HERC Coverage Guidance – Coronary Computed Tomography Angiography
Disposition of Public Comments

General Comments

Stakeholder	#	Comment	Disposition
ICER	1	We read with great interest your draft guidance on this topic, and we appreciate very much being one of the trusted sources you cite in the guidance. We realize that you often include verbatim text from other reviews in your guidance, but we wanted to call your attention to text from our review that might be misconstrued as coming from the HERC rather than our organization. Specifically, text on page 9 of your guidance reads "the original rating for comparative value was 'High', however, based primarily on evidence of earlier emergency department discharge. In light of these recent data on increased resource use following CCTA, we would recommend changing CCTA's comparative value rating to 'Reasonable/Comparable'." Some stakeholders might feel as though you are making a recommendation to change ICER's rating of comparative value, when in fact it was ICER itself that made the recommendation. You might consider clarifying this by putting a parenthetical next to word "we" indicating the source of the recommendation.	Thank you for your comment. The EbGS appreciates the importance of clarifying the source of recommendations. Change made to the document as suggested.