence that other multianalyte serum assays improve health outcomes; further, it is not possible to construct a chain of evidence for clinical utility due to the lack of sufficient evidence on clinical validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Noninvasive Imaging

For individuals who have chronic liver disease who receive transient elastography, the evidence includes many systematic reviews of more than 50 observational studies (>10,000 patients). Relevant outcomes are test validity, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. Transient elastography (FibroScan) has been studied in populations with viral hepatitis, NASH, and ALD. There are varying cutoffs for positivity. Failures of the test are not uncommon, particularly for those with high body mass index, but these failures often went undetected in analyses of the validation studies. Given these limitations and the imperfect reference standard, it can be difficult to interpret performance characteristics. However, for the purposes of deciding whether a patient has severe fibrosis or cirrhosis, the FibroScan results provide data sufficiently useful to determine therapy. In fact, FibroScan has been used as an alternative to biopsy to establish eligibility regarding the presence of fibrosis or cirrhosis in the participants of several RCTs. These trials showed the efficacy of HCV treatments, which in turn demonstrated that the test can identify patients who would benefit from therapy. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have chronic liver disease who receive multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), the evidence includes several prospective and retrospective observational studies. Multiparametric MRI (eg, LiverMultiScan) has been studied in mixed populations, including nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), viral hepatitis, and ALD. Quantitative MRI provides various measures to assess liver fat content, fibrosis and inflammation. Various cutoffs have been utilized for positivity. Given these limitations and the imperfect reference standard, it can be difficult to interpret performance characteristics. Otherwise, multiparametric MRI performed similarly to transient elastography, and fewer technical failures of multiparametric MRI were reported. The prognostic ability of quantitative MRI to predict liver-related clinical events has been evaluated in 2 studies. Both studies reported positive correlations, but the confidence intervals (CI) were wide. Larger cohorts with a longer follow-up time would be useful to further derive the prognostic characteristic of the test. Multiparametric MRI has been used to measure the presence of fibrosis or cirrhosis in the patients who have achieved biochemical remission after treatment in small prospective studies. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have chronic liver disease who receive noninvasive radiologic methods other than transient elastography for liver fibrosis measurement, the evidence includes systematic reviews of observational studies. Relevant outcomes are test validity, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. Other radiologic methods (eg, MRE, RTE, ARFI imaging) may have similar performance for detecting significant fibrosis or cirrhosis. Studies have frequently included varying cutoffs not prespecified or validated. Given these limitations and the imperfect reference standard, it is difficult to interpret performance characteristics. There is no direct evidence that other noninvasive radiologic methods improve health outcomes; further, it is not possible to construct a chain of evidence for clinical utility due to the lack of sufficient evidence on clinical validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in 'Supplemental Information' if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease

American Gastroenterological Association et al

In 2018, the practice guidelines on the diagnosis and management of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), developed by the American Gastroenterological Association (AGA), the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases, and the American College of Gastroenterology, stated that "NFS [NAFLD fibrosis score] or FIB-4 [Fibrosis-4] index are clinically useful tools for identifying NAFLD patients with a higher likelihood of having bridging fibrosis (stage 3) or cirrhosis (stage 4)."[95,] This guideline also cited vibration-controlled transient elastography (VCTE) and magnetic resonance elastography (MRE) as "clinically useful tools for identifying advanced fibrosis in patients with NAFLD."

A 2022 consensus-based clinical care pathway was published by the AGA on risk stratification and management of NAFLD, including some recommendations regarding the use of non-invasive testing for individuals with chronic liver disease[96,] Among individuals with increased risk of NAFLD or nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH)-related fibrosis (i.e., individuals with type-2 diabetes, ≥2 metabolic risk factors, or an incidental finding of hepatic steatosis or elevated aminotransferases), assessment with a nonproprietary fibrosis scoring system such as FIB-4 is recommended, although aspartate transaminase to platelet ratio index can be used in lieu of FIB-4 scoring. Depending on the fibrosis score, imaging-based testing for liver stiffness may be warranted with transient elastography (FibroScan), although bidimensional shear wave elastography or point shear wave elastography are also imaging options included in the clinical care pathway.

American Association of Clinical Endocrinology and American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases

A 2022 joint clinical practice guideline issued by the American Association of Clinical Endocrinology and American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases included the following recommendations on the use of noninvasive techniques for diagnosis of NAFLD with clinically significant fibrosis (stage F2 to F4)[97,]:

- Clinicians should use liver fibrosis prediction calculations to assess the risk of NAFLD with liver fibrosis. The preferred noninvasive initial test is the FIB-4 (Grade B, Level 2 evidence)
- High-risk individuals with indeterminate or high FIB-4 score for further workup with an transient elastography or enhanced liver fibrosis test, as available (Grade B, Level 2 evidence)
- Clinicians should prefer the use of transient elastography as best validated to identify advanced disease and predict liver-related outcomes. Alternative imaging approaches may be considered, including shear wave elastography (less well validated) and/or magnetic resonance elastography (most accurate but with a high cost and limited availability; best if ordered by liver specialist for selected cases) (Grade B, Level 2 evidence).

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

In 2016, the NICE published guidance on the assessment and management of NAFLD.[49,] The guidance did not reference elastography. The guidance recommended the enhanced liver fibrosis test to test for advanced liver fibrosis, utilizing a cutoff enhanced liver fibrosis score of 10.51.

American Gastroenterological Association Institute

In 2017, the American Gastroenterological Association Institute published guidelines on the role of elastography in chronic liver disease. The guidelines indicate that, in adults with NAFLD, VCTE has superior diagnostic sensitivity and specificity for diagnosing cirrhosis when compared to the aspartate aminotransferase platelet ratio index (APRI) or FIB-4 tests (very low quality of evidence).[98,] Moreover, the guidelines state that, in adults with NAFLD, magnetic resonance-guided elastography has little or no increased diagnostic accuracy for identifying cirrhosis compared with VCTE in patients who have cirrhosis, and has higher diagnostic accuracy than VCTE in patients who do not have cirrhosis (very low quality of evidence).

Hepatitis B and C Viruses

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

In 2017, the NICE published updated guidance on the management and treatment of patients with hepatitis B virus.[99,] The guidance recommends offering transient elastography as the initial test in adults diagnosed with chronic hepatitis B, to inform the antiviral treatment decision (Table 1).

Table 1. Antiviral Treatment Recommendations by Transient Elasticity Score

Transient Elasticity Score	Antiviral Treatment
>11 kPa	Offer antiviral treatment
6 to 10 kPa	Offer liver biopsy to confirm fibrosis level prior to offering antiviral treatment
<6 kPa plus abnormal ALT	Offer liver biopsy to confirm fibrosis level prior to offering antiviral treatment
<6 kPa plus normal ALT	Do not offer antiviral treatment

ALT: alanine aminotransferase; kPa: kilopascal.

American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases and Infectious Diseases Society of America

In 2020, the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases and Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines for testing, managing, and treating hepatitis C virus (HCV) recommended that, for counseling and pretreatment assessment purposes, the following should be completed:

"Evaluation for advanced fibrosis using noninvasive markers and/or elastography, and rarely liver biopsy, is recommended for all persons with HCV infection to facilitate decision making regarding HCV treatment strategy and determine the need for initiating additional measures for the management of cirrhosis (eg, hepatocellular carcinoma screening) Rating: Class I, Level A [evidence and/or general agreement; data derived from multiple randomized trials, or meta-analyses]"[100,]

The guidelines noted that there are several noninvasive tests to stage the degree of fibrosis in patients with HCV. Tests included indirect serum biomarkers, direct serum biomarkers, and VCTE. The guidelines asserted that no single method is recognized to have high accuracy alone and careful interpretation of these tests is required.

American Gastroenterological Association Institute

In 2017, guidelines published by the American College of Gastroenterology Institute on the role of elastography in chronic liver disease indicated that, in adults with chronic hepatitis B virus and chronic HCV, VCTE has superior diagnostic performance for diagnosing cirrhosis when compared to the APRI and FIB-4 tests (moderate quality of evidence for HCV, low quality of evidence for hepatitis B virus).[98,] In addition, the guidelines state that, in adults with HCV, magnetic resonance-guided elastography has little or no increased diagnostic accuracy for identifying cirrhosis compared with VCTE in patients who have cirrhosis, and has lower diagnostic accuracy than VCTE in patients who do not have cirrhosis (very low quality of evidence).

Chronic Liver Disease

American College of Radiology

In 2020, the American College of Radiology appropriateness criteria rated ultrasound shear wave elastography as an 8 (usually appropriate) for the diagnosis of liver fibrosis in patients with chronic liver disease.[101,] The criteria noted that high-quality data can be difficult to obtain in obese patients, and assessments of liver stiffness can be confounded by parenchyma, edema, inflammation, and cholestasis.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

A 2020 U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement for HCV screening notes that a diagnostic evaluation for fibrosis stage or cirrhosis with a noninvasive test reduces the risk for harm compared to a liver biopsy.[102,] This statement does not give preference to a specific noninvasive test.

Medicare National Coverage

There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

REFERENCES

1. Regev A, Berho M, Jeffers LJ, et al. Sampling error and intraobserver variation in liver biopsy in patients with chronic HCV infection. Am J Gastroenterol. Oct 2002; 97(10): 2614-8. PMID 12385448
2. Rockey DC, Caldwell SH, Goodman ZD, et al. Liver biopsy. Hepatology. Mar 2009; 49(3): 1017-44. PMID 19243014
3. Mehta SH, Lau B, Afdhal NH, et al. Exceeding the limits of liver histology markers. J Hepatol. Jan 2009; 50(1): 36-41. PMID 19012989
4. Trikalinos TA, Balion CM. Chapter 9: options for summarizing medical test performance in the absence of a "gold standard". J Gen Intern Med. Jun 2012; 27 Suppl 1: S67-75. PMID 22648677
5. Crossan C, Tsochatzis EA, Longworth L, et al. Cost-effectiveness of non-invasive methods for assessment and monitoring of liver fibrosis and cirrhosis in patients with chronic liver disease: systematic review and economic evaluation. Health Technol Assess. Jan 2015; 19(9): 1-409, v-vi. PMID 25633908
6. Houot M, Ngo Y, Munteanu M, et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: direct comparisons of biomarkers for the diagnosis of fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C and B. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. Jan 2016; 43(1): 16-29. PMID 26516104
7. Imbert-Bismut F, Ratziu V, Pieroni L, et al. Biochemical markers of liver fibrosis in patients with hepatitis C virus infection: a prospective study. Lancet. Apr 07 2001; 357(9262): 1069-75. PMID 11297957
8. Poynard T, McHutchison J, Manns M, et al. Biochemical surrogate markers of liver fibrosis and activity in a randomized trial of peginterferon alfa-2b and ribavirin. Hepatology. Aug 2003; 38(2): 481-92. PMID 12883493
9. Poynard T, Munteanu M, Imbert-Bismut F, et al. Prospective analysis of discordant results between biochemical markers and biopsy in patients with chronic hepatitis C. Clin Chem. Aug 2004; 50(8): 1344-55. PMID 15192028
10. Afdhal NH, Nunes D. Evaluation of liver fibrosis: a concise review. Am J Gastroenterol. Jun 2004; 99(6): 1160-74. PMID 15180741
11. Lichtinghagen R, Bahr MJ. Noninvasive diagnosis of fibrosis in chronic liver disease. Expert Rev Mol Diagn. Sep 2004; 4(5): 715-26. PMID 15347264
12. Afdhal N, Reddy KR, Nelson DR, et al. Ledipasvir and sofosbuvir for previously treated HCV genotype 1 infection. N Engl J Med. Apr 17 2014; 370(16): 1483-93. PMID 24725238
13. Afdhal N, Zeuzem S, Kwo P, et al. Ledipasvir and sofosbuvir for untreated HCV genotype 1 infection. N Engl J Med. May 15 2014; 370(20): 1889-98. PMID 24725239
14. Curry MP, O'Leary JG, Bzowej N, et al. Sofosbuvir and Velpatasvir for HCV in Patients with Decompensated Cirrhosis. N Engl J Med. Dec 31 2015; 373(27): 2618-28. PMID 26569658
15. Foster GR, Afdhal N, Roberts SK, et al. Sofosbuvir and Velpatasvir for HCV Genotype 2 and 3 Infection. N Engl J Med. Dec 31 2015; 373(27): 2608-17. PMID 26575258
16. Kowdley KV, Gordon SC, Reddy KR, et al. Ledipasvir and sofosbuvir for 8 or 12 weeks for chronic HCV without cirrhosis. N Engl J Med. May 15 2014; 370(20): 1879-88. PMID 24720702
17. Zeuzem S, Dusheiko GM, Salupere R, et al. Sofosbuvir and ribavirin in HCV genotypes 2 and 3. N Engl J Med. May 22 2014; 370(21): 1993-2001. PMID 24795201
18. Naveau S, Raynard B, Ratziu V, et al. Biomarkers for the prediction of liver fibrosis in patients with chronic alcoholic liver disease. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. Feb 2005; 3(2): 167-74. PMID 15704051
19. Ratziu V, Massard J, Charlotte F, et al. Diagnostic value of biochemical markers (FibroTest-FibroSURE) for the prediction of liver fibrosis in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. BMC Gastroenterol. Feb 14 2006; 6: 6. PMID 16503961
20. Lassailly G, Caiazzo R, Hollebecque A, et al. Validation of noninvasive biomarkers (FibroTest, SteatoTest, and NashTest) for prediction of liver injury in patients with morbid obesity. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol. Jun 2011; 23(6): 499-506. PMID 21499110
21. Poynard T, Ratziu V, Charlotte F, et al. Diagnostic value of biochemical markers (NashTest) for the prediction of non alcoholo steato hepatitis in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. BMC Gastroenterol. Nov 10 2006; 6: 34. PMID 17096854
22. Mohamadnejad M, Montazeri G, Fazlollahi A, et al. Noninvasive markers of liver fibrosis and inflammation in chronic hepatitis B-virus related liver disease. Am J Gastroenterol. Nov 2006; 101(11): 2537-45. PMID 17029616
23. Zeng MD, Lu LG, Mao YM, et al. Prediction of significant fibrosis in HBeAg-positive patients with chronic hepatitis B by a noninvasive model. Hepatology. Dec 2005; 42(6): 1437-45. PMID 16317674
24. Park MS, Kim BK, Cheong JY, et al. Discordance between liver biopsy and FibroTest in assessing liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis B. PLoS One. 2013; 8(2): e55759. PMID 23405210
25. Salkic NN, Jovanovic P, Hauser G, et al. FibroTest/Fibrosure for significant liver fibrosis and cirrhosis in chronic hepatitis B: a meta-analysis. Am J Gastroenterol. Jun 2014; 109(6): 796-809. PMID 24535095
26. Xu XY, Kong H, Song RX, et al. The effectiveness of noninvasive biomarkers to predict hepatitis B-related significant fibrosis and cirrhosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy. PLoS One. 2014; 9(6): e100182. PMID 24964038
27. Wai CT, Cheng CL, Wee A, et al. Non-invasive models for predicting histology in patients with chronic hepatitis B. Liver Int. Aug 2006; 26(6): 666-72. PMID 16842322

28. Patel K, Gordon SC, Jacobson I, et al. Evaluation of a panel of non-invasive serum markers to differentiate mild from moderate-to-advanced liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C patients. J Hepatol. Dec 2004; 41(6): 935-42. PMID 15582126
29. Mehta P, Ploutz-Snyder R, Nandi J, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of serum hyaluronic acid, FIBROSpect II, and YKL-40 for discriminating fibrosis stages in chronic hepatitis C. Am J Gastroenterol. Apr 2008; 103(4): 928-36. PMID 18371145
30. Patel K, Nelson DR, Rockey DC, et al. Correlation of FIBROSpect II with histologic and morphometric evaluation of liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. Feb 2008; 6(2): 242-7. PMID 18187364
31. Snyder N, Nguyen A, Gajula L, et al. The APRI may be enhanced by the use of the FIBROSpect II in the estimation of fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C. Clin Chim Acta. Jun 2007; 381(2): 119-23. PMID 17442291
32. Castellana M, Donghia R, Guerra V, et al. Fibrosis-4 Index vs Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Fibrosis Score in Identifying Advanced Fibrosis in Subjects With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Meta-Analysis. Am J Gastroenterol. Sep 01 2021; 116(9): 1833-1841. PMID 34160377
33. Mozes FE, Lee JA, Selvaraj EA, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of non-invasive tests for advanced fibrosis in patients with NAFLD: an individual patient data meta-analysis. Gut. May 2022; 71(5): 1006-1019. PMID 34001645
34. Sharma C, Cococcia S, Ellis N, et al. Systematic review: Accuracy of the enhanced liver fibrosis test for diagnosing advanced liver fibrosis and cirrhosis. J Gastroenterol Hepatol. Jul 2021; 36(7): 1788-1802. PMID 33668077
35. Wai CT, Greenson JK, Fontana RJ, et al. A simple noninvasive index can predict both significant fibrosis and cirrhosis in patients with chronic hepatitis C. Hepatology. Aug 2003; 38(2): 518-26. PMID 12883497
36. Giannini EG, Zaman A, Ceppa P, et al. A simple approach to noninvasively identifying significant fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C patients in clinical practice. J Clin Gastroenterol. Jul 2006; 40(6): 521-7. PMID 16825935
37. Bourliere M, Penaranda G, Renou C, et al. Validation and comparison of indexes for fibrosis and cirrhosis prediction in chronic hepatitis C patients: proposal for a pragmatic approach classification without liver biopsies. J Viral Hepat. Oct 2006; 13(10): 659-70. PMID 16970597
38. Zarski JP, Sturm N, Guechot J, et al. Comparison of nine blood tests and transient elastography for liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C: the ANRS HCEP-23 study. J Hepatol. Jan 2012; 56(1): 55-62. PMID 21781944
39. Sebastiani G, Halfon P, Castera L, et al. SAFE biopsy: a validated method for large-scale staging of liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C. Hepatology. Jun 2009; 49(6): 1821-7. PMID 19291784
40. Boursier J, de Ledinghen V, Zarski JP, et al. Comparison of eight diagnostic algorithms for liver fibrosis in hepatitis C: new algorithms are more precise and entirely noninvasive. Hepatology. Jan 2012; 55(1): 58-67. PMID 21898504
41. Rosenberg WM, Voelker M, Thiel R, et al. Serum markers detect the presence of liver fibrosis: a cohort study. Gastroenterology. Dec 2004; 127(6): 1704-13. PMID 15578508
42. Siemens Healthineers. Liver Fibrosis Assays: Enhanced Liver Fibrosis (ELF) Test. 2019. https://www.siemens-healthineers.com/laboratory-diagnostics/assays-by-diseases-conditions/liver-disease/elf-test. Accessed September 12, 2022.
43. Younossi ZM, Felix S, Jeffers T, et al. Performance of the Enhanced Liver Fibrosis Test to Estimate Advanced Fibrosis Among Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. JAMA Netw Open. Sep 01 2021; 4(9): e2123923. PMID 34529067
44. Sterling RK, Lissen E, Clumeck N, et al. Development of a simple noninvasive index to predict significant fibrosis in patients with HIV/HCV coinfection. Hepatology. Jun 2006; 43(6): 1317-25. PMID 16729309
45. Vallet-Pichard A, Mallet V, Nalpas B, et al. FIB-4: an inexpensive and accurate marker of fibrosis in HCV infection. comparison with liver biopsy and fibrotest. Hepatology. Jul 2007; 46(1): 32-6. PMID 17567829
46. Yan LT, Wang LL, Yao J, et al. Total bile acid-to-cholesterol ratio as a novel noninvasive marker for significant liver fibrosis and cirrhosis in patients with non-cholestatic chronic hepatitis B virus infection. Medicine (Baltimore). Feb 2020; 99(8): e19248. PMID 32080129
47. Cianci N, Subhani M, Hill T, et al. Prognostic non-invasive biomarkers for all-cause mortality in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. World J Hepatol. May 27 2022; 14(5): 1025-1037. PMID 35721296
48. Sanyal AJ, Harrison SA, Ratziu V, et al. The Natural History of Advanced Fibrosis Due to Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis: Data From the Simtuzumab Trials. Hepatology. Dec 2019; 70(6): 1913-1927. PMID 30993748
49. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD): assessment and management [NG49]. 2016; https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng49. Accessed September 13, 2022.
50. Brener S. Transient Elastography for Assessment of Liver Fibrosis and Steatosis: An Evidence-Based Analysis. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser. 2015; 15(18): 1-45. PMID 26664664
51. Bota S, Herkner H, Sporea I, et al. Meta-analysis: ARFI elastography versus transient elastography for the evaluation of liver fibrosis. Liver Int. Sep 2013; 33(8): 1138-47. PMID 23859217
52. Chon YE, Choi EH, Song KJ, et al. Performance of transient elastography for the staging of liver fibrosis in patients with chronic hepatitis B: a meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2012; 7(9): e44930. PMID 23049764
53. Friedrich-Rust M, Ong MF, Martens S, et al. Performance of transient elastography for the staging of liver fibrosis: a meta-analysis. Gastroenterology. Apr 2008; 134(4): 960-74. PMID 18395077
54. Kwok R, Tse YK, Wong GL, et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: non-invasive assessment of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease--the role of transient elastography and plasma cytokeratin-18 fragments. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. Feb 2014; 39(3): 254-69. PMID 24308774
55. Poynard T, Morra R, Ingiliz P, et al. Assessment of liver fibrosis: noninvasive means. Saudi J Gastroenterol. Oct 2008; 14(4): 163-73. PMID 19568532
56. Poynard T, Ngo Y, Munteanu M, et al. Noninvasive Markers of Hepatic Fibrosis in Chronic Hepatitis B. Curr Hepat Rep. Jun 2011; 10(2): 87-97. PMID 21654911
57. Shaheen AA, Wan AF, Myers RP. FibroTest and FibroScan for the prediction of hepatitis C-related fibrosis: a systematic review of diagnostic test accuracy. Am J Gastroenterol. Nov 2007; 102(11): 2589-600. PMID 17850410
58. Shi KQ, Tang JZ, Zhu XL, et al. Controlled attenuation parameter for the detection of steatosis severity in chronic liver disease: a meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy. J Gastroenterol Hepatol. Jun 2014; 29(6): 1149-58. PMID 24476011

59. Steadman R, Myers RP, Leggett L, et al. A health technology assessment of transient elastography in adult liver disease. Can J Gastroenterol. Mar 2013; 27(3): 149-58. PMID 23516679
60. Stebbing J, Farouk L, Panos G, et al. A meta-analysis of transient elastography for the detection of hepatic fibrosis. J Clin Gastroenterol. Mar 2010; 44(3): 214-9. PMID 19745758
61. Talwalkar JA, Kurtz DM, Schoenleber SJ, et al. Ultrasound-based transient elastography for the detection of hepatic fibrosis: systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. Oct 2007; 5(10): 1214-20. PMID 17916549
62. Tsochatzis EA, Gurusamy KS, Ntaoula S, et al. Elastography for the diagnosis of severity of fibrosis in chronic liver disease: a meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy. J Hepatol. Apr 2011; 54(4): 650-9. PMID 21146892
63. Tsochatzis EA, Crossan C, Longworth L, et al. Cost-effectiveness of noninvasive liver fibrosis tests for treatment decisions in patients with chronic hepatitis C. Hepatology. Sep 2014; 60(3): 832-43. PMID 25043847
64. Xu XY, Wang WS, Zhang QM, et al. Performance of common imaging techniques vs serum biomarkers in assessing fibrosis in patients with chronic hepatitis B: A systematic review and meta-analysis. World J Clin Cases. Aug 06 2019; 7(15): 2022-2037. PMID 31423434
65. Cai C, Song X, Chen X, et al. Transient Elastography in Alcoholic Liver Disease and Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis. Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2021; 2021: 8859338. PMID 33542909
66. Geng XX, Huang RG, Lin JM, et al. Transient elastography in clinical detection of liver cirrhosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Saudi J Gastroenterol. Jul-Aug 2016; 22(4): 294-303. PMID 27488324
67. Jiang W, Huang S, Teng H, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of point shear wave elastography and transient elastography for staging hepatic fibrosis in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a meta-analysis. BMJ Open. Aug 23 2018; 8(8): e021787. PMID 30139901
68. Li Y, Huang YS, Wang ZZ, et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: the diagnostic accuracy of transient elastography for the staging of liver fibrosis in patients with chronic hepatitis B. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. Feb 2016; 43(4): 458-69. PMID 26669632
69. Njei B, McCarty TR, Luk J, et al. Use of transient elastography in patients with HIV-HCV coinfection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Gastroenterol Hepatol. Oct 2016; 31(10): 1684-1693. PMID 26952020
70. Pavlov CS, Casazza G, Nikolova D, et al. Transient elastography for diagnosis of stages of hepatic fibrosis and cirrhosis in people with alcoholic liver disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Jan 22 2015; 1: CD010542. PMID 25612182
71. Xu X, Su Y, Song R, et al. Performance of transient elastography assessing fibrosis of single hepatitis B virus infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis of a diagnostic test. Hepatol Int. Oct 2015; 9(4): 558-66. PMID 26187292
72. Abdel Alem S, Elsharkawy A, El Akel W, et al. Liver stiffness measurements and FIB-4 are predictors of response to sofosbuvir-based treatment regimens in 7256 chronic HCV patients. Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. Oct 2019; 13(10): 1009-1016. PMID 31418303
73. Beyer C, Hutton C, Andersson A, et al. Comparison between magnetic resonance and ultrasound-derived indicators of hepatic steatosis in a pooled NAFLD cohort. PLoS One. 2021; 16(4): e0249491. PMID 33793651
74. Imajo K, Tetlow L, Dennis A, et al. Quantitative multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging can aid non-alcoholic steatohepatitis diagnosis in a Japanese cohort. World J Gastroenterol. Feb 21 2021; 27(7): 609-623. PMID 33642832
75. McDonald N, Eddowes PJ, Hodson J, et al. Multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging for quantitation of liver disease: a two-centre cross-sectional observational study. Sci Rep. Jun 15 2018; 8(1): 9189. PMID 29907829
76. Jayaswal ANA, Levick C, Selvaraj EA, et al. Prognostic value of multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging, transient elastography and blood-based fibrosis markers in patients with chronic liver disease. Liver Int. Dec 2020; 40(12): 3071-3082. PMID 32730664
77. Pavlides M, Banerjee R, Sellwood J, et al. Multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging predicts clinical outcomes in patients with chronic liver disease. J Hepatol. Feb 2016; 64(2): 308-315. PMID 26471505
78. Harrison SA, Dennis A, Fiore MM, et al. Utility and variability of three non-invasive liver fibrosis imaging modalities to evaluate efficacy of GR-MD-02 in subjects with NASH and bridging fibrosis during a phase-2 randomized clinical trial. PLoS One. 2018; 13(9): e0203054. PMID 30192782
79. Nakajima A, Eguchi Y, Yoneda M, et al. Randomised clinical trial: Pemafibrate, a novel selective peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor modulator (SPPARM), versus placebo in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. Nov 2021; 54(10): 1263-1277. PMID 34528723
80. Jayaswal ANA, Levick C, Collier J, et al. Liver cT 1 decreases following direct-acting antiviral therapy in patients with chronic hepatitis C virus. Abdom Radiol (NY). May 2021; 46(5): 1947-1957. PMID 33247768
81. Janowski K, Shumbayawonda E, Dennis A, et al. Multiparametric MRI as a Noninvasive Monitoring Tool for Children With Autoimmune Hepatitis. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr. Jan 01 2021; 72(1): 108-114. PMID 32925554
82. Arndtz K, Shumbayawonda E, Hodson J, et al. Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Autoimmune Hepatitis, and Prediction of Disease Activity. Hepatol Commun. Jun 2021; 5(6): 1009-1020. PMID 34141986
83. Bradley C, Scott RA, Cox E, et al. Short-term changes observed in multiparametric liver MRI following therapy with direct-acting antivirals in chronic hepatitis C virus patients. Eur Radiol. Jun 2019; 29(6): 3100-3107. PMID 30506214
84. Heneghan MA, Shumbayawonda E, Dennis A, et al. Quantitative magnetic resonance imaging to aid clinical decision making in autoimmune hepatitis. EClinicalMedicine. Apr 2022; 46: 101325. PMID 35340625
85. Guo Y, Parthasarathy S, Goyal P, et al. Magnetic resonance elastography and acoustic radiation force impulse for staging hepatic fibrosis: a meta-analysis. Abdom Imaging. Apr 2015; 40(4): 818-34. PMID 24711064
86. Hu X, Qiu L, Liu D, et al. Acoustic Radiation Force Impulse (ARFI) Elastography for non-invasive evaluation of hepatic fibrosis in chronic hepatitis B and C patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Med Ultrason. Jan 31 2017; 19(1): 23-31. PMID 28180193
87. Lin Y, Li H, Jin C, et al. The diagnostic accuracy of liver fibrosis in non-viral liver diseases using acoustic radiation force impulse elastography: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2020; 15(1): e0227358. PMID 31940395
88. Liu H, Fu J, Hong R, et al. Acoustic Radiation Force Impulse Elastography for the Non-Invasive Evaluation of Hepatic Fibrosis in Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Patients: A Systematic Review Meta-Analysis. PLoS One. 2015; 10(7): e0127782. PMID 26131717

89. Nierhoff J, Chavez Ortiz AA, Herrmann E, et al. The efficiency of acoustic radiation force impulse imaging for the staging of liver fibrosis: a meta-analysis. Eur Radiol. Nov 2013; 23(11): 3040-53. PMID 23801420
90. Singh S, Venkatesh SK, Wang Z, et al. Diagnostic performance of magnetic resonance elastography in staging liver fibrosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. Mar 2015; 13(3): 440-451.e6. PMID 25305349
91. Singh S, Venkatesh SK, Loomba R, et al. Magnetic resonance elastography for staging liver fibrosis in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a diagnostic accuracy systematic review and individual participant data pooled analysis. Eur Radiol. May 2016; 26(5): 1431-40. PMID 26314479
92. Xiao G, Zhu S, Xiao X, et al. Comparison of laboratory tests, ultrasound, or magnetic resonance elastography to detect fibrosis in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: A meta-analysis. Hepatology. Nov 2017; 66(5): 1486-1501. PMID 28586172
93. Kobayashi K, Nakao H, Nishiyama T, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of real-time tissue elastography for the staging of liver fibrosis: a meta-analysis. Eur Radiol. Jan 2015; 25(1): 230-8. PMID 25149296
94. Hong H, Li J, Jin Y, et al. Performance of real-time elastography for the staging of hepatic fibrosis: a meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2014; 9(12): e115702. PMID 25541695
95. Chalasani N, Younossi Z, Lavine JE, et al. The diagnosis and management of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Practice guidance from the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. Hepatology. Jan 2018; 67(1): 328-357. PMID 28714183
96. Kanwal F, Shubrook JH, Adams LA, et al. Clinical Care Pathway for the Risk Stratification and Management of Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. Gastroenterology. Nov 2021; 161(5): 1657-1669. PMID 34602251
97. Cusi K, Isaacs S, Barb D, et al. American Association of Clinical Endocrinology Clinical Practice Guideline for the Diagnosis and Management of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Primary Care and Endocrinology Clinical Settings: Co-Sponsored by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases (AASLD). Endocr Pract. May 2022; 28(5): 528-562. PMID 35569886
98. Singh S, Muir AJ, Dieterich DT, et al. American Gastroenterological Association Institute Technical Review on the Role of Elastography in Chronic Liver Diseases. Gastroenterology. May 2017; 152(6): 1544-1577. PMID 28442120
99. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Hepatitis B (chronic): diagnosis and management [CG165]. 2017; https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg165. Accessed September 12, 2022.
100. American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases, Infectious Diseases Society of America. HCV Guidance: Recommendations for Testing, Managing, and Treating Hepatitis C. Last updated March 12, 2022; https://www.hcvguidelines.org. Accessed September 12, 2022.
101. Bashir MR, Horowitz JM, Kamel IR, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria(R) Chronic Liver Disease. J Am Coll Radiol. May 2020; 17(5S): S70-S80. PMID 32370979
102. Owens DK, Davidson KW, Krist AH, et al. Screening for Hepatitis C Virus Infection in Adolescents and Adults: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. JAMA. Mar 10 2020; 323(10): 970-975. PMID 32119076

POLICY HISTORY - THIS POLICY WAS APPROVED BY THE FEP® PHARMACY AND MEDICAL POLICY COMMITTEE ACCORDING TO THE HISTORY BELOW:

Date	Action	Description
December 2023	New policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 12, 2022; references added. Minor editorial refinements to policy statements; intent unchanged. FEP new benefit, new policy.