SelectHealth Medical Policies

Genetic Testing Policies

Table of Contents

Policy Title	Policy Number	Last Reviewed
Circulating Tumor Cell (CTC) Test for Metastic Cancers (Cellsearch)	401	01/14/23
Gene Expression Profiling for Monitoring Acute Rejection in Cardiac Transplant Patients (ALLOMAP)	357	12/06/23
Gene Expression Profiling: Cutaneous Melanomas	667	09/01/23
Gene Expression Profiling: Uveal Melanomas	680	03/08/24
Gene Expression Testing for Indeterminate Thyroid Nodule Biopsy	538	03/14/23
Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling	123	01/10/24
Genetic Testing for Prostate Cancer Prognosis	544	11/08/23
Genetic Testing: 5-Fluorouracil Testing in Cancer Patients	594	04/05/23
Genetic Testing: Age-Related Macular Degeneration	530	03/07/23
Genetic Testing: Apolipoprotein (APOE) Testing	339	02/14/23
Genetic Testing: *BRAF* Mutation Testing	434	03/01/23
Genetic Testing: Breast Cancer	664	07/01/23
Genetic Testing: Cardiomyopathy	665	12/06/23
Genetic Testing: Celiac Disease (Celiagene)	286	02/07/23
Genetic Testing: Cell-free Fetal DNA Testing	679	03/25/24
Genetic Testing: Cell-free Tumor DNA/Liquid Biopsy	581	01/17/23
Genetic Testing: Charcot Marie-Tooth Syndrome (Herediitiary Motor Sensory Neuropathy)	134	01/24/23
Genetic Testing: Comparative Genomic Hybridization (CGH)/Chromosomal Microarray (CMA)	297	02/14/23
Genetic Testing: Cystic Fibosis (CF)	289	08/07/23
Genetic Testing: Donor-Derived Cell-Free DNA for Monitoring of Rejection in Heart and Kidney Transplantation	671	01/22/24
Genetic Testing: Epilepsy	602	07/21/23
Genetic Testing: EsoGuard	678	02/19/24
Genetic Testing: Expanded Carrier Screening	452	08/16/23
Genetic Testing: FLT3 Mutation Analysis and WT1RQ-PCR for Acute Myelogenous Leukemia	314	02/14/23
Genetic Testing: Gene Expression Profiling in the Management of Breast Cancer	281	02/07/23

By accessing and/or downloading SelectHealth policies, you automatically agree to the Medical and Coding/ Reimbursement Policy Manual Terms and Conditions.

SelectHealth Medical Policies

Genetic Testing Policies

Table of Contents, continued

Policy Title	Policy Number	Last Reviewed
Genetic Testing: Genetic Mutation Analysis Utilizing Solid Tumor Tissue	570	01/17/23
Genetic Testing: Hearing Loss	666	07/01/23
Genetic Testing: Hereditary Hemorrhagic Telangiectasiia (HHO)	240	01/31/23
Genetic Testing: Heritable Thoracic and Abdominal Aneurysim and Dissection (TAAD) Related Disorders	453	12/06/23
Genetic Testing: Inheritable Colon Cancer	222	01/31/23
Genetic Testing: KRAS Mutation Testing	414	03/01/23
Genetic Testing: Lactose Intolerance	318	02/14/23
Genetic Testing: Leber's Hereditary Optic Neuropathy (LHON)	356	02/21/23
Genetic Testing: Long QT Syndrome	385	12/06/23
Genetic Testing: Methylenetetrahydrofolate Reductase (MTHFR) Polymorphisms in Cancer, Cardiovascular Disease, and Neural Tube Defects	426	03/01/23
Genetic Testing: Minimual Residual Disease (MRD) Assessment	673	7/21/23
Genetic Testing: Myloproliferative Neoplasms	668	11/08/23
Genetic Testing: *Notch3* Testing for Cerebral Autosomal Dominant Arteriopaythy with Subcortical Infarcts and Leukoencephalopathy (CADASIL)	353	02/14/23
Genetic Testing: Ovarian Cancer	676	12/13/23
Genetic Testing for Screening and Detection of Prostate Cancer	510	09/21/23
Genetic Testing: PCR for BCR-ABL in Chronic Myelogenous Leukemia (CML)	340	02/14/23
Genetic Testing: PTEN Mutation Analysis	438	03/14/23
Genetic Testing: RETT Syndrome	586	04/05/23
Genetic Testing: Septin9 (SEPT9) methylated DNA Detection for Colorectal Cancer Screening	521	03/14/23
Genetic Testing: Spinal Muscularatrophy	600	04/05/23
Genetic Testing: TP53 Mutation Analysis for B-Cell Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia (B-CLL)	328	02/14/23
Pharmacogenomic Testing for Drug Metabolism	590	04/26/23
Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS)/Whole Exome Sequencing (WES)	514	08/28/23

By accessing and/or downloading SelectHealth policies, you automatically agree to the Medical and Coding/ Reimbursement Policy Manual Terms and Conditions.

MEDICAL POLICY

CIRCULATING TUMOR CELL (CTC) TEST FOR METASTATIC CANCERS (CELLSEARCH)

Policy # 401

Implementation Date:	5/19/08
Review Dates:	6/11/09, 6/17/10, 8/16/11, 8/16/12, 8/15/13, 8/28/14, 8/20/15, 8/25/16, 8/17/17, 9/18/18, 8/8/19, 12/28/20, 11/18/21
Revision Dates:	8/22/17

Related Medical Policies:

#570 Genetic Testing: Molecular Profiling for Determining Therapy of Malignant Tumors

#581 Genetic Testing: Liquid Biopsy

Disclaimer:

1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Metastatic cancer is a cancer that has spread from its primary site (the part of the body in which it developed) to other parts of the body. If cells break away from a cancerous tumor, they can travel to other areas of the body. In patients with metastatic cancer, tumor cells may circulate in blood. These cells are called circulating tumor cells (CTCs).

The CellSearch test (Veridex LLC, Warren, NJ, a Johnson & Johnson company) is a blood test that captures and assesses CTCs to determine the prognosis of patients' various cancers. It has been FDA approved for assessment of patients with metastatic breast, colon, and/or prostate cancer. CellSearch is an automated method that identifies, counts, and characterizes epithelial-derived tumor cells circulating in peripheral blood by using CD45 markers (leukocyte marker); DAPI (nuclear marker); EpCam cytokeratin 8,18, and/or 19 (epithelial cell markers). The CellSearch test works by using antibodies that are joined to microscopic iron particles, called ferrofluid. These antibody/ferrofluid combinations attach very specifically to CTCs. Powerful magnets then "pull" the CTCs out of the blood sample. They are then stained with additional bio-molecules and chemicals so that they can be positively identified as CTCs.

The CellSearch test differs from the current standard of care because it may detect tumors or changes in tumors much earlier than traditional imaging (e.g., CT scans), and is not subject to the variation observed with other blood tests, called serum tumor markers. However, the clinical role of CTC testing has not been established in patients with metastatic cancers; its use has not been established in clinical guidelines either.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

SelectHealth does **NOT cover circulating tumor cell (CTC) test for metastatic cancers (CellSearch).*** The lack of evidence clarifying the role in the management of metastatic cancers meets the plan's definition of investigational/experimental.

*Coverage will be allowed only for instances in which this testing was performed and qualified for coverage per criteria outlined in Medical Policy #570.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

The literature evaluating the CellSearch System is focused primarily on its use in breast cancer. Twelve studies were identified for this indication. Many of these studies were funded by Immunicon, manufacturer of the technology underlying CellSearch. These studies universally conclude that circulating tumor cells isolated through immunomagnetic separation are a reliable prognostic indicator in metastatic breast cancer. An early prospective trial by Cristofanilli et al., for example, involved 177 women tested at U.S. cancer centers prior to initiating treatment for metastatic breast cancer and 345 women with nonmalignant breast diseases who served as controls. The first 102 breast cancer patients served as a training set to determine the CTC count that best predicted survival, which was subsequently validated in the remaining 75 patients. Of 177 patients, 87 (49%) had ≥ 5 circulating tumor cells per 7.5 ml of blood at baseline. These 87 patients had a significantly shorter median progression-free survival (approximately 2.7 months) and median overall survival (approximately 10.1 months; 95% confidence interval, 6.3 to 14.6) than did patients with < 5 circulating tumor cells per 7.5 ml of blood (median progression-free survival, approximately 7.0 months; overall survival; > 18 months). CTCs were detected in only 1% of 345 control subjects, none of whom had > 3 cells per 7.5 ml of blood.

In 2007, a retrospective analysis of 151 patients with metastatic breast cancer compared the prognostic significance of CTCs with clinical and laboratory measures of tumor burden and phenotypic subtype of disease. Of these, 32 were participants in the Cristofanilli, et al. study from 2004. The remaining 119 were a new cohort of patients who had CTCs measured before initiating therapy. In addition to CTCs, Swenerton score, cancer antigen 27−29 level, age (< 50 years vs. ≥ 50 years), hormone-receptor status and HER2 status, metastatic site, and type and line of therapy were measured as prognostic indicators. A multivariable Cox model revealed CTCs to be the strongest predictor of survival with ≥ 5 CTCs having 2.2 times the risk of death ($p = 0.003$).

These studies suggest that CellSearch is a reliable prognostic indicator of survival in metastatic breast cancer patients. However, there are insufficient data to conclude how measurement of CTCs through this or any other method would improve survival or change clinical management of the disease. There are also insufficient data comparing it with alternative techniques to conclude that it is a more reliable means of estimating prognosis. Finally, data are insufficient to determine whether CellSearch can be used to monitor response to treatment.

The use of CellSearch in early stage breast cancer is promising and may predict the use of appropriate adjuvant therapy. Wong et al. states: “A study involving detection of CTCs by semi-automated fluorescence-based microscopy after immuno-magnetic enrichment in women who have completed adjuvant chemotherapy for early breast cancer is ongoing and survival data is not available yet.” Even in patients with metastatic disease the use of CellSearch in a predictive fashion is encouraging, but Budd et al. states: “Our results have implications for both standard care and clinical research. More accurate determination of treatment effectiveness early in the course of therapy might spare patient toxicity from futile therapy and allow treatment to be changed to a more effective regimen. Whether such an early assessment of response results in an improved overall outcome or quality of life will need to be prospectively assessed in clinical trials designed to investigate this question.” CellSearch was also more

effective than standard radiological measures in evaluating progressive metastatic disease. The clinical utility of this finding has not been explored in prospective studies in treated patients.

The literature on use of CellSearch for prostate and colorectal cancers is insufficient to determine whether the technique is useful for these indications. The 2 studies evaluating CellSearch in colorectal surgery postoperatively did not show prognostic significance.

Billing/Coding Information

Not covered: Investigational/Experimental/Unproven for this indication

CPT CODES

81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure
86152	Cell enumeration using immunologic selection and identification in fluid specimen (eg, circulating tumor cells in blood);
86153	; physician interpretation and report, when required
86849	Unlisted immunology procedure

HCPCS CODES

G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Aguado J. Identification of circulating tumour cells in metastatic breast cancer with the CellSearch (TM) system. 2006. Agencia de Evaluacion de Tecnologias Sanitarias de Andalucia (AETSA). Available: http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/salud/contenidos/aetsa/pdf/Ficha%20CTCs%20ENG.pdf. Date Accessed: April 7, 2008.
2. Ahnen DJ. Clinical manifestations, diagnosis, and staging of colorectal cancer. 2007. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=gicancer/2111&selectedTitle=2~150&source=search_result. Date Accessed: March 6, 2008.
3. Allard WJ, Matera J, Miller MC, et al. "Tumor cells circulate in the peripheral blood of all major carcinomas but not in healthy subjects or patients with nonmalignant diseases." Clin Cancer Res 10.20 (2004): 6897-904.
4. American Cancer Society. Treatment by Stage of Colon Cancer. 2008. Available: http://www.cancer.org/docroot/CRI/content/CRI_2_4_4X_Treatment_by_Stage_of_Colon_Cancer_10.asp?sitearea=. Date Accessed: March 2008.
5. American Cancer Society. What are the key statistics for metastatic cancer? Available: http://www.cancer.org/docroot/CRI/content/CRI_2_4_1X_What_are_the_key_statistics_for_metastatic_cancer_67.asp?rnav=cri. Date Accessed: March 27, 2008.
6. Aral I, Hussain F, Aziz H, et al. Controversies in Prostate Cancer. 2006. EMedicine. Available: http://www.emedicine.com/med/TOPIC3536.HTM#section~metastatic_disease. Date Accessed: March 10, 2008.
7. Balic M, Dandachi N, Hofmann G, et al. "Comparison of two methods for enumerating circulating tumor cells in carcinoma patients." Cytometry B Clin Cytom 68.1 (2005): 25-30.
8. Budd GT, Cristofanilli M, Ellis MJ, et al. "Circulating tumor cells versus imaging--predicting overall survival in metastatic breast cancer." Clin Cancer Res 12.21 (2006): 6403-9.
9. Cohen SJ, Alpaugh RK, Gross S, et al. "Isolation and characterization of circulating tumor cells in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer." Clin Colorectal Cancer 6.2 (2006): 125-32.
10. Cristofanilli M, Broglio KR, Guarneri V, et al. "Circulating tumor cells in metastatic breast cancer: biologic staging beyond tumor burden." Clin Breast Cancer 7.6 (2007): 471-9.
11. Cristofanilli M, Budd GT, Ellis MJ, et al. "Circulating tumor cells, disease progression, and survival in metastatic breast cancer." N Engl J Med 351.8 (2004): 781-91.
12. Cristofanilli M, Hayes DF, Budd GT, et al. "Circulating tumor cells: a novel prognostic factor for newly diagnosed metastatic breast cancer." J Clin Oncol 23.7 (2005): 1420-30.
13. Cristofanilli M. "Circulating tumor cells, disease progression, and survival in metastatic breast cancer." Semin Oncol 33.3 Suppl 9 (2006): S9-14.
14. El-Deiry WS. Colon Cancer, Adenocarcinoma. 2006. EMedicine. Available: http://www.emedicine.com/med/TOPIC413.HTM. Date Accessed: March 8, 2008.
15. Food and Drug Administration. 510K Summary: CellSearchTM Circulating Tumor Cell Kit-Breast Cancer. 2004. Available: http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/PDF3/k031588.pdf. Date Accessed: March 10, 2008.
16. Food and Drug Administration. 510K Summary: CellSearchTM Circulating Tumor Cell Kit-Colorectal Cancer. 2007. Available: http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/pdf7/K071729.pdf. Date Accessed: March 5, 2008.
17. Gaforio JJ, Serrano MJ, Sanchez-Rovira P, et al. "Detection of breast cancer cells in the peripheral blood is positively correlated with estrogen-receptor status and predicts for poor prognosis." Int J Cancer 107.6 (2003): 984-90.
18. Hayes DF, Cristofanilli M, Budd GT, et al. "Circulating tumor cells at each follow-up time point during therapy of metastatic breast cancer patients predict progression-free and overall survival." Clin Cancer Res 12.14 Pt 1 (2006): 4218-24.
19. Hayes DF. General principles of management of metastatic breast cancer. 2008. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/online/content/topic.do?topicKey=breastcn/2474&selectedTitle=3~94&source=search_result#25. Date Accessed: March 27, 2008.
20. Jacobson BC, Moy B, Farraye FA. Surveillance after colorectal cancer resection. 2008. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=gicancer/18914&selectedTitle=3~150&source=search_result. Date Accessed: March 8, 2008.

Circulating Tumor Cell (CTC) Test for Metastic Cancers (Cellsearch®), continued

21. Johnson and Johnson. FDA Clears Advanced Test For Monitoring Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. 2007. Available: http://www.jnj.com/news/jnj_news/20071121_091351.htm. Date Accessed: March 6, 2008.
22. Lang JE, Mosalpuria K, Cristofanilli M, et al. "HER2 status predicts the presence of circulating tumor cells in patients with operable breast cancer." Breast Cancer Res Treat (2008).
23. Lobodasch K, Frohlich F, Rengsberger M, et al. "Quantification of circulating tumour cells for the monitoring of adjuvant therapy in breast cancer: an increase in cell number at completion of therapy is a predictor of early relapse." Breast 16.2 (2007): 211-8.
24. Makhoul I, Harvey H, Souba W, Makhoul H. Breast Cancer. 2006. EMedicine. Available: http://www.emedicine.com/med/TOPIC2808.HTM. Date Accessed: March 27, 2008.
25. Matzakos T, Lawrence S, Ahnen D. "Epidemiology and risk factors for colorectal cancer." UpToDate http://www.utdol.com/ (2005).
26. Moreno JG, Miller MC, Gross S, Allard WJ, Gomella LG, Terstappen LW. "Circulating tumor cells predict survival in patients with metastatic prostate cancer." Urology 65.4 (2005): 713-8.
27. Muller V, Stahmann N, Riethdorf S, et al. "Circulating tumor cells in breast cancer: correlation to bone marrow micrometastases, heterogeneous response to systemic therapy and low proliferative activity." Clin Cancer Res 11.10 (2005): 3678-85.
28. Nole F, Munzone E, Zorzino L, et al. "Variation of circulating tumor cell levels during treatment of metastatic breast cancer: prognostic and therapeutic implications." Ann Oncol (2007).
29. Racila E, Euhus D, Weiss AJ, et al. "Detection and characterization of carcinoma cells in the blood." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 95.8 (1998): 4589-94.
30. Riethdorf S, Fritsche H, Muller V, et al. "Detection of circulating tumor cells in peripheral blood of patients with metastatic breast cancer: a validation study of the CellSearch system." Clin Cancer Res 13.3 (2007): 920-8.
31. Ring AE, Zabaglo L, Ormerod MG, Smith IE, Dowsett M. "Detection of circulating epithelial cells in the blood of patients with breast cancer: comparison of three techniques." Br J Cancer 92.5 (2005): 906-12.
32. Sastre J, Maestro ML, Puente J, et al. "Circulating tumor cells in colorectal cancer: correlation with clinical and pathological variables." Ann Oncol (2008).
33. Shaffer DR, Leversha MA, Danila DC, et al. "Circulating tumor cell analysis in patients with progressive castration-resistant prostate cancer." Clin Cancer Res 13.7 (2007): 2023-9.
34. Terris MK, Rhee A, Qureshi SM. Prostate Cancer: Metastatic and Advanced Disease. 2008. EMedicine. Available: http://www.emedicine.com/MED/topic3197.htm. Date Accessed: March 10, 2008.
35. Theodorescu D, Krupski TL. Prostate Cancer: Biology, Diagnosis, Pathology, Staging, and Natural History. 2005. EMedicine. Available: http://www.emedicine.com/med/TOPIC3537.HTM. Date Accessed: March 10, 2008.
36. Veridex LLC. CellSearch System. 2007. Available: http://www.veridex.com/CellSearch/Products.aspx. Date Accessed: March 8, 2008.
37. Wong NS, Kahn HJ, Zhang L, et al. "Prognostic significance of circulating tumour cells enumerated after filtration enrichment in early and metastatic breast cancer patients." Breast Cancer Res Treat 99.1 (2006): 63-9.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENE EXPRESSION PROFILING FOR MONITORING ACUTE REJECTION IN CARDIAC TRANSPLANT PATIENTS (ALLOMAP)

Policy # 357

Implementation Date: 7/1/07
Review Dates: 6/19/08, 6/11/09, 8/16/11, 8/16/12, 8/15/13, 8/20/15, 8/25/16, 8/17/17, 7/20/18, 6/13/19, 2/21/23
Revision Dates: 11/10/08, 8/16/10, 8/28/14, 6/17/15, 7/17/15, 8/2/19, 7/1/23, 12/6/23

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the “Policy” section for more information.

Description

Cardiac transplantation is considered the definitive therapy for end-stage heart disease. Continuing advancements in organ procurement, surgical techniques, and immunosuppressive drugs have reduced mortality rates in the early post-transplant period. A common complication to arise post-transplantation is rejection of the donor heart. This may result in significant morbidity and mortality. The incidence of rejection peaks about one month after transplant and then rapidly declines. Biopsy evidence of rejection usually is present before other signs and symptoms of myocardial compromise, and cardiac rejection is often asymptomatic. Endomyocardial biopsy has been the standard of care for rejection monitoring and drug titration management. However, this is an invasive and imperfect measure of rejection that has risks for significant adverse events.

Less invasive indicators of early rejection (e.g., echocardiography) have been studied, but all have limited sensitivity and specificity compared to endomyocardial biopsy. One test, gene expression profiling of peripheral blood lymphocytes, attempts to quantify the relative levels of messenger RNA (mRNA) for large numbers of genes in specific cells or tissues. The goal is to measure differences in the level of translation (expression) of different genes and utilize patterns of differential gene expression in order to identify early changes in the immune system that correlate with rejection of the transplanted organ.

AlloMap is the only commercially available gene expression profile test currently available for heart transplant patients. The test identifies 11 genes that distinguish transplant rejection from quiescence (i.e., ISHLT grade 0). These genes are ITGA4 (associated with T-cell infiltration at the site of inflammation), PDCD1 (limits potential autoreactivity), PF4 and G6b (associated with rejection and expressed by platelets) MIR, WDR40A (erythrocytes), and SEMA7A (granulocytes) (expressed by immature lymphocytes and elevated in rejection), IL1R2, ITGAM, and FLT3 (expressed in monocytes; level of expression correlates with increasing steroid doses), RHOU (involved in modulation of cytoskeletal organization; undetermined role in rejection). The assay also measures expression levels of an additional nine “housekeeping” genes that serve as reference standards.

Reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT- PCR) is used to measure the relative expression of these 20 genes in peripheral blood mononuclear cells. Then, a proprietary algorithm is applied to the results to generate a score ranging from 0−40 and the corresponding 95% confidence interval. The value of the score is then used to predict the likelihood of rejection. The exact cut-point for low-risk of rejection varies depending on the time since the initial transplant.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic expression profiling for monitoring acute rejection in cardiac transplant patients using the AlloMap test in *limited circumstances*; and when specific criteria are met:

Criteria for coverage:

Criteria for coverage include meeting the criteria for the IMAGE trial, and after a physical and echocardiogram have been performed.

IMAGE Trial Guidelines:

1. Heart transplant recipients who are at least ≥ 55 days post-transplant
2. Age > 15 years
3. Stable outpatient being seen for routine monitoring of rejection. Stability is defined as absence of prior or current evidence of either severe cardiac allograft vasculopathy (CAV) or antibody-mediated rejection (AMR) with associated hemodynamic compromise
   - Severe CAV is defined as either
     - 50% left main stenosis;
     - ≥ 50% stenosis in ≥ 2 primary vessels (proximal 1/3 or middle 1/3 of the LAD or LCx, RCA to takeoff of PDA in right-dominant coronary circulations) or
     - Isolated branch stenosis of > 50% in all 3 systems (diagonal branches, obtuse marginal branches, distal 1/3 of LAD or LCx, PDA, PLB, and RCA to takeoff of PDA in non-dominant systems)
   - AMR with associated hemodynamic compromise is defined as AMR (defined according to local criteria) with either:
     - A left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤ 30% or at least 25% lower than the baseline value,
     - A cardiac index < 2 l/min/m2, or
     - The use of inotropic agents to support circulation
4. Left ventricular ejection fraction ≥ 45% by Echocardiography, Multiple Gated Acquisition (MUGA) scan, or ventriculography at study entry (baseline/enrollment study).
5. Testing being performed as part of an established post-transplant surveillance protocol*

Exclusion Criteria:

1. Any clinical signs of declining graft function:
   - Symptoms of congestive heart failure (CHF) at the enrollment visit
   - Signs of decompensated heart failure, including the development of a new S3 gallop at the enrollment visit
   - Elevated right heart pressures with diminished cardiac index < 2.2 L/min/m^2 that is new compared to a previous measurement within 6 months
   - Decrease in LVEF as measured by echocardiography: ≥ 25% compared to prior measurement within 6 months.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

2. Rejection therapy for biopsy-proven ISHLT Grade 3A or higher during the preceding 2 months
3. Major changes in immunosuppression therapy within previous 30 days (e.g., discontinuation of calcineurin inhibitors, switch from mycophenolate mofetil to sirolimus or vice versa)
4. Patient receiving hematopoietic growth factors (e.g., Neupogen, Epogen) currently or during the previous 30 days
5. Patients receiving ≥ 20 mg/day of prednisone equivalent corticosteroids
6. Patient enrolled in a trial requiring routine surveillance endomyocardial biopsies
7. Patient received transfusion within preceding 4 weeks
8. Patients with end-stage renal disease requiring some form of renal replacement therapy (hemodialysis or peritoneal dialysis)
9. Pregnancy
10. Age < 15 years

*Current Intermountain protocol based upon the study for which AlloMap® gained approval, listed the following biopsy frequency post-transplant.

1. 1st year post-tx:
   a. Monthly until month 7
   b. Q 6 weeks x2 (until month 10)
   c. Then at 1st year annual
2. 2nd year post-tx: Q 3 months
3. 3rd year post-tx: Q 4 months
4. 4th year post-tx: Q 6 months
5. 5th year: Once

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Three studies have been published that attempt to use gene expression profiling of blood samples to detect rejection in cardiac transplant patients. Schoels et al. in 2004 collected 58 blood samples from 44 patients. The blood samples included 32 with < ISHLT grade 2 rejection and 26 with ≥ ISHLT grade 2 rejections. The authors used rt-PCR to amplify 39 candidate genes selected for analysis based on their suspected association with transplant rejection. Discriminate analysis identified 5 gene products that discriminated between grade ≥ 2 rejection and grade < 2 rejection. The optimal cutoff led to a sensitivity of 82% and specificity of 84%; no cross-validation was reported.

Horowitz et al. biopsied 409 endomyocardial samples from 189 transplant patients, of which 81% showed no evidence of allograft rejection (ISHLT grades 0, 1A, or 1B) and 6% showed clinically significant

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

rejection (≥ grade 3A). Of these, blood samples from 7 patients with ≥ grade 3A rejection (rejection) and 7 patients with grade 0 or 1A rejection (controls). Using an Affymetrix microarray with 22,215 transcripts, the investigators initially identified 91 candidate gene products that differentiated between rejection and controls. Of these, 40 transcripts representing 30 unique gene products maximally differentiated between rejection and non-rejection. Validation of the 91 candidate gene markers involved 7 additional rejection patients who underwent augmented immunosuppressive resulting in resolution of rejection to ≤ grade 2. The change in these gene markers before and after therapy was consistent with a response to immunosuppressive therapy.

Deng et al. reported on the results of the CARGO study, which formed the basis of the AlloMap test. This study involved several phases that identified and validated candidate genes that discriminate between rejection and quiescence. The gene discovery phase used a custom microarray of 7,370 gene sequences to identify 97 candidate genes in 285 samples, 98 cardiac transplant patients. The investigators used rt-PCR in 145 samples (36 rejections; 109 quiescent samples) to further refine that number to 68 genes that distinguished between rejection and quiescent samples (ISHLT grade ≥ 3A vs. grade 0). A discriminate function equation yielded a group of 11 genes (5 from the gene discovery phase and 6 from the literature) that best distinguished between rejection and quiescence.

The primary validation involved 63 samples (63 patients not included in the first phases of the study). The secondary validation included these 63 samples (31 grade ≥ 3A; 32 grade 0) and an additional 184 samples, 30 of which were also used in the gene discovery phase. Using a prospectively defined score ≥ 20 as the rejection threshold, the test had a sensitivity of 84% (95% CI 66%−94%) and a specificity of 38% (95% CI 22%−56%). The secondary validation study yielded similar results (sensitivity 76%, specificity 41%). The authors also noted that time since transplant was highly correlated with AlloMap scores and suggested a cutoff of 28 at ≥ 6 months and 30 for ≥ 1-year post-transplant.

The authors also conducted a prevalence population study to determine the predictive value of test results in a population that more closely represented the distribution of patients likely to be encountered in clinical practice (the initial study phases over-sampled for rejection). This validation sample included samples from 166 patients ≥ 1-year post-transplant. These included 160 (56.9%) grade 0 samples, 68 (24.1%) grade 1A, 23 (8.1%) grade 1B, 21 (7.4%) grade 2, and 9 (3.2%) grade ≥ 3A, a distribution representative of the entire CARGO database. At a threshold of 30, the positive predictive value was 6.8% while the negative predictive value was 99.6%.

Evans et al. assessed economic implications of using the AlloMap test for monitoring cardiac transplant patients relative to endomyocardial biopsy. Their analysis examined the outpatient costs of biopsy and did not include costs for hospitalization and right heart catheterization. They estimated average reimbursement for biopsy to range from $3,581 and $4,140. Their analysis further assumed a roughly 60% reduction in the number of routine biopsies performed during the first-year post-transplant, replaced by AlloMap testing; 20% of AlloMap tests would be followed by a biopsy. In years 2−5 post-transplant, the number of routine biopsies per year is reduced by 80% with approximately 20% follow-up biopsies. The price of AlloMap testing was estimated at $2950. Using these parameters, Evans et al. assumed a per patient savings between $4,193 and $6,511 over 5 years. They estimated an annual savings to U.S. health insurers of approximately $12 million.

The last study by Yamani et al. evaluated the validity of AlloMap test results in patients with transplant vasculopathy. The authors found that patients with vasculopathy had higher AlloMap scores than control patients. The authors conclude that prospective studies are needed to determine the predictive capacity of the AlloMap test in identifying patients at risk for transplant vasculopathy without concomitant transplant rejection.

The primary weakness in this literature is a lack of prospective research to examine the predictive utility of the AlloMap test in clinical populations. The primary study of this test (Deng et al.) used multiple overlapping patient samples and suggests the test has poor positive predictive value in clinical populations. The negative predictive value is high (99.6%), though, it should be noted that if the test had classified all the samples in this study as negative, the negative predictive value would be 96.8%. In other words, because of the low prevalence of biopsy-proven rejection, a negative AlloMap test contributes only a small amount of negative predictive value to the evaluation.

A 2006 evaluation by the California Technology Assessment forum further noted that none of the 11 genes used for the AlloMap test match the genes identified by Horowitz et al. or Schoels et al., which

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

raises concerns about the ability to generalize this particular gene set to other cardiac transplant populations. Moreover, the time-dependent cutoffs proposed by the authors also require additional validation. Finally, the Yamani et al. study highlights the complexities of interpreting AlloMap findings in light of multiple clinical factors, the effect of which on AlloMap scores have not been adequately reported in the literature. At a minimum, a validation study in an independent population would increase confidence in the predictive utility of AlloMap test results. More informative, would be a prospective randomized controlled trial in which the utility of AlloMap and cardiac biopsy could be examined.

Due to the FDA approval of the AlloMap test a re-review of the literature was undertaken in October 2008. This review identified an ongoing prospective, randomized clinical trial (also multicenter, non-blinded), the Invasive Monitoring Attenuation Through Gene Expression (IMAGE) trial: "… designed to test the hypothesis that a primarily non-invasive rejection surveillance strategy utilizing GEP testing is not inferior to an invasive EMB-based strategy with respect to cardiac allograft dysfunction, rejection with hemodynamic compromise (HDC) and all-cause mortality."

All previous studies are retrospective, case-control studies. In this regard: "… the limitations of a case–control study design restricts the clinical and causal conclusions one can make." Mehra also states that: "… we call for validation [of AlloMap] within the context of randomized intervention trials that seek to study conventional surveillance vs. gene expression profiling–based patient management in the early time-period after transplantation. Additionally, Deng et al. state that: "… additional clinical experience is needed to establish the role of molecular testing for clinical event prediction and immunosuppression management."

Also, there have been additional publications reflecting the continued questions and concerns about the value and use of endomyocardial biopsies. Hamour et al. for example, suggests that the "frequency of such biopsies should be reevaluated in light of their low yield with current immunosuppression." These conclusions are supported by multiple other studies. The recent trend away from protocol-based EMBs, independent of the introduction of the AlloMap test, reflects the recognition that the benefits of the procedure have moved toward parity with its risks, especially after the first year.

A technology assessment performed in July 2010 identified a new article by Pham et al. presenting their data from the IMAGE trial. This was a prospective, randomized non-blinded study utilizing AlloMap in patients with a recent cardiac transplantation to assess rejection post-transplant (> 6 months). This study compares outcomes between the standard of care approach, endomyocardial biopsy and gene expression testing. Primary outcomes were defined as: 1) rejection with hemodynamic compromise; 2) graft dysfunction due to other causes; 3) death; or 4) retransplantation.

Statistical analysis required a 95% confidence interval to satisfy a non-inferiority position for gene-expression testing. Key aspects of the study showed primary outcomes were fewer in the genetic expression group, 14.5% vs. 15.3%, biopsy frequency was 0.5 vs. 3.0 per patient year in favor of the gene expression group and death from any cause was more frequent in the gene expression group, 6.3% vs. 5.5%. The authors concluded that gene expression testing decreases the complications and frequency of endomyocardial biopsy without jeopardizing risk of rejection or all-cause mortality. Their assumptions were tempered by numerous design concerns of the protocol and results of the study.

The study was biased; physicians could determine which patients could be enrolled. Only 20% of the initial candidates eventually became randomized. This raises the concern that the patient selection favored patients with less risk of rejection. This would favor the gene expression arm of the study due to AlloMap's high negative predictive value. The study also included patients with inherent low risk. The criteria for "low risk" were not fully described in the study, thus, making it difficult for physicians to determine how this test would be utilized in clinical situations.

Patients with antibody mediated rejection were excluded from the study, yet an estimated 15%−40% of transplant recipients will experience a form of antibody mediated rejection. How this influenced the outcome of the study is unclear.

The study only included patients 6 months post-transplant. The literature demonstrates the dramatic increase risk of cellular rejection in the first 6 months and the dramatic decrease in rejection after 24 months post-transplant. Endomyocardial biopsy which may detect rejection prior to physical or echocardiographic changes of rejection would still be required early post-transplant. Discouraging, is the result that of all the patients in the gene expression group who underwent an endomyocardial biopsy,

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

most had a biopsy done due to physical findings of echo findings (28/34) and not due to the genetic expression score. The use of AlloMap during the first 6 months would not help determine early rejection if used alone in the clinical assessment.

Rejection rates varied among the groups. Eighty-one discrete rejection episodes occurred. Fifty-nine percent of the rejections in the gene expression group were detected by overt heart failure on clinical exam or by echo. Only 18% of rejection episodes were detected by gene expression alone. This compared with the rate of 47% in the endomyocardial biopsy group who were asymptomatic. This observation illustrates not necessarily the non-inferior status for gene expression testing but raises the concern that studies are needed to address the current protocol for monitoring post-transplant patients. Treating only those with clinical or echocardiographic findings of worsening cardiac function should be treated. This raises the issue of overly aggressive treatment of rejection since those in the gene expression group undoubtedly had silent rejection but were not treated and yet did well without an increase in rejection.

In an editorial by Jarcho, he states: “This observation suggests that, even if rejection is not identified until graft dysfunction is present, the clinical outcomes may not be substantially worse than when rejection is detected early. Perhaps it is time to perform a randomized trial that compares a strategy for continuing endomyocardial biopsies indefinitely with that of discontinuing routine endomyocardial biopsies at some specified interval.”

Finally, the wide confidence interval allows for extreme statistical variability. The trials reduced power was reflected in a relatively wide confidence interval that does not exclude the possibility of a 33% decrease in primary event rates or a 68% increase among patients in the gene-profiling group. This troubling analysis raises serious questions about the reliability of AlloMap despite its 99.2% negative predictive value seen in the CARGO trial. The poor sensitivity of AlloMap is reflected in that 54% of patients who tested above the 34-value (positive test) had no evidence of rejection.

Several positive aspects of the IMAGE trial were the improved quality of life perceived by the patients enrolled in the gene expression group and the associated decrease in complications and costs due to the reduction in endomyocardial biopsies associated with the use of gene expression testing.

A review article by Lipshultz et al, published in 2014 covers the use of AlloMap in acute rejection monitoring. It stated that current practice entails use of the test in patients 15 years of age or older. This is also the age of use referred to in the International Society of Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) Guidelines from 2010 (Rogers et al., 2010) for use of Allomap. AlloMap scores in patients less than age 15 years remain to be validated.

A review of the literature in mid-2016 found one publication presenting the results of the CARGO II study on gene expression profiling (GEP) in cardiac rejection surveillance (Crespo-Leiro et al., 2016) to further clinically validate GEP. The results based on 938 biopsies continue to show high negative predictive value and low positive predictive value (due to the rarity of rejection) confirming previous studies.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES

0018M	Transplantation medicine (allograft rejection, renal), measurement of donor and third-party-induced CD154+T-cytotoxic memory cells, utilizing whole peripheral blood, algorithm reported as a rejection risk score
0055U	Cardiology (heart transplant), cell-free DNA, PCR assay of 96 DNA target sequences (94 single nucleotide polymorphism targets and two control targets), plasma
0087U	Cardiology (heart transplant), mRNA gene expression profiling by microarray of 1283 genes, transplant biopsy tissue, allograft rejection and injury algorithm reported as a probability score
0118U	Transplantation medicine, quantification of donor-derived cell-free DNA using whole genome next-generation sequencing, plasma, reported as percentage of donor-derived cell-free DNA in the total cell-free DNA

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Gene Expression Profiling for Monitoring Acute Rejection in Cardiac Transplant Patients (ALLOMAP), continued

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

81560 Transplantation medicine, measurement of donor and third party-induced CD154+T-cytotoxic memory cells

81595 Cardiology (heart transplant), mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time quantitative PCR of 20 genes (11 content and 9 housekeeping), utilizing subfraction of peripheral blood, algorithm reported as a rejection risk score

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. AlloMap Molecular Expression Testing. 510(k) Substantial Equivalence Determination Decision Summary Assay And Instrument Combination Template.
2. Avello, N, Molina, BD, Llorente, E, et al. (2007). N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide as a potential non-invasive marker of cardiac transplantation rejection. Ann Clin Biochem 44 Pt 2: 182-8.
3. Bernstein, D, Williams, GE, Eisen, H, et al. (2007). Gene expression profiling distinguishes a molecular signature for grade 1B mild acute cellular rejection in cardiac allograft recipients. J Heart Lung Transplant 26.12: 1270-80.
4. California Technology Assessment Forum. (2006) Gene-Expression Profiling for the Diagnosis of Heart Transplant Rejection. Available: http://www.ctaf.org/files/624_file_Gene_Expression_Profiling_for_the_Diagnosis_of_Heart_Transplant_Rejection.pdf. Date Accessed: June 29, 2010.
5. Costanzo, M. R., et al. (2010). "The International Society of Heart and Lung Transplantation Guidelines for the care of heart transplant recipients." J Heart Lung Transplant 29(8): 914-956.
6. Crespo-Leiro, M. G., J. Stypmann, U. Schulz, A. Zuckermann, P. Mohacsi, C. Bara, H. Ross, J. Parameshwar, M. Zakliczynski, R. Fiocchi, D. Hoefer, M. Colvin, M. C. Deng, P. Leprince, B. Elashoff, J. P. Yee and J. Vanhaecke (2016). "Clinical usefulness of gene-expression profile to rule out acute rejection after heart transplantation: CARGO II." Eur Heart J.
7. Deng MC, Eisen HJ, Mehra MR, et al. (2006). Noninvasive discrimination of rejection in cardiac allograft recipients using gene expression profiling. Am J Transplant 6.1: 150-60.
8. Dixon V, Macauley C, Burch M, Sebire NJ. (2007). Unsuspected rejection episodes on routine surveillance endomyocardial biopsy post-heart transplant in paediatric patients. Pediatr Transplant 11.3: 286-90.
9. Eisen, H, Jessup, ML. (2007) Acute cardiac allograft rejection: Diagnosis. V16.2. September 25, 2007. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/online/content/topic.do?topicKey=hrt_tran/3061&selectedTitle=1~150&source=search_result. Date Accessed: October 8, 2008.
10. Evans RW, Williams GE, Baron HM, et al. (2005). The economic implications of noninvasive molecular testing for cardiac allograft rejection." Am J Transplant 5.6: 1553-8.
11. Hamour, IM, Burke, MM, Bell, AD, et al. (2008). Limited utility of endomyocardial biopsy in the first year after heart transplantation. Transplantation 85.7: 969-74.
12. Horwitz PA, Tsai EJ, Putt ME, et al. (2004). Detection of cardiac allograft rejection and response to immunosuppressive therapy with peripheral blood gene expression. Circulation 110, 25: 3815-21.
13. Intermountain Medical Center. (2010) Heart Transplant Program. Intermountain Healthcare. Available: http://intermountainhealthcare.org/hospitals/imed/services/heartnew/programs/hearttransplant/Pages/Doctors.aspx#28957. Date Accessed: June 29, 2010,
14. Jarcho, JA. (2010). Fear of rejection--monitoring the heart-transplant recipient. N Engl J Med 362.20: 1932-3.
15. Kobashigawa, J., Patel, J., Babak, A., Kittleson, M., Chang, D., Czer, L. … Esmailian, F. (2015). Randomized Pilot Trial of Gene Expression Profiling Versus Heart Biopsy in the First Year After Heart Transplant Early Invasive Monitoring Attenuation Through Gene Expression Trial. Circ Heart Fail, 8:557−564. doi: 10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.114.001658
16. Kobashigawa, J., et al., Results of a Randomized Trial of Allomap vs Heart Biopsy in the 1st Year after Heart Transplant: Early Invasive Monitoring Attenuation through Gene Expression Trial. The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation, 2013. 32(4, Supplement): p. S203.
17. Levi DS, DeConde AS, Fishbein MC, et al. (2004). "The yield of surveillance endomyocardial biopsies as a screen for cellular rejection in pediatric heart transplant patients. Pediatr Transplant 8.1: 22-8.
18. Lipshultz, S. E., et al. (2014). "Issues in solid-organ transplantation in children: translational research from bench to bedside." Clinics (Sao Paulo) 69 Suppl 1: 55-72.
19. Marboe CC, Billingham M, Eisen H, et al. (2005). Nodular endocardial infiltrates (Quilty lesions) cause significant variability in diagnosis of ISHLT Grade 2 and 3A rejection in cardiac allograft recipients." J Heart Lung Transplant 24.7 Suppl: S219-26.
20. Mehra MR, Kobashigawa JA, Deng MC, et al. (2007). Transcriptional signals of T-cell and corticosteroid-sensitive genes are associated with future acute cellular rejection in cardiac allografts. J Heart Lung Transplant 26.12: 1255-63.
21. Mehra, MR, Kobashigawa, JA, Deng, MC, et al. (2008). Clinical implications and longitudinal alteration of peripheral blood transcriptional signals indicative of future cardiac allograft rejection. J Heart Lung Transplant 27.3: 297-301.
22. Morgun, A, Shulzhenko, N, Perez-Diez, A, et al. (2006). Molecular profiling improves diagnoses of rejection and infection in transplanted organs. Circ Res 98.12: e74-83.
23. Pham, MX, Teuteberg, JJ, Kfoury, AG, et al. (2010). Gene-expression profiling for rejection surveillance after cardiac transplantation. N Engl J Med 362.20: 1890-900.
24. Schoels M, Dengler TJ, Richter R, Meuer SC, Giese T. (2004). Detection of cardiac allograft rejection by real-time PCR analysis of circulating mononuclear cells. Clin Transplant 18.5: 513-7.
25. Starling RC, Pham M, Valantine H, et al. (2006). Molecular testing in the management of cardiac transplant recipients: initial clinical experience. J Heart Lung Transplant 25.12: 1389-95.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Gene Expression Profiling for Monitoring Acute Rejection in Cardiac Transplant Patients (ALLOMAP), continued

26. Wagner K, Oliver MC, Boyle GJ, et al. (200). Endomyocardial biopsy in pediatric heart transplant recipients: a useful exercise? (Analysis of 1,169 biopsies). Pediatr Transplant 4.3: 186-92.
27. XDx Inc. (2006) AlloMap Website. Available: http://www.allomap.com. Date Accessed: Jun 29, 2010.
28. XDx Inc. AlloMap Website. 2006. Available: http://www.allomap.com. Date Accessed: October 1, 2008.
29. Yamani MH, Taylor DO, Haire C, Smedira N, Starling RC. (2007). "Post-transplant ischemic injury is associated with up-regulated AlloMap gene expression. Clin Transplant 21.4: 523-5.
30. Yamani MH, Taylor DO, Rodriguez ER, et al. (2007). Transplant vasculopathy is associated with increased AlloMap gene expression score. J Heart Lung Transplant 26.4: 403-6.

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

GENE EXPRESSION PROFILING: CUTANEOUS MELANOMAS

Policy # 667
Implementation Date: 7/1/23
Review Dates:
Revision Dates: 9/1/23

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Cutaneous melanoma (CM) is a malignant tumor formed from pigment-producing cells called melanocytes. It is one of the most aggressive and fatal forms of skin malignancy. In the last decades, CM's incidence has gradually risen, with 351,880 new cases in 2015. Since the 1960s, its incidence has increased steadily, in 2019, with approximately 96,000 new cases. A greater understanding of early diagnosis and management of CM is urgently needed because of the high mortality rates due to metastatic melanoma. Timely detection of melanoma is crucial for successful treatment, but diagnosis with histopathology may also pose a significant challenge to this objective. Early diagnosis and management are essential and contribute to better survival rates of the patient. To better control this malignancy, such information is expected to be particularly useful in the early detection of possible metastatic lesions and the development of new therapeutic approaches.

Prognostic gene expression profiling (GEP) tests for cutaneous melanoma (CM) are not recommended in current guidelines, outside of a clinical trial. However, their use is becoming more prevalent, and some practitioners are using GEP tests to guide patient management. Thus, there is an urgent need to bridge this gap between test usage and clinical guideline recommendations by obtaining high-quality evidence to guide us toward best practice use of GEP testing in CM patients.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Select Health does not cover gene expression profiling (e.g., myPath Melanoma, DecisionDX-Melanoma) or non-invasive gene expression tests (e.g., DermTech Pigmented Lesion Assay) in the evaluation of cutaneous melanomas, as there is a lack of evidence available in peer-reviewed literature which would support either sufficient sensitivity or specificity that would be necessary in defining a valid clinical role. This meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0089U Oncology (melanoma), gene expression profiling by RTqPCR, PRAME and LINC00518, superficial collection using adhesive patch(es)

0090U Oncology (cutaneous melanoma) mRNA gene expression profiling by RT-PCR of 23 genes (14 content and 9 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin embedded tissue, algorithm reported as a categorical result (i.e., benign, indeterminate, or malignant)

0314U Oncology (cutaneous melanoma), mRNA gene expression profiling by RT-PCR of 35 genes (32 content and 3 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue, algorithm reported as a categorical result (i.e., benign, intermediate, malignant)

0315U Oncology (cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma), mRNA gene expression profiling by RT-PCR of 40 genes (34 content and 6 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue, algorithm reported as a categorical risk result (i.e., Class 1, Class 2A, Class 2B)

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

81529 Oncology (cutaneous melanoma), mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 31 genes (28 content and 3 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin embedded tissue, algorithm reported as recurrence risk, including likelihood of sentinel lymph node metastasis; Decision Dx

81599 Unlisted multianalyte assay with algorithmic analysis

84999 Unlisted chemistry procedure

Key References

1. Grossman, D., et al. Prognostic gene expression profiling in melanoma: necessary steps to incorporate into clinical practice. *Melanoma Manag*. 2019 Dec; 6(4): MMT32. doi: 10.2217/mmt-2019-0016
2. Naik, P. P. Cutaneous Malignant Melanoma: A Review of Early Diagnosis and Management. *World J Oncol*. 2021 Feb; 12(1): 7–19. doi: 10.14740/wjon1349
3. NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2023, Melanoma: Cutaneous.
4. Ontario Health (Quality). Pigmented Lesion Assay for Suspected Melanoma Lesions: A Health Technology Assessment. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser. 2021 Jun 4;21(5):1-81. PMID: 34188732; PMCID: PMC8196402.
5. Swetter, S.M., Tsao, H., Bichakjian, C.K., Curiel-Lewandrowski C., Elder, D.E., Gershenwald, J.E. ... Lamina, T. Guidelines of care for the management of primary cutaneous melanoma. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2019 Jan;80(1): 208-250.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Gene Expression Profiling: Cutaneous Melanomas, **continued**

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENE EXPRESSION PROFILING: UVEAL MELANOMAS

Policy # 680

Implementation Date: 3/8/24
Review Dates:
Revision Dates:

Related Medical Policies:
#667: Gene Expression Profiling: Cutaneous Melanomas

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Uveal melanoma is a rare malignancy that arises from melanocytes within the uveal tract of the eye, which includes the iris, ciliary body, and choroid. Uveal melanoma comprises approximately 85 percent of all ocular melanomas, with the remainder arising mostly from the conjunctiva (5 percent) or other sites (10 percent).

The molecular pathogenesis of uveal melanoma is distinct from that of cutaneous melanoma and other melanoma subtypes, including conjunctival melanoma. Uveal melanomas usually harbor specific initiating mutations in GNAQ, GNA11, or other members of the G protein alpha subunit signaling pathway, as well as secondary driver mutations with prognostic significance in genes such as BAP1, SF3B1, and EIF1AX.

Patients with metastatic uveal melanoma should have their tumors assessed using next generation sequencing (NGS) or gene expression profiling. While molecular alterations that are targetable for treatment are limited in uveal melanoma, some alterations may offer insights into prognosis as well as clinical trial options.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when recommended by a genetic counselor, medical geneticist, or other provider with recognized expertise in this area; and
2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

Select Health considers gene expression profiling for patients with a diagnosis of primary, localized uveal melanoma to be medically necessary; one test per diagnosis.

SELECT HEALTH ADVANTAGE (MEDICARE/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage,

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SELECT HEALTH COMMUNITY CARE (MEDICAID)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

Covered when the above criteria are met

81552 Oncology (uveal melanoma), mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time RTPCR of 15 genes (12 content and 3 housekeeping), utilizing fine needle aspirate or formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as risk of metastasis

Key References

1. Carvajal, R. D., & Harbour, J. W. Metastatic uveal melanoma. *UpToDate*. Last updated: Nov 03, 2023.

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENE EXPRESSION TESTING FOR INDETERMINATE THYROID NODULE BIOPSY

Policy # 538

Implementation Date:	8/13/13
Review Dates:	10/15/15, 10/20/16, 12/19/18, 10/15/20, 11/18/21, 9/12/22, 3/14/23
Revision Dates:	10/13/14, 1/30/17, 1/25/18, 2/28/18, 8/7/18, 1/29/21, 10/24/22, 7/1/23

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

A thyroid nodule is an abnormal structure that is anatomically distinct from the surrounding thyroid parenchyma. Thyroid nodules can be visible or palpable when they are big enough or superficially located; however, most nodules are found incidentally on an imaging study performed for a different purpose. Nodules may be single or multiple and may occur with or without symptoms of thyroid hormone excess or deficiency. Most thyroid nodules are benign, but they may be malignant in 5% to 15% of cases. The primary objective of the evaluation of a thyroid nodule is to determine whether the nodule is benign or malignant; the secondary objective is to determine whether the nodule is associated with thyroid dysfunction.

The prevalence of thyroid nodules varies depending on the population studied and is estimated at 2% to 6% with palpation, 19% to 35% with ultrasonography and 8% to 65% at autopsy. Nodules are found up to six times more often in women, based on clinical examination, with smaller differences when imaging is used. The rates of malignancy in nodules are higher in men.

Ruling out malignancy in thyroid nodules historically depended on thyroid resection and histopathological evaluation until fine needle aspiration (FNA) biopsy was introduced into the United States in the 1970s. Thyroid FNA biopsy identified most thyroid nodules as benign, obviating the need for surgery in over half of the patients. However, 15%−30% of thyroid FNAs yields an indeterminate cytological interpretation that leads to surgical biopsy, even though most of these biopsied nodules prove to be benign. These indeterminate nodules harbor an approximate 24% risk of malignancy; too high to ignore but driving surgery where most nodules are benign. FNA is the preferred technique for obtaining thyroid follicular cells from thyroid nodules in the office setting. Cytopathologic examination of these cells provides the best information available, short of surgical excision, to assess whether a nodule is benign or malignant.

Several genetic testing panels, also known as molecular markers, have been developed to improve diagnosis of thyroid FNA. These include the Afirma Gene Sequencing Classifier (GSC) test (Veracyte, Inc., South San Francisco, CA) and the ThyroSeq Gene Classifier (GC) test (Sonic Healthcare, USA), which tests have been developed and can be run on the FNA sample in order to predict which cytologically indeterminate thyroid nodules are benign and to potentially avoid surgery on these nodules. These tests assess PAX8-PPARγ translocation, PPARγ-$CREB_3L_2$ fusions, RAS mutations, $LGALS_3$ expression, BRAF mutations, RET-PTC rearrangements, $PCSK_2$ $CCDN_2$ and PLAB expression and TFF_3 expression among other abnormalities have all been associated with thyroid cancer with varying degrees of evidence; in recent years the positive predictive value (PPV) and specificity for these tests has increased substantially.

The Afirma Thyroid FNA Analysis combines specialized cytopathology (if requested) and the novel Afirma GSC Physicians submit to Veracyte thyroid nodule FNA samples collected in a single patient visit. Alternatively, an FNA sample is submitted for GSC alone only after a local cytopathologist has made a diagnosis of a Bethesda 3 or 4 nodule. Then, a thyroid cytopathology specialist at Thyroid Cytopathology Partners (TCP), an independent partner of Veracyte, performs cytopathology assessment of a thyroid

nodule FNA sample under the microscope. If the cytopathology diagnosis is benign or malignant, the analysis is complete. Only when TCP's cytopathology diagnosis is indeterminate (a recent study showed TCP's indeterminate rate to be 16%) is the proprietary Afirma GSC performed.

ThyroSeq GC is also based on next-generation sequencing of DNA and RNA. However, it is expanded to analyze 112 genes, providing information on > 12,000 mutation hotspots and > 120 gene fusion types. The test detects 4 classes of genetic alterations: mutations (SNVs, indels); gene fusions; gene expression alterations; and copy number variations (CNVs). The test utilizes a proprietary genomic classifier (GC) based on the algorithmic analysis of all detected genetic alterations to report the test result as positive or negative.

ThyraMIR and ThyGenX were developed in-house by Interpace Diagnostics, Inc. and are performed in a laboratory regulated by and certified under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments. ThyraMIR is a PCR-based micro-RNA (miRNA) expression classifier which evaluates the expression of 10 miRNA genes. ThyGenX performs targeted next-generation sequencing (NGS) analysis to identify over 100 genetic alterations within 5 thyroid cancer-relevant genes. The test combination has been designed to both rule out malignancy as well as confirm it, if present.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic testing for indeterminate thyroid nodule biopsy using the Afirma GSC test, ThyroSeq GC, or ThyGeNEXT/ThyraMIR, when criteria are met:

A. One fine needle aspiration (FNA) of the thyroid nodule interpreted as meeting one of the Bethesda guidelines (either III or IV) listed below*****

**Bethesda Guidelines:*

I. Nondiagnostic

II. Benign – This includes macrofollicular or adenomatoid/hyperplastic nodules, colloid adenomas, nodular goiter, and Hashimoto's thyroiditis

III. Follicular lesion or atypia of undetermined significance (FLUS or AUS) – This includes lesions with atypical cells, or mixed macro- and microfollicular nodules

IV. Follicular neoplasm – This includes microfollicular nodules, including Hürthle cell lesions

V. Suspicious for malignancy

VI. Malignant

SelectHealth does NOT cover other genetic testing for indeterminate thyroid biopsies/fine needle aspirates as current evidence is inadequate to reach conclusions on the clinical and statistical validity of these tests; these tests meet the plan's definition of investigational/experimental.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Thyroid cancer is most found on routine physical examination as a palpable thyroid nodule. A fine-needle aspiration (FNA) biopsy is usually performed to rule out malignancy. In some cases, the nodules are not clearly benign or malignant based on FNA results alone. Those patients with cytologically indeterminate nodules are often referred for diagnostic surgery, though, most of these nodules turn out to be benign. The 2013 guidelines from the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) state that: "Molecular diagnostics ... using molecular classifiers may be useful in the evaluation of FNA samples that are indeterminate." Several tests have been developed to reduce the incidence of nondiagnostic biopsy results to better guide surgical decision making. The bulk of the literature focuses on the Veracyte, Afirma test. The literature on the other genetic tests used in the evaluation of indeterminate thyroid biopsies is inadequate to draw conclusions regarding the clinical validity and clinical utility of these tests.

Afirma: No approval by the FDA is required for the Afirma analysis, as it was developed in-house by Veracyte, Inc. All tests are performed by Veracyte in their laboratory which is certified under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments.

A single study has examined the analytical validity of the Afirma analysis. Chudova and colleagues (2010) reported on the development process and performance validation of the GEC. Microarray data was generated from 178 thyroid tissue specimens representing the 8 most common types of benign and malignant lesions. Messenger RNA transcripts were used to develop a molecular classifier. After testing of the final test set, the sensitivity was determined to be 100%, and the specificity at 73.3%, to yield a negative predictive value (NPV) of 96%.

Clinical validity of the GEC was evaluated by Alexander et al. (2012) in a multicenter study of independently and prospectively collected thyroid FNA specimens. Of 3,789 samples, 265 were classified as indeterminate, had an adequate specimen for analysis, and had results of a histopathological examination, and were included in the analysis. 142 genes were used in the main GEC, which would classify the FNA samples as benign or suspicious. Of the 265 indeterminate specimens, 85 were classified as malignant after evaluation of thyroid tissue. Of these 85 specimens, 78 were correctly classified as suspicious by the Afirma® analysis for a sensitivity of 92%. There were therefore 7 incorrectly classified malignancies. Of the 180 nonmalignant samples, 93 were correctly classified as benign by the GEC for a specificity of 52%. For the entire set of test samples, the positive predictive value (PPV) and NPV was reported at 47% and 93%, respectively.

A single study by Duick et al., in 2012 has documented the impact of the Afirma FNA analysis on the management of patients with indeterminate thyroid nodules. In a retrospective, multicenter study, the researchers evaluated data from endocrinology practices that ordered the Afirma analysis for which the result was benign for at least three patients. A total of 51 endocrinologists from 21 centers reported data on a total of 368 patients. Physicians reported on their management decisions for each patient. According to the survey, surgery was performed in 28 patients with a benign GEC result; the reasons most often given for surgery was nodule size, a nodule causing symptoms of pressure, and a rapidly growing nodule. Hemithyroidectomy was performed in 19 and total thyroidectomy was recommended in 8. The percentage

of patients who were operated on (7.4%) represented a significant decrease from the previously reported rate of diagnostic surgery (74%).

ThyraMIR and ThyGenX: The tests were developed in-house by Interpace Diagnostics, Inc. and are performed in a laboratory regulated by and certified under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments. No approval by the FDA is required.

In terms of analytic validity, the methodologies used in these tests are reliable, well-known, and reproducible. ThyraMIR is a PCR-based micro-RNA (miRNA) expression classifier which evaluates the expression of 10 miRNA genes. ThyGenX performs targeted next-generation sequencing (NGS) analysis to identify over 100 genetic alterations within 5 thyroid cancer-relevant genes. The test combination has been designed to both rule out malignancy as well as confirm it, if present.

Clinical validity has been studied prospectively using a high number of samples in multiple settings. In a recent study by Labourier et al. in 2015, 638 FNA and surgical specimens were tested for 17 validated gene alterations. The molecular results were compared to surgical histopathology to determine the diagnostic accuracy. miRNA testing correctly identified 64% of malignant cases and 98% of benign cases, Negative predictive value was reported at 94%. The authors reported that the rate of avoidable diagnostic surgeries was reduced by 69%. In another study by Beaudenon et al., 2014, in a prospective, multicenter, double-blind study, 769 FNAs were evaluated. Based on the high rate of cancer detection when present, the authors concluded that the use of molecular testing decreases the rate of two-stage thyroidectomy surgeries.

Clinical utility specific to this testing has not been established and relies on the general acceptance of molecular genomic testing in avoiding unnecessary surgeries and reducing the need for two-stage surgeries.

ThyroSeq: The ThyroSeq test was developed by researchers at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center. The available evidence for this test is not as decisive as that for the other commercially available tests, but the methodology used is established, and known to be reproducible. There is adequate validation that ThyroSeq can accurately identify point mutations in the genes and fusions in an FNA sample, facilitating treatment decisions in patients with indeterminate thyroid FNA biopsies. The latest version (ThyroSeq GC) offers detection of more than 1,000 cancer “hotspots” (single nucleotide polymorphisms, or SNPs) on 14 thyroid cancer-related genes and 42 fusion genes known to occur in thyroid cancer. In a validation study of 143 consecutive FNA samples with indeterminate diagnosis of follicular neoplasm or suspicious for follicular neoplasm, the test resulted in 104 benign nodules and 39 malignant nodules, which correlated with surgical pathology results for a 90% sensitivity, 83% positive predictive value, and negative predictive value of 96%.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0018U	Oncology (thyroid), microRNA profiling by RT-PCR of 10 microRNA sequences, utilizing fine needle aspirate, algorithm reported as a positive or negative result for moderate to high risk of malignancy
0026U	Oncology (thyroid), DNA and mRNA of 112 genes, next-generation sequencing, fine needle aspirate of thyroid nodule, algorithmic analysis reported as a categorical result ("Positive, high probability of malignancy" or "Negative, low probability of malignancy")
0204U	Oncology (thyroid), mRNA, gene expression analysis of 593 genes (including BRAF, RAS, RET, PAX8, and NTRK) for sequence variants and rearrangements, utilizing fine needle aspirate, reported as detected or not detected
0245U	Oncology (thyroid), mutation analysis of 10 genes and 37 RNA fusions and expression of 4 mRNA markers using next-generation sequencing, fine needle aspirate, report includes associated risk of malignancy expressed as a percentage
0287U	Oncology (thyroid), DNA and mRNA, next-generation sequencing analysis of 112 genes, fine needle aspirate or formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue, algorithmic prediction of cancer recurrence, reported as a categorical risk result (low, intermediate, high)

0362U	Oncology (papillary thyroid cancer), gene-expression profiling via targeted hybrid capture–enrichment RNA sequencing of 82 content genes and 10 housekeeping genes, formalin-fixed paraffin embedded (FFPE) tissue, algorithm reported as one of three molecular subtypes
81345	TERT (telomerase reverse transcriptase) (eg, thyroid carcinoma, glioblastoma multiforme) gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (eg, promoter region)
81445	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, 5-50 genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, MET, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed; DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure
81546	Oncology (thyroid), mRNA, gene expression analysis of 10,196 genes, utilizing fine needle aspirate, algorithm reported as a categorical result (eg, benign or suspicious)

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1 Agretti, P, Ferrarini, E, Rago, T, et al. (2012). MicroRNA expression profile helps to distinguish benign nodules from papillary thyroid carcinomas starting from cells of fine-needle aspiration. Eur J Endocrinol 167.3: 393-400.
2. Ali, SZM, Fish, SAM, Lanman, RM, et al. (2013). Use of the Afirma(R) Gene Expression Classifier for Preoperative Identification of Benign Thyroid Nodules with Indeterminate Fine Needle Aspiration Cytopathology. PLoS Curr 5.
3. Alexander, EK, Kennedy, GC, Baloch, ZW, et al. (2012). Preoperative diagnosis of benign thyroid nodules with indeterminate cytology. N Engl J Med 367.8: 705-15.
4. American Thyroid Association Guidelines Taskforce on Thyroid, N, Differentiated Thyroid, C, Cooper, DS, et al. (2009). Revised American Thyroid Association management guidelines for patients with thyroid nodules and differentiated thyroid cancer. Thyroid 19.11: 1167-214.
5. Aschebrook-Kilfoy, B, Schechter, RB, Shih, YC, et al. (2013). The Clinical and Economic Burden of a Sustained Increase in Thyroid Cancer Incidence. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.
6. Cerutti, JM. (2011). Employing genetic markers to improve diagnosis of thyroid tumor fine needle biopsy. Curr Genomics 12.8: 589-96.
7. Chen et al. The Role of the ThyroSeq v3 Molecular Test in the Surgical Management of Thyroid Nodules in the Canadian Public Health Care Setting Thyroid. Sep 2020.1280-1287.
8. Davies, L. and G. Randolph (2014). "Evidence-based evaluation of the thyroid nodule." Otolaryngol Clin North Am 47(4): 461-474.
9. Duick, DS, Klopper, J, Diggans, JC, et al. (2012). The Impact of Benign Gene Expression Classifier Test Results on the Endocrinologist-Patient Decision to Operate on Patients with Thyroid Nodules with Indeterminate FNA Cytopathology. Thyroid.
10. Endo et al. Use of Molecular Diagnostic Tests in Thyroid Nodules with Hurthle Cell-Dominant Cytology. Thyroid 2020, Vol 00. doi: 10.1089/thy.2020.0021
11. Ganly, I., et al., Integrated Genomic Analysis of Hurthle Cell Cancer Reveals Oncogenic Drivers, Recurrent Mitochondrial Mutations, and Unique Chromosomal Landscapes. Cancer Cell, 2018. 34(2): p. 256-270.e5.
12. Gharib, H, Papini, E, Paschke, R, et al. (2010). American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, Associazione Medici Endocrinologi, and European Thyroid Association Medical guidelines for clinical practice for the diagnosis and management of thyroid nodules: executive summary of recommendations. Endocr Pract 16.3: 468-75.
13. Gopal, R.K., et al., Widespread Chromosomal Losses and Mitochondrial DNA Alterations as Genetic Drivers in Hurthle Cell Carcinoma. Cancer Cell, 2018. 34(2): p. 242-255.e5.
14. Gilfillan, CP. (2010). Review of the genetics of thyroid tumours: diagnostic and prognostic implications. ANZ J Surg 80.1-2: 33-40.
15. Hao et al. Identification of Hürthle cell cancers: solving a clinical challenge with genomic sequencing and a trio of machine learning algorithms BMC Systems Biology 2019, 13(Suppl 2):27 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12918-019-0693-z
16. Hegedus, L. (2004). Clinical practice. The thyroid nodule. N Engl J Med 351.17: 1764-71.
17. Hila Benjamin, MSc; Temima Schnitzer-Perlman, MSc; Alexander Shtabsky, MD, PhD; Christopher J. VandenBussche, MD; Syed Z. Ali, MD; Zdenek Kolar, MD, PhD; Fabio Pagni, MD; Rosetta Genomics Group; Dganit Bar, PhD; and Eti Meiri, PhD Analytical Validity of a MicroRNA-Based Assay for Diagnosing Indeterminate Thyroid FNA Smears From Routinely Prepared Cytology Slides. Cancer Cytopathol 2016; 124:711–21.
18. Hodak, SP, Rosenthal, DS, erican Thyroid Association Clinical Affairs, C. (2013). Information for clinicians: commercially available molecular diagnosis testing in the evaluation of thyroid nodule fine-needle aspiration specimens. Thyroid 23.2: 131-4.
19. Jameson, JL. (2012). Minimizing unnecessary surgery for thyroid nodules. N Engl J Med 367.8: 765-7.

20. Jeffrey F. Krane, MD, et al. Afirma Xpression Atlas for Thyroid Nodules and Thyroid Cancer Metastases: Insights to Inform Clinical Decision-Making from a Fine-Needle Aspiration Sample. Cancer Cytopathology July 2020.
21. Kloos, RT, Reynolds, JD, Walsh, PS, et al. (2013). Does addition of BRAF V600E mutation testing modify sensitivity or specificity of the Afirma Gene Expression Classifier in cytologically indeterminate thyroid nodules? J Clin Endocrinol Metab 98.4: E761-8.
22. Labourier, E., Shifrin, A., Busseniers, A.E., et al (2015). Molecular testing for miRNA, mRNA and DNA on fine needle aspiration improves the preoperative diagnosis of thyroid nodules with indeterminate cytology. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism [E-Pub] doi: 10.1210/jc.2015-1158.
23. Livhits MJ, Zhu CY, Kuo EJ, Nguyen DT, Kim J, Tseng CH, Leung AM, … Levin M, ML. *Beckett Effectiveness of Molecular Testing Techniques for Diagnosis of Indeterminate Thyroid Nodules: A Randomized Clinical Trial.* JAMA Oncol. 2021 Jan 1;7(1):70-77. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2020.5935. PMID: 33300952
24. Lee, K. H., et al. (2014). "Atypia of undetermined significance in thyroid fine-needle aspiration cytology: prediction of malignancy by US and comparison of methods for further management." Ann Surg Oncol 21(7): 2326-2331.
25. Lee, L., et al. (2014). "Cost-effectiveness of molecular testing for thyroid nodules with atypia of undetermined significance cytology." J Clin Endocrinol Metab 99(8): 2674-2682.
26. Li, H, Robinson, KA, Anton, B, et al. (2011). Cost-effectiveness of a novel molecular test for cytologically indeterminate thyroid nodules. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 96.11: E1719-26.
27. Liebertpub.com. (2018). 2015 American Thyroid Association Management Guidelines for Adult Patients with Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer: The American Thyroid Association Guidelines Task Force on Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer I Thyroid. [online] Available at: https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/thy.2015.0020 [Accessed 21 May 2018].
28. Lithwick-Yanai G, et al. J Clin Pathol 2016;0:1–8. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2016-204089
29. Livhits MJ, Zhu CY, Kuo EJ, Nguyen DT, Kim J, Tseng CH, Leung AM, Rao J, Levin M, Douek ML, Beckett KR, Cheung DS, Gofnung YA, Smooke-Praw S, Yeh MW. Effectiveness of Molecular Testing Techniques for Diagnosis of Indeterminate Thyroid Nodules: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Oncol. 2021 Jan 1;7(1):70-77. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2020.5935. PMID: 33300952; PMCID: PMC7729582.
30. Mekel, M, Nucera, C, Hodin, RA, et al. (2010). Surgical implications of B-RafV600E mutation in fine-needle aspiration of thyroid nodules. Am J Surg 200.1: 136-43.
31. Nasr, C. (2011) Thyroid nodule. August 30, 2011. Elsevier. Available: https://www.clinicalkey.com/#!/ContentPlayerCtrl/doPlayContent/21-s2.0-1014753/{"scope":"all","query":"Thyroid Nodules"}. Date Accessed: July 11, 2013.
32. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in OncologyTM. Thyroid Carcinoma. v.1.2017. [cited 05/21/2018]; Available from: http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/thyroid.pdf
33. Network, NCC. (2013) Thyroid Carcinoma. Available: NCCN.org. Date Accessed: July 26, 2013.
34. Nikiforov, Y.E., Carty, S.E., Chlosea, S.I. et al (2014) Highly accurate diagnosis of cancer in thyroid nodules with follicular neoplasm/suspicious for a follicular neoplasm cytology by ThyroSeq v.2 next-generation sequencing assay. Cancer 120, 3627-34.
35. Nikiforova, M.N., Wald, A.I., Roy, S. et al (2013) Targeted next-generation sequencing panel (ThyroSeq) for detection of mutations in thyroid cancer. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism 98, E1852-60.
36. Nikiforova, et al. Analytical performance of the ThyroSeq v3 genomic classifier for cancer diagnosis in thyroid nodules. Cancer. 2018;124(8):1682.
37. Nishino M, Mateo R, Kilim H, Feldman A, Elliott A, Shen C, Hasselgren PO, Wang H, Hartzband P, Hennessey JV. Repeat Fine Needle Aspiration Cytology Refines the Selection of Thyroid Nodules for Afirma Gene Expression Classifier Testing. Thyroid. 2021 Aug;31(8):1253-1263. doi: 10.1089/thy.2020.0969. Epub 2021 Jun 22. PMID: 33813868; PMCID: PMC8377518.
38. Patel et al. Performance of a Genomic Sequencing Classifier for the Preoperative Diagnosis of Cytologically Indeterminate Thyroid Nodules JAMA Surgery March 2018.
39. Sarah Pearlstein,1 Arash H. Lahouti,2 Elana Opher,2 Yuri E. Nikiforov,3 and Daniel B. Kuriloff4,5Thyroseq V3 Molecular Profiling for Tailoring the Surgical Management of Hürthle Cell Neoplasms Case Reports in Endocrinology 16 Jul 2018.
40. Steward DL, Carty SE, Sippel RS, et al. Performance of a Multigene Genomic Classifier in Thyroid Nodules with Indeterminate Cytology: A Prospective Blinded Multicenter Study. JAMA Oncol. 2019;5(2):204–212. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2018.4616
41. Walsh, PS, Wilde, JI, Tom, EY, et al. (2012). Analytical performance verification of a molecular diagnostic for cytology-indeterminate thyroid nodules. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 97.12: E2297-306.
42. Ward, LS, Kloos, RT. (2013). Molecular markers in the diagnosis of thyroid nodules. Arq Bras Endocrinol Metabol 57.2: 89-97.
43. Veracyte. (2013) Afirma Thyroid FNA Analysis. Veracyte. Available: http://www.veracyte.com/afirma/Overview/. Date Accessed: July 11, 2013.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

Gene Expression Testing for Indeterminate Thyroid Nodule Biopsy, **continued**

”Intermountain Healthcare” and its accompanying logo, the marks of “SelectHealth” and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENE THERAPY, TESTING, AND COUNSELING

Policy # 123
Implementation Date: 7/98
Review Dates: 1/4/00, 2/27/01, 8/27/02, 1/03, 10/23/03, 11/18/04, 12/15/05, 12/20/07, 12/18/08, 11/29/12, 10/24/13, 10/23/14, 10/15/15, 10/20/16, 4/23/18, 6/20/19, 6/2/20, 5/31/21, 5/19/22, 1/31/23, 6/13/23
Revision Dates: 3/8/04, 9/14/06, 6/25/07, 12/17/09, 10/21/10, 10/12/11, 6/7/17, 6/5/18, 12/5/18, 6/26/23, 8/18/23, 10/6/23, 11/27/23, 1/10/24

Related Medical Policies:
#83 Molecular Genetic Testing Guidelines

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Gene Therapy

Gene therapy or gene-based therapies are any treatments which try to replace a portion of a person's DNA code with material from an external source with the purpose of correcting a genetic defect related to a specific disease or to treat a specific condition. The external DNA can be in the form of intact genes, portions of genes, or the building blocks of genes-nucleic acids.

Genetic Testing

Genetic testing is the analysis, for clinical purposes, of human genetic material (i.e., DNA, RNA, and chromosomes), proteins, and metabolites to detect abnormalities related to an inheritable disorder or trait. There are 6 categories of genetic testing: diagnostic, predictive (for disease assessment), predictive/presymptomatic, prenatal, newborn, preimplantation, and carrier testing (gender analysis).

Genetic Counseling

Genetic Counseling is a communication process, which deals with the human problems associated with the occurrence, or the risk of occurrence, of a genetic disorder in a family. This process involves an interaction with appropriately trained health professionals (geneticists and genetic counselors) to help the individual or family:

- Comprehend the medical facts, including the diagnosis, the probable course of the disorder, and the available management
- Appreciate the way heredity contributes to the disorder, and the risk of recurrence in specified relatives
- Understand the options for dealing with risk of recurrence
- Choose the course of action which seems appropriate to them in view of their risk and their family goals and act in accordance with that decision, and
- Make the best possible adjustment to the disorder in an affected family member and/or to the risk of recurrence of that disorder

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

I. Select Health covers gene therapy (gene-based therapy) when the P&T committee AND the Chief Medical Officer (CMO) determine that the proposed gene therapy will affect clinical outcome.

Select Health covers genetic testing as follows:

A. Genetic Testing for Inherited Disease:
   1. Genetic testing to establish a diagnosis or susceptibility for an inherited disease may be **medically necessary** when all the following criteria are met:
      i. Diagnostic results from physical examination, pedigree analysis, and conventional testing are inconclusive and a definitive diagnosis is uncertain.
      ii. The natural history of the disease is associated with significant disability and or mortality in affected individuals.
         a. Confirmation of the pathogenic variant(s) is expected to directly impact clinical management (predictive, diagnostic, surveillance, or therapeutic) of the individual in a substantial way.
      iii. The clinical utility of all requested genes and gene mutations must be established (including the genes and gene mutations in a panel test, as applicable). The clinical record must document:
         a. How test results will guide decisions regarding: disease treatment, prevention, or management, such as averting treatment for other possible diagnosis; and that the test being performed is the most appropriate according to currently accepted literature or guidelines
      iv. Not performed as part of a research study or population prevalence study.
      iv. Any multi-gene panel should be as focused as reasonably possible.

OR

B. Genetic Testing Not Related to Inherited Conditions:
   1. Genetic testing for indications *other than* determining risk or establishing a diagnosis for a genetically inherited disease (e.g., genetic expression analysis in breast cancer) may be considered **medically necessary** when all the following criteria are met:
      i. Diagnostic results from physical examination, pedigree analysis, and conventional testing are inconclusive and a definitive diagnosis is uncertain.
      ii. The clinical utility of all requested genes and gene mutations must be established (including all genes and gene mutations in a panel test, as applicable). The clinical records must document:
         a. How test results will guide decisions regarding: disease treatment, prevention, or management, such as averting treatment for other possible diagnosis; and that the test

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

being performed is the most appropriate according to currently accepted literature or guidelines

OR

C. If there is a known pathogenetic familial variant, then genetic testing is allowed for that variant.

II. Preimplantation genetic testing

Preimplantation genetic testing is considered medically necessary when the embryo(s) is at increased risk of a recognized inherited conditions based on all the following:

1. The medical condition being tested would result in significant morbidity and/or mortality
2. The condition is known to result from a single gene (PGT-M) abnormality, or from structural changes of a parents' chromosome (PGT-SR)
3. Biological parents meet one of the following criteria:
   a) Both parents are known carriers of an autosomal recessive disease; or
   b) At least one parent is a known carrier of an autosomal dominant, sex-linked, or mitochondrial condition; or
   c) At least one parent is a carrier of a balanced structural chromosome rearrangement.

Select Health does NOT cover preimplantation genetic testing for aneuploidy (PGT-A) separately, due to a lack of sufficient evidence supporting efficacy of this testing; this meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

Select Health does NOT cover genetic testing under the following circumstances:

- Home genetic test
- Other genetic test for population screening

Select Health considers situations in which a duplicative germline test was performed for the same genetic content as a previous test to be not medically necessary.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

"A genetic test is the analysis of human DNA, RNA, chromosomes, proteins, or certain metabolites in order to detect alterations related to heritable disorder. This can be accomplished by directly examining the DNA or RNA that makes up the gene (direct testing), looking at markers co-inherited with a disease-causing gene (linkage testing), assaying certain metabolites (biochemical testing), or examining the

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

chromosomes (cytogenetic testing)." Genetic tests are conducted for various purposes, including predicting disease risk, newborn screening, determining clinical management, identifying carriers, and establishing prenatal or clinical diagnoses or prognoses in an individual, families, or populations.

General Categories of Genetic Tests

Diagnostic Genetic Testing: Occurs in a symptomatic patient with a clinical presentation in association with or without a family history that leads the clinician to suspect a genetic disorder. Test results may confirm the suspected diagnosis, provide prognostic information, and assist in care management decisions, including treatment, preventative care recommendations, and condition specific surveillance.

Predictive Genetic Testing for Disease Assessment: Occurs in a patient with or without symptoms which would indicate a high probability of a genetic mutation; this test should be prognostic and assist in care management decisions including treatment, preventive care recommendations and condition-specific surveillance.

Prenatal Genetic Testing: A diagnostic test of the fetus to predict disease.

Population Genetic Screening applies to testing individuals without regard to the family history or phenotypic expression of a genetic disease, which may include newborn screening, maternal serum screening, or screening as specific ethnic population.

Newborn Screening: May include genetic and metabolic testing for early, presymptomatic detection, when diagnosed and treated, and prevents possibly irreversible health consequences.

Preimplantation Testing: Preimplantation genetic testing is a technique used to identify genetic defects in embryos created through in vitro fertilization (IVF) before pregnancy. Preimplantation genetic diagnosis (PGD) refers specifically to when one or both genetic parents have a known genetic abnormality and testing is performed on an embryo to determine if it also carries a genetic abnormality. In contrast, preimplantation genetic screening (PGS) refers to techniques where embryos from presumed chromosomally normal genetic parents are screened for aneuploidy.

Carrier Genetic Testing: Used to evaluate the potential of transmission of genetic mutations in asymptomatic, disease-free individuals; this includes testing parents in the preconception or prenatal periods to assess risk of having a child with a genetic disorder in a planned or ongoing pregnancy.

The Wilson and Jungner classic screening criteria offer some useful information and guidelines which may be beneficial in determining genetic testing of children.

Wilson and Jungner classic screening criteria:

1. The condition sought should be an important health problem.

2. There should be an accepted treatment for patients with recognized disease.

3. Facilities for diagnosis and treatment should be available.

4. There should be a recognizable latent or early symptomatic stage.

5. There should be a suitable test or examination.

6. The test should be acceptable to the population.

7. The natural history of the condition, including development from latent to declared disease, should be adequately understood.

8. There should be an agreed policy on whom to treat as patients.

9. The cost of case finding (including diagnosis and treatment of patients diagnosed) should be economically balanced in relation to possible expenditure on medical care as a whole.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

10. Case finding should be a continuing process and not a "once and for all" project.

Billing/Coding Information
Covered: ONLY for the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES

0032U COMT (catechol-O-methyltransferase) (drug metabolism) gene analysis, c.472G>A (rs4680) variant

0232U CSTB (cystatin B) (eg, progressive myoclonic epilepsy type 1A, Unverricht-Lundborg disease), full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat (STR) expansions, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions

0234U MECP2 (methyl CpG binding protein 2) (eg, Rett syndrome), full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions

0235U PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome), full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions

0236U SMN1 (survival of motor neuron 1, telomeric) and SMN2 (survival of motor neuron 2, centromeric) (eg, spinal muscular atrophy) full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, duplications and deletions, and mobile element insertions

0238U Oncology (Lynch syndrome), genomic DNA sequence analysis of MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, PMS2, and EPCAM, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions

0244U Oncology (solid organ), DNA, comprehensive genomic profiling, 257 genes, interrogation for single-nucleotide variants, insertions/deletions, copy number alterations, gene rearrangements, tumor-mutational burden and microsatellite instability, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin embedded tumor tissue

0254U Reproductive medicine (preimplantation genetic assessment), analysis of 24 chromosomes using embryonic DNA genomic sequence analysis for aneuploidy, and a mitochondrial DNA score in euploid embryos, results reported as normal (euploidy), monosomy, trisomy, or partial deletion/duplication, mosaicism, and segmental aneuploidy, per embryo tested

81105 –81112 HPA genotyping code range

81170-81383 Gene Analysis: Tier 1 Procedures

81228 Cytogenomic (genome-wide) analysis for constitutional chromosomal abnormalities; interrogation of genomic regions for copy number variants, comparative genomic hybridization [CGH] microarray analysis

81229 Cytogenomic (genome-wide) analysis for constitutional chromosomal abnormalities; interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) variants, comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) microarray analysis

81349 Cytogenomic (genome-wide) analysis for constitutional chromosomal abnormalities; interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and loss-of-heterozygosity variants, low-pass sequencing analysis

81400 Molecular pathology procedure level 1

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling continued

81401	Molecular pathology procedure level 2
81402	Molecular pathology procedure level 3
81403	Molecular pathology procedure level 4
81404	Molecular pathology procedure level 5
81405	Molecular pathology procedure level 6
81406	Molecular pathology procedure level 7
81407	Molecular pathology procedure level 8
81408	Molecular pathology procedure level 9
81410-81471	Genomic Sequencing
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure
81490-81599	Multianalyte Assays with Algorithmic Analyses
88235	Tissue culture for non-neoplastic disorders; amniotic fluid or chorionic villus cells
88245	Chromosome analysis for breakage syndromes; baseline Sister Chromatid Exchange (SCE), 20-25 cells
88248	Chromosome analysis for breakage syndromes; baseline breakage, score 50-100 cells, count 20 cells, 2 karyotypes (eg, for ataxia telangiectasia, Fanconi anemia, fragile X)
88249	Chromosome analysis for breakage syndromes; score 100 cells, clastogen stress (eg, diepoxybutane, mitomycin C, ionizing radiation, UV radiation)
88261	Chromosome analysis; count 5 cells, 1 karyotype, with banding
88262	Chromosome analysis; count 15-20 cells, 2 karyotypes, with banding
88263	Chromosome analysis; count 45 cells for mosaicism, 2 karyotypes, with banding
88264	Chromosome analysis; analyze 20-25 cells
88267	Chromosome analysis, amniotic fluid or chorionic villus, count 15 cells, 1 karyotype, with banding
88269	Chromosome analysis, in situ for amniotic fluid cells, count cells from 6-12 colonies, 1 karyotype, with banding
88280	Chromosome analysis; additional karyotypes, each study
88283	Chromosome analysis; additional specialized banding technique (eg, NOR, C-banding)
88285	Chromosome analysis; additional cells counted, each study
96040	Medical genetics and genetic counseling services, each 30 minutes face-to-face with patient/family

HCPCS CODES

G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report
S0265	Genetic counseling, under physician supervision, each 15 minutes
S3840	DNA analysis for germline mutations of the RET proto-oncogene for susceptibility to multiple endocrine neoplasia type 2
S3841	Genetic testing for retinoblastoma

Not covered for the indications listed above

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling continued

0396U Obstetrics (pre-implantation genetic testing), evaluation of 300000 DNA single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) by microarray, embryonic tissue, algorithm reported as a probability for single-gene germline conditions

Key References

1. Antonarakis, S.E. Carrier screening for recessive disorders. Nat Rev Genet. 2019;20(9):549-561. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0134-2.
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2010). Genomic Testing: ACCE Model Process for Evaluating Genetic Tests. Date Accessed: October 29, 2010. Available: http://cdc.gov/genomics/gtesting/ACCE/index.htm. Last Update: December 28, 2010.
3. Epstein, C.J., et al. Genetic Counseling. *Am J Hum Get*, 27:240-242,1975.
4. GeneTests.org. (2020). Educational Materials. University of Washington. Date Accessed: June 2, 2020. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK1116/
5. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gtr/. Accessed June 1, 2020.
6. https://www.acmg.net/ Accessed June 1, 2020.
7. Hershberger, R.E., et al. Genetic Evaluation of Cardiomyopathy-A Heart Failure Society of America Practice Guideline. J Card Fail. 2018 May;24(5):281-302.
8. Izraeli, S, & Rechavi, G. (2002). Molecular medicine--an overview. Isr Med Assoc J. Aug;4(8):638-40.
9. Malinowski, J., et al. ACMG Professional Practice and Guidelines Committee. Systematic evidence-based review: outcomes from exome and genome sequencing for pediatric patients with congenital anomalies or intellectual disability. Genet Med. 2020 Jun;22(6):986-1004.
10. Miller, D.T., et al. Consensus statement: chromosomal microarray is a first-tier clinical diagnostic test for individuals with developmental disabilities or congenital anomalies. Am J Hum Genet. 2010 May 14; 86(5):749-64. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/projects/gap/cgi-bin/study.cgi?study_id=phs000205.v2.p1
11. Manning, M., et al. (2010). "Array-based technology and recommendations for utilization in medical genetics practice for detection of chromosomal abnormalities." *Genet Med*, 12(11): 742-745.
12. Ross, L.F., et al. Technical report: ethical and policy issues in genetic testing and screening of children. Genet Med 2013:15(3):234–245.
13. Waggoner, D., et al. ACMG Professional Practice and Guidelines Committee. Yield of additional genetic testing after chromosomal microarray for diagnosis of neurodevelopmental disability and congenital anomalies: a clinical practice resource of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). Genet Med. 2018 Oct;20(10):1105-1113.

.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING FOR PROSTATE CANCER PROGNOSIS

Policy # 544
Implementation Date: 11/11/13
Review Dates: 6/11/15, 6/16/16, 10/20/16, 10/19/17, 5/17/21, 11/17/22, 1/17/23
Revision Dates: 9/9/21, 7/1/23, 11/8/23

Related Medical Policies:
#510 Genetic Testing: PCA3 Testing for Prostate Cancer

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Prostate cancer (PCa) is the second leading cause of cancer death in men, exceeded only by lung cancer. A man's lifetime risk of PCa is 1 in 6. Not everyone experiences symptoms of prostate cancer. Many times, signs of PCa are first detected by a doctor during a routine check-up. Part of the annual exam that men over the age of 50 undergo includes a digital rectal exam (DRE) to feel the prostate and a PSA to screen for asymptomatic prostate cancer. Use of the PSA has become controversial in the last couple of years due to the low sensitivity in screening for prostate cancer. Consequently, new tests which may be more sensitive and specific for identifying early or aggressive prostate cancer are being developed.

One such test is the Oncotype DX Prostate test. This gene expression test measures specific RNA markers and generates the Genomic Prostate Score (GPS). The GPS is purported to assist in determining the aggressiveness of an individual's prostate cancer and assist in determining the appropriate approach to management.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

Select Health covers the following prostate cancer screening tests when applicable criteria are met.

A. **Oncotype DX for the following indications post-biopsy (either 1 or 2):**

1) Men with NCCN very-low-risk, low-risk, and favorable intermediate-risk prostate cancer who have greater than 10-year life expectancy and who have not received treatment for prostate cancer and are candidates for active surveillance or definitive therapy; or

B. Prolaris for the following indications post-biopsy (either 1 or 2):

1) Men with NCCN very-low-risk, low-risk, and favorable intermediate-risk prostate Cancer, who have greater than 10-year life expectancy and who have not received treatment for prostate cancer. and are candidates for active surveillance or definitive therapy; or

2) Men with intermediate-risk prostate cancer when deciding whether to add androgen-deprivation therapy to radiation.

C. ProMark for the following indications post-biopsy (either 1 or 2):

1) Men with NCCN very-low-risk, low-risk men, and favorable intermediate risk prostate cancer who have greater than 10-year life expectancy and who have not received treatment for prostate cancer and are candidates for active surveillance or definitive therapy; or

2) Men with intermediate-risk prostate cancer when deciding whether to add androgen-deprivation therapy to radiation.

D. Decipher GC for the following indications (either 1 or 2):

1) Post biopsy in men with NCCN very-low-risk, low-risk, and favorable intermediate-risk prostate cancer who have a greater than 10-year life expectancy who have not received treatment for prostate cancer and are candidates for active surveillance or definitive therapy; or

2) Post biopsy in men with intermediate-risk prostate cancer when deciding whether to add androgen-deprivation therapy to radiation.

E. Decipher RP for the following indications:

1) The Decipher RP molecular assay is recommended to inform adjuvant treatment if adverse features are found, post-radical prostatectomy, and may be considered as part of counseling for risk stratification in patients with PSA resistance/recurrence after radical prostatectomy.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Currently, no systematic reviews or primary literature are available regarding the Oncotype DX Prostate Test. A validation study was presented at the 2013 American Urology Association annual meeting, which is purported to: "… strongly predicted disease aggressiveness (p = 0.002) offering information beyond

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

currently available clinical factors, such as PSA and biopsy Gleason Score." However, that presentation is not available nor have these findings been published.

As no literature on this technology has been published to date, an assessment regarding safety or efficacy of the test is not possible at this time (GRADE 2C).

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0005U Oncology (prostate) gene expression profile by real-time RT-PCR of 3 genes (ERG, PCA3, and SPDEF), urine, algorithm reported as risk score

0011M Oncology, prostate cancer, mRNA expression assay of 12 genes (10 content and 2 housekeeping), RT-PCR test utilizing blood plasma and urine, algorithms to predict high-grade prostate cancer risk

0016M Oncology (bladder), mRNA, microarray gene expression profiling of 219 genes, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as molecular subtype (luminal, luminal infiltrated, basal, basal claudin-low, neuroendocrinelike)

0021U Oncology (prostate), detection of 8 autoantibodies (ARF 6, NKX3-1, 5'-UTR-BMI1, CEP 164, 3'-UTR-Ropporin, Desmocollin, AURKAIP-1, CSNK2A2), multiplexed immunoassay and flow cytometry serum, algorithm reported as risk score

0047U Oncology (prostate), mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 17 genes (12 content and 5 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as a risk score

0053U Oncology (prostate cancer), FISH analysis of 4 genes (ASAP1, HDAC9, CHD1 and PTEN), needle biopsy specimen, algorithm reported as probability of higher tumor grade

0113U Oncology (prostate), measurement of PCA3 and TMPRSS2-ERG in urine and PSA in serum following prostatic massage, by RNA amplification and fluorescence-based detection, algorithm reported as risk score

0228U Oncology (prostate), multianalyte molecular profile by photometric detection of macromolecules adsorbed on nanosponge array slides with machine learning, utilizing first morning voided urine, algorithm reported as likelihood of prostate cancer

0339U Oncology (prostate), mRNA expression profiling of HOXC6 and DLX1, reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), first-void urine following digital rectal examination, algorithm reported as probability of high-grade cancer

0359U Oncology (prostate cancer), analysis of all prostate-specific antigen (PSA) structural isoforms by phase separation and immunoassay, plasma, algorithm reports risk of cancer

0376U Oncology (prostate cancer), image analysis of at least 128 histologic features and clinical factors, prognostic algorithm determining the risk of distant metastases, and prostate cancer-specific mortality, includes predictive algorithm to androgen deprivation-therapy response, if appropriate

81313 PCA3/KLK3 (prostate cancer antigen 3 [non-protein coding]/kallikrein-related peptidase 3 [prostate specific antigen]) ratio (eg, prostate cancer)

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

81539 Oncology (high-grade prostate cancer), biochemical assay of four proteins (Total PSA, Free

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

PSA, Intact PSA, and human kallikrein-2 [hK2]), utilizing plasma or serum, prognostic algorithm reported as a probability score

81541 Oncology (prostate), mRNA gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 46 genes (31 content and 15 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as a disease-specific mortality risk score

81542 Oncology (prostate), mRNA, microarray gene expression profiling of 22 content genes, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as metastasis risk score

81551 Oncology (prostate), promoter methylation profiling by real-time PCR of 3 genes (GSTP1, APC, RASSF1), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as a likelihood of prostate cancer detection on repeat biopsy

81599 Unlisted multianalyte assay with algorithmic analysis

Not Covered for the Indications Listed Above

0343U Oncology (prostate), exosome-based analysis of 442 small noncoding RNAs (sncRNAs) by quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR), urine, reported as molecular evidence of no-, low-, intermediate- or high-risk of prostate cancer

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

Active Surveillance

1. Cooperberg MR, et al. The Diverse Genomic Landscape of Clinically Low-risk Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2018; 74(4): 444-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2018.05.014
2. Goldberg H, et al. Clinical-genomic Characterization Unveils More Aggressive Disease Features in Elderly Prostate Cancer Patients with Low-grade Disease. *Eur Urol Focus* 2020. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32156491
3. Herlemann, A et al. Decipher identifies men with otherwise clinically favorable-intermediate risk disease who may not be good candidates for active surveillance. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2020; 23: 136-143. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41391-019-0167-9
4. Hu JC, et al. Clinical Utility of Gene Expression Classifiers in Men With Newly Diagnosed Prostate Cancer. *JCO Precision Oncology* 2018; 2: 1-15. https://ascopubs.org/doi/10.1200/PO.18.00163
5. Kim HL, et al. Validation of the Decipher Test for predicting adverse pathology in candidates for prostate cancer active surveillance. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2019; 22(3): 399-405. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41391-018-0101-6
6. Klein EA, et al. Molecular Analysis of Low Grade Prostate Cancer Using a Genomic Classifier of Metastatic Potential. *J Urol* 2017; 197(1): 122-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2016.08.091
7. Martin DT, et al. Prostate Cancer Genomic Classifier Relates More Strongly to Gleason Grade Group Than Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System Score in Multiparametric Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging-ultrasound Fusion Targeted Biopsies. *Urology* 2019; 125: 64-72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2018.12.001
8. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Prostate Cancer. Version 1.2020—March 16, 2020.

Definitive Therapy

9. Beksac AT, et al. Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging Features Identify Aggressive Prostate Cancer at the Phenotypic and Transcriptomic Level. *J Urol* 2018; 200(6): 1241-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2018.06.041
10. Berlin A, et al. Genomic Classifier for Guiding Treatment of Intermediate-Risk Prostate Cancers to Dose-Escalated Image Guided Radiation Therapy Without Hormone Therapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2019; 103(1): 84-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2018.08.030
11. Falagario UG, et al. Defining Prostate Cancer at Favorable Intermediate Risk: The Potential Utility of Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Genomic Tests. *J Urol* 2019; 202(1): 102-07. https://doi.org/10.1097/JU.0000000000000134
12. Kishan AU, et al. Transcriptomic Heterogeneity of Gleason Grade Group 5 Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2020; 78: 327-332. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32461072
13. Klein EA, et al. Decipher Genomic Classifier Measured on Prostate Biopsy Predicts Metastasis Risk. *Urology* 2016; 90: 148-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2016.01.012
14. Knudsen BS, et al. Application of a Clinical Whole-Transcriptome Assay for Staging and Prognosis of Prostate Cancer Diagnosed in Needle Core Biopsy Specimens. *J Mol Diagn* 2016; 18(3): 395-406. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoldx.2015.12.006

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing for Prostate Cancer Prognosis, **continued**

15. Lee HJ, et al. Evaluation of a genomic classifier in radical prostatectomy patients with lymph node metastasis. *Res Rep Urol* 2016; 8: 77-84. https://doi.org/10.2147/RRU.S99997
16. Martini A, et al. A transcriptomic signature of tertiary Gleason 5 predicts worse clinicopathological outcome. *BJU Int* 2019; 124(1): 155-62. https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.14740
17. Muralidhar V, et al. Genomic Validation of 3-Tiered Clinical Subclassification of High-Risk Prostate Cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2019; 105: 621-627. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2019.06.2510
18. Nguyen PL, et al. Ability of a Genomic Classifier to Predict Metastasis and Prostate Cancer-specific Mortality after Radiation or Surgery based on Needle Biopsy Specimens. *Eur Urol* 2017; 72(5): 845-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2017.05.009
19. Nguyen PL, et al. Utilization of biopsy-based genomic classifier to predict distant metastasis after definitive radiation and short-course ADT for intermediate and high-risk prostate cancer. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2017; 20(2): 186-92. https://doi.org/10.1038/pcan.2016.58
20. Purysko AS, et al. Correlation between MRI phenotypes and a genomic classifier of prostate cancer: preliminary findings. *Eur Radiol* 2019; 29(9): 4861-70. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-019-06114-x
21. Radtke JP, et al. Transcriptome Wide Analysis of Magnetic Resonance Imaging-targeted Biopsy and Matching Surgical Specimens from High-risk Prostate Cancer Patients Treated with Radical Prostatectomy: The Target Must Be Hit. *Eur Urol Focus* 2018; 4(4): 540-46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2017.01.005
22. Spratt DE, et al. Development and Validation of a Novel Integrated Clinical-Genomic Risk Group Classification for Localized Prostate Cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2018; 36(6): 581-90. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.74.2940
23. Stoyanova R, et al. Association of multiparametric MRI quantitative imaging features with prostate cancer gene expression in MRI-targeted prostate biopsies. *Oncotarget* 2016; 7(33): 53362-76. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.10523
24. Tosco L, et al. Neoadjuvant degarelix with or without apalutamide followed by radical prostatectomy for intermediate and high-risk prostate cancer: ARNEO, a randomized, double blind, placebo-controlled trial. *BMC Cancer* 2018; 18(1): 354. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-018-4275-z
25. Tosoian JJ, et al. Performance of clinicopathologic models in men with high risk localized prostate cancer: impact of a 22-gene genomic classifier. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2020; 23: 646-653. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32231245
26. Van den Broeck T, et al. Validation of the Decipher Test for Predicting Distant Metastatic Recurrence in Men with High-risk Nonmetastatic Prostate Cancer 10 Years After Surgery. *Eur Urol Oncol* 2019; 2(5): 589-96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euo.2018.12.007
27. Xu MJ, et al. Genomic Risk Predicts Molecular Imaging-detected Metastatic Nodal Disease in Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol Oncol* 2019; 2: 685-690. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euo.2018.11.002

After Radical Prostatectomy
Early vs. Salvage Radiation

28. Badani K, et al. Impact of a genomic classifier of metastatic risk on postoperative treatment recommendations for prostate cancer patients: a report from the DECIDE study group. *Oncotarget* 2013; 4(4): 600-9. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.918
29. Badani KK, et al. Effect of a genomic classifier test on clinical practice decisions for patients with high-risk prostate cancer after surgery. *BJU Int* 2015; 115(3): 419-29. https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.12789
30. Cooperberg MR, et al. Combined value of validated clinical and genomic risk stratification tools for predicting prostate cancer mortality in a high-risk prostatectomy cohort. *Eur Urol* 2015; 67(2): 326-33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2014.05.039
31. Dalela D, et al. Genomic Classifier Augments the Role of Pathological Features in Identifying Optimal Candidates for Adjuvant Radiation Therapy in Patients With Prostate Cancer: Development and Internal Validation of a Multivariable Prognostic Model. *J Clin Oncol* 2017; 35(18): 1982-90. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2016.69.9918
32. Den RB, et al. Genomic prostate cancer classifier predicts biochemical failure and metastases in patients after postoperative radiation therapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2014; 89(5): 1038-46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2014.04.052
33. Den RB, et al. Genomic classifier identifies men with adverse pathology after radical prostatectomy who benefit from adjuvant radiation therapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2015; 33(8): 944-51. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2014.59.0026
34. Den RB. et al. Decipher correlation patterns post prostatectomy: initial experience from 2,342 prospective patients. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2016; 19(4): 374-79. https://doi.org/10.1038/pcan.2016.38
35. Erho N, et al. Discovery and validation of a prostate cancer genomic classifier that predicts early metastasis following radical prostatectomy. *PLoS One* 2013;8(6):e66855. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066855
36. Glass AG, et al. Validation of a Genomic Classifier for Predicting Post-Prostatectomy Recurrence in a Community Based Health Care Setting. *J Urol* 2016; 195(6): 1748-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2015.11.044
37. Gore JL, et al. Decipher test impacts decision making among patients considering adjuvant and salvage treatment after radical prostatectomy: Interim results from the Multicenter Prospective PRO-IMPACT study. *Cancer* 2017; 123(15): 2850-59. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.30665
38. Gore, JL et al. Clinical Utility of a Genomic Classifier in Men Undergoing Radical Prostatectomy: The PRO-IMPACT Trial. *Pract Radiat Oncol* 2020; 10: e82-e90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prro.2019.09.016
39. Howard, LE et al. Validation of a genomic classifier for prediction of metastasis and prostate cancer-specific mortality in African-American men following radical prostatectomy in an equal access healthcare setting. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2020; 23: 419-428. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41391-019-0197-3
40. Jambor, I et al. Prediction of biochemical recurrence in prostate cancer patients who underwent prostatectomy using routine clinical prostate multiparametric MRI and decipher genomic score. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2020; 51: 1075-1085. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.26928
41. Karnes RJ, et al. Validation of a genomic classifier that predicts metastasis following radical prostatectomy in an at risk patient population. *J Urol* 2013;190(6):2047-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2013.06.017
42. Karnes RJ, et al. Validation of a Genomic Risk Classifier to Predict Prostate Cancer-specific Mortality in Men with Adverse Pathologic Features. *Eur Urol* 2018; 73(2): 168-75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2017.03.036
43. Klein EA, et al. A genomic classifier improves prediction of metastatic disease within 5 years after surgery in node-negative high-risk prostate cancer patients managed by radical prostatectomy without adjuvant therapy. *Eur Urol* 2015; 67(4): 778-86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2014.10.036

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

44. Lee, DI et al. External validation of genomic classifier-based risk-stratification tool to identify candidates for adjuvant radiation therapy in patients with prostate cancer. *World J Urol* 2021. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33388922
45. Li, L et al. A novel imaging based Nomogram for predicting post-surgical biochemical recurrence and adverse pathology of prostate cancer from pre-operative bi-parametric MRI. *EBioMedicine* 2021; 63: 103163. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33321450
46. Lobo JM, et al. Evaluating the clinical impact of a genomic classifier in prostate cancer using individualized decision analysis. *PLoS One* 2015; 10(3): e0116866. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0116866
47. Lobo JM, et al. Cost-effectiveness of the Decipher Genomic Classifier to Guide Individualized Decisions for Early Radiation Therapy After Prostatectomy for Prostate Cancer. *Clin Genitourin Cancer* 2017; 15(3): e299-e309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clgc.2016.08.012
48. Marascio J, et al. Prospective study to define the clinical utility and benefit of Decipher testing in men following prostatectomy. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2020; 23: 295-302. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41391-019-0185-7
49. Michalopoulos SN, et al. Influence of a genomic classifier on post-operative treatment decisions in high-risk prostate cancer patients: results from the PRO-ACT study. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2014; 30(8): 1547-56. https://doi.org/10.1185/03007995.2014.919908
50. Nguyen PL, et al. Impact of a Genomic Classifier of Metastatic Risk on Postprostatectomy Treatment Recommendations by Radiation Oncologists and Urologists. *Urology* 2015;86(1):35-40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2015.04.004
51. Ross AE, et al. Tissue-based Genomics Augments Post-prostatectomy Risk Stratification in a Natural History Cohort of Intermediate- and High-Risk Men. *Eur Urol* 2016; 69(1): 157-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2015.05.042
52. Ross AE, et al. Efficacy of post-operative radiation in a prostatectomy cohort adjusted for clinical and genomic risk. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2016; 19(3): 277-82. https://doi.org/10.1038/pcan.2016.15
53. Shahait, M et al. Impact of Decipher on use of post-operative radiotherapy: Individual patient analysis of two prospective registries. *BJU Int* 2021; 00: 1-8. https://bjui-journals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/bco2.70
54. Spratt DE, et al. Individual Patient-Level Meta-Analysis of the Performance of the Decipher Genomic Classifier in High-Risk Men After Prostatectomy to Predict Development of Metastatic Disease. *J Clin Oncol* 2017; 35(18): 1991-98. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2016.70.2811

Salvage Therapy after Surgery

55. Feng, FY et al. Validation of a 22-Gene Genomic Classifier in Patients With Recurrent Prostate Cancer: An Ancillary Study of the NRG/RTOG 9601 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Oncol* 2021. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33570548
56. Freedland SJ, et al. Utilization of a Genomic Classifier for Prediction of Metastasis Following Salvage Radiation Therapy after Radical Prostatectomy. *Eur Urol* 2016;70(4):588-96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2016.01.008
57. Ross AE, et al. A genomic classifier predicting metastatic disease progression in men with biochemical recurrence after prostatectomy. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2014;17(1):64-9. https://doi.org/10.1038/pcan.2013.49
58. Spratt DE, et al. Performance of a Prostate Cancer Genomic Classifier in Predicting Metastasis in Men with Prostate-specific Antigen Persistence Postprostatectomy. *Eur Urol* 2018;74(1):107-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2017.11.024

GRID

59. Abdueva D, et al. Quantitative expression profiling in formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded samples by affymetrix microarrays. *J Mol Diagn* 2010; 12(4): 409-17. https://doi.org/10.2353/jmoldx.2010.090155
60. Abou-Ouf H, et al. Validation of a 10-gene molecular signature for predicting biochemical recurrence and clinical metastasis in localized prostate cancer. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2018; 144(5): 883-91. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00432-018-2615-7
61. Adams EJ, et al. FOXA1 mutations alter pioneering activity, differentiation and prostate cancer phenotypes. *Nature* 2019;571(7765):408-12. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1318-9
62. Alshalalfa M, et al. Clinical and genomic analysis of metastatic prostate cancer progression with a background of postoperative biochemical recurrence. *BJU Int* 2015; 116(4): 556-67. https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.13013
63. Alshalalfa M, et al. Evolving transcriptomic fingerprint based on genome-wide data as prognostic tools in prostate cancer. *Biol Cell* 2015; 107(7): 232-44. https://doi.org/10.1111/boc.201400097
64. Alshalalfa M, et al. Low PCA3 expression is a marker of poor differentiation in localized prostate tumors: exploratory analysis from 12,076 patients. *Oncotarget* 2017; 8(31): 50804-13. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.15133
65. Alshalalfa M, et al. Characterization of transcriptomic signature of primary prostate cancer analogous to prostatic small cell neuroendocrine carcinoma. *Int J Cancer* 2019; 145: 3453-3461. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.32430
66. Alshalalfa M, et al. Transcriptomic and Clinical Characterization of Neuropeptide Y Expression in Localized and Metastatic Prostate Cancer: Identification of Novel Prostate Cancer Subtype with Clinical Implications. *Eur Urol Oncol* 2019;2(4):405-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euo.2019.05.001
67. Awasthi, S et al. Comparative Genomics Reveals Distinct Immune-oncologic Pathways in African American Men with Prostate Cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2021; 27: 320-329. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33037017
68. Bahler, CD et al. Predictors of Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen (PSMA/FOLH1) Expression in a Genomic Database. *Urology* 2020; 144: 117-122. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32619596
69. Benzon B, et al. Correlation of B7-H3 with androgen receptor, immune pathways and poor outcome in prostate cancer: an expression-based analysis. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2017; 20(1): 28-35. https://doi.org/10.1038/pcan.2016.49
70. Ben-Salem, S *et al.* Diversity in Androgen Receptor Action Among Treatment-naive Prostate Cancers Is Reflected in Treatment Response Predictions and Molecular Subtypes. *Eur Urol Open Sci* 2020; 22: 34-44. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33299986
71. Berglund AE, et al. Distinct transcriptional repertoire of the androgen receptor in ETS fusion-negative prostate cancer. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2019; 22(2): 292-302. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41391-018-0103-4
72. Boufaied N, et al. Development of a predictive model for stromal content in prostate cancer samples to improve signature performance. *J Pathol* 2019; 249: 411-424. https://doi.org/10.1002/path.5315
73. Cato L, et al. ARv7 Represses Tumor-Suppressor Genes in Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. *Cancer Cell* 2019; 35(3): 401-13 e6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2019.01.008

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

74. Chakravarty D, et al. The oestrogen receptor alpha-regulated lncRNA NEAT1 is a critical modulator of prostate cancer. *Nat Commun* 2014; 5: 5383. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms6383
75. Chen WS, et al. Novel RB1-Loss Transcriptomic Signature Is Associated with Poor Clinical Outcomes across Cancer Types. *Clin Cancer Res* 2019; 25(14): 4290-99. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-0404
76. Cheng A, et al. A four-gene transcript score to predict metastatic-lethal progression in men treated for localized prostate cancer: Development and validation studies. *Prostate* 2019; 79(14): 1589-96. https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.23882
77. Chipidza, FE et al. Development and Validation of a Novel TP53 Mutation Signature That Predicts Risk of Metastasis in Primary Prostate Cancer. *Clin Genitourin Cancer* 2020. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32896505
78. Das R, et al. MicroRNA-194 Promotes Prostate Cancer Metastasis by Inhibiting SOCS2. *Cancer Res* 2017; 77(4): 1021-34. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-16-2529
79. Echevarria MI, et al. African American Specific Gene Panel Predictive of Poor Prostate Cancer Outcome. *J Urol* 2019;202(2):247-55. https://doi.org/10.1097/JU.0000000000000193
80. Erho N, et al. Transcriptome-wide detection of differentially expressed coding and non-coding transcripts and their clinical significance in prostate cancer. *J Oncol* 2012; 2012: 541353. https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/541353
81. Evans JR, et al. Patient-Level DNA Damage and Repair Pathway Profiles and Prognosis After Prostatectomy for High-Risk Prostate Cancer. *JAMA Oncol* 2016; 2(4): 471-80. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2015.4955
82. Faisal FA, et al. Racial Variations in Prostate Cancer Molecular Subtypes and Androgen Receptor Signaling Reflect Anatomic Tumor Location. *Eur Urol* 2016; 70(1): 14-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2015.09.031
83. Feng Y, et al. Metagenomic and metatranscriptomic analysis of human prostate microbiota from patients with prostate cancer. *BMC Genomics* 2019;20(1):146. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-019-5457-z
84. Ferrari, MG et al. Identifying and treating ROBO1(-ve) /DOCK1(+ve) prostate cancer: An aggressive cancer subtype prevalent in African American patients. *Prostate* 2020; 80: 1045-1057. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32687658
85. Flores IE, et al. Stress alters the expression of cancer-related genes in the prostate. *BMC Cancer* 2017; 17(1): 621. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28874141
86. Gerke T, et al. Low Tristetraprolin Expression Is Associated with Lethal Prostate Cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2019;28(3):584-90. https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-18-0667
87. Goodwin JF, et al. DNA-PKcs-Mediated Transcriptional Regulation Drives Prostate Cancer Progression and Metastasis. *Cancer Cell* 2015; 28(1): 97-113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2015.06.004
88. Guedes LB, et al. Analytic, Preanalytic, and Clinical Validation of p53 IHC for Detection of TP53 Missense Mutation in Prostate Cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2017; 23(16): 4693-703. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-17-0257
89. Hectors SJ, et al. Radiomics Features Measured with Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging Predict Prostate Cancer Aggressiveness. *J Urol* 2019;202(3):498-505. https://doi.org/10.1097/JU.0000000000000272
90. Hughes RM, et al. Asporin Restricts Mesenchymal Stromal Cell Differentiation, Alters the Tumor Microenvironment, and Drives Metastatic Progression. *Cancer Res* 2019;79(14):3636-50. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-18-2931
91. Hu BR, et al. AXIN2 expression predicts prostate cancer recurrence and regulates invasion and tumor growth. *Prostate* 2016; 76(6): 597-608. https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.23151
92. Hurley PJ, et al. Secreted protein, acidic and rich in cysteine-like 1 (SPARCL1) is down regulated in aggressive prostate cancers and is prognostic for poor clinical outcome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2012;109(37):14977-82. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1203525109
93. Hurley PJ, et al. Androgen-Regulated SPARCL1 in the Tumor Microenvironment Inhibits Metastatic Progression. *Cancer Res* 2015; 75(20): 4322-34. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-15-0024
94. Hurley PJ, et al. Germline Variants in Asporin Vary by Race, Modulate the Tumor Microenvironment, and Are Differentially Associated with Metastatic Prostate Cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2016; 22(2): 448-58. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-15-0256
95. Itkonen HM, et al. Lipid degradation promotes prostate cancer cell survival. *Oncotarget* 2017; 8(24): 38264-75. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.16123
96. Jager W, et al. Patient-derived bladder cancer xenografts in the preclinical development of novel targeted therapies. *Oncotarget* 2015; 6(25): 21522-32. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.3974
97. Johnson MH, et al. SPINK1 Defines a Molecular Subtype of Prostate Cancer in Men with More Rapid Progression in an at Risk, Natural History Radical Prostatectomy Cohort. *J Urol* 2016; 196(5): 1436-44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2016.05.092
98. Karnes RJ, et al. Development and Validation of a Prostate Cancer Genomic Signature that Predicts Early ADT Treatment Response Following Radical Prostatectomy. *Clin Cancer Res* 2018; 24(16): 3908-16. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-17-2745
99. Kaushik AK, et al. Metabolomic profiling identifies biochemical pathways associated with castration-resistant prostate cancer. *J Proteome Res* 2014; 13(2): 1088-100. https://doi.org/10.1021/pr401106h
100. Kim H, et al. Potential Impact on Clinical Decision Making via a Genome-Wide Expression Profiling: A Case Report. *Urol Case Rep* 2016; 9: 51-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eucr.2016.08.010
101. Kim H, et al. Transcriptome evaluation of the relation between body mass index and prostate cancer outcomes. *Cancer* 2017; 123(12): 2240-47. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.30580
102. Kiss B, et al. Her2 alterations in muscle-invasive bladder cancer: Patient selection beyond protein expression for targeted therapy. *Sci Rep* 2017; 7: 42713. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep42713
103. Knudsen ES, et al. Progression of ductal carcinoma in situ to invasive breast cancer is associated with gene expression programs of EMT and myoepithelia. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2012; 133(3): 1009-24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-011-1894-3
104. Labbe DP, et al. TOP2A and EZH2 Provide Early Detection of an Aggressive Prostate Cancer Subgroup. *Clin Cancer Res* 2017; 23(22): 7072-83. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-17-0413
105. Labbe DP, et al. High-fat diet fuels prostate cancer progression by rewiring the metabolome and amplifying the MYC program. *Nat Commun* 2019;10(4358). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-12298-z
106. Lalonde E, et al. Tumour genomic and microenvironmental heterogeneity for integrated prediction of 5-year biochemical recurrence of prostate cancer: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Oncol* 2014; 15(13): 1521-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(14)71021-6

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

107. Liang Y, et al. LSD1-Mediated Epigenetic Reprogramming Drives CENPE Expression and Prostate Cancer Progression. *Cancer Res* 2017; 77(20): 5479-90. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-17-0496
108. Liu D, et al. Impact of the SPOP Mutant Subtype on the Interpretation of Clinical Parameters in Prostate Cancer. *JCO Precis Oncol* 2018. https://doi.org/10.1200/PO.18.00036
109. Mahal BA, et al. Clinical and Genomic Characterization of Low-Prostate-specific Antigen, High-grade Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2018; 74(2): 146-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2018.01.043
110. Mahal BA, et al. Prostate Cancer Genomic-risk Differences Between African-American and White Men Across Gleason Scores. *Eur Urol* 2019;75(6):1038-40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2019.01.010
111. Mahal BA, et al. Genomic and clinical characterization of stromal infiltration markers in prostate cancer. *Cancer* 2020; 126(7): 1407-1412. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.32688
112. McNair C, et al. Cell cycle-coupled expansion of AR activity promotes cancer progression. *Oncogene* 2017; 36(12): 1655-68. https://doi.org/10.1038/onc.2016.334
113. Mo F, et al. Stromal Gene Expression is Predictive for Metastatic Primary Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2018; 73(4): 524-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2017.02.038
114. Nouri M, et al. Therapy-induced developmental reprogramming of prostate cancer cells and acquired therapy resistance. *Oncotarget* 2017; 8(12): 18949-67. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.14850
115. Pellegrini KL, et al. Evaluation of a 24-gene signature for prognosis of metastatic events and prostate cancer-specific mortality. *BJU Int* 2017; 119(6): 961-67. https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.13779
116. Prensner JR, et al. The long noncoding RNA SChLAP1 promotes aggressive prostate cancer and antagonizes the SWI/SNF complex. *Nat Genet* 2013; 45(11): 1392-8. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.2771
117. Prensner JR, et al. RNA biomarkers associated with metastatic progression in prostate cancer: a multi-institutional high-throughput analysis of SChLAP1. *Lancet Oncol* 2014; 15(13): 1469-80. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(14)71113-1
118. Prensner JR, et al. The IncRNAs PCGEM1 and PRNCR1 are not implicated in castration resistant prostate cancer. *Oncotarget* 2014; 5(6): 1434-8. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.1846
119. Rai R, et al. Epigenetic analysis identifies factors driving racial disparity in prostate cancer. *Cancer Reports* 2018;2(2): e1153. https://doi.org/10.1002/CNR2.1153
120. Ramnarine VR, et al. The long noncoding RNA landscape of neuroendocrine prostate cancer and its clinical implications. *Gigascience* 2018; 7(6). https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giy050
121. Ramnarine VR, et al. The evolution of long noncoding RNA acceptance in prostate cancer initiation, progression, and its clinical utility in disease management. *Eur Urol* 2019; 76: 546-559. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2019.07.040
122. Rounbehler RJ, et al. Tristetraprolin Is a Prognostic Biomarker for Poor Outcomes among Patients with Low-Grade Prostate Cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers* Prev 2018; 27(11): 1376-83. https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-18-0369
123. Salami SS, et al. Transcriptomic heterogeneity in multifocal prostate cancer. *JCI Insight* 2018; 3(21). https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.123468
124. Seiler R, et al. An Oncofetal Glycosaminoglycan Modification Provides Therapeutic Access to Cisplatin-resistant Bladder Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2017; 72(1): 142-50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2017.03.021
125. Sharma V, et al. Gene Expression Correlates of Site-specific Metastasis Among Men with Lymph Node Positive Prostate Cancer Treated With Radical Prostatectomy: A Case Series. *Urology* 2018; 112: 29-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2017.10.016
126. Shoag, J et al. Prognostic value of the SPOP mutant genomic subclass in prostate cancer. *Urol Oncol* 2020; 38: 418-422. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32192889
127. Sjostrom M, et al. Clinicogenomic Radiotherapy Classifier Predicting the Need for Intensified Locoregional Treatment After Breast-Conserving Surgery for Early-Stage Breast Cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2019; 37: 3340-3349. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.19.00761
128. Sjostrom M, et al. Comprehensive transcriptomic profiling identifies breast cancer patients who may be spared adjuvant systemic therapy. *Clin Cancer Res* 2019; 26: 171-182. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-1038
129. Spans L, et al. Genomic and epigenomic analysis of high-risk prostate cancer reveals changes in hydroxymethylation and TET1. *Oncotarget* 2016; 7(17): 24326-38. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.8220
130. Spratt DE, et al. Transcriptomic heterogeneity of androgen receptor (AR) activity defines a de novo low AR-active subclass in treatment naive primary prostate cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2019; 25: 6721-6730. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-1587
131. Tabrizi, S et al. Doublecortin Expression in Prostate Adenocarcinoma and Neuroendocrine Tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2020; 108: 936-940. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32585335
132. Taylor AS, et al. Correlation between cribriform/intraductal prostatic adenocarcinoma and percent Gleason pattern 4 to a 22-gene genomic classifier. *Prostate* 2020; 80: 146-152. https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.23926
133. Todenhofer T, et al. Selective Inhibition of the Lactate Transporter MCT4 Reduces Growth of Invasive Bladder Cancer. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2018; 17(12): 2746-55. https://doi.org/10.1158/1535-7163.MCT-18-0107
134. Tomlins SA, et al. Characterization of 1577 primary prostate cancers reveals novel biological and clinicopathologic insights into molecular subtypes. *Eur Urol* 2015; 68(4): 555-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2015.04.033
135. Torres A, et al. Comprehensive Determination of Prostate Tumor ETS Gene Status in Clinical Samples Using the CLIA Decipher Assay. *J Mol Diagn* 2017; 19(3): 475-84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoldx.2017.01.007
136. Torres A, et al. ETS2 is a prostate basal cell marker and is highly expressed in prostate cancers aberrantly expressing p63. *Prostate* 2018; 78(12): 896-904. https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.23646
137. Tsai H, et al. Cyclin D1 Loss Distinguishes Prostatic Small-Cell Carcinoma from Most Prostatic Adenocarcinomas. *Clin Cancer Res* 2015; 21(24): 5619-29. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-15-0744
138. Tsai HK, et al. Gene expression signatures of neuroendocrine prostate cancer and primary small cell prostatic carcinoma. *BMC Cancer* 2017; 17(1): 759. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-017-3729-z
139. Tse BWC, et al. Neuropilin-1 is upregulated in the adaptive response of prostate tumors to androgen-targeted therapies and is prognostic of metastatic progression and patient mortality. *Oncogene* 2017; 36(24): 3417-27. https://doi.org/10.1038/onc.2016.482
140. Urbanucci A, et al. Androgen Receptor Deregulation Drives Bromodomain-Mediated Chromatin Alterations in Prostate Cancer. *Cell Rep* 2017; 19(10): 2045-59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2017.05.049

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

141. Vergara IA, et al. Genomic "Dark Matter" in Prostate Cancer: Exploring the Clinical Utility of ncRNA as Biomarkers. *Front Genet* 2012; 3: 23. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2012.00023
142. Wahl DR, et al. Pan-Cancer Analysis of Genomic Sequencing Among the Elderly. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2017; 98(4): 726-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2017.01.002
143. Wei L, et al. Intratumoral and Intertumoral Genomic Heterogeneity of Multifocal Localized Prostate Cancer Impacts Molecular Classifications and Genomic Prognosticators. *Eur Urol* 2017; 71(2): 183-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2016.07.008
144. Weiner, AB et al. Somatic HOXB13 Expression Correlates with Metastatic Progression in Men with Localized Prostate Cancer Following Radical Prostatectomy. *Eur Urol Oncol* 2020. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32540218
145. Weiner, AB et al. Plasma cells are enriched in localized prostate cancer in Black men and are associated with improved outcomes. *Nat Commun* 2021; 12: 935. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33568675
146. White NM, et al. Multi-institutional Analysis Shows that Low PCAT-14 Expression Associates with Poor Outcomes in Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2017; 71(2): 257-66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2016.07.012
147. Winters BR, et al. Mechanistic target of rapamycin (MTOR) protein expression in the tumor and its microenvironment correlates with more aggressive pathology at cystectomy. *Urol Oncol* 2018; 36(7): 342 e7-42 e14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urolonc.2018.03.016
148. Wiseman SM, et al. Whole-transcriptome profiling of thyroid nodules identifies expression-based signatures for accurate thyroid cancer diagnosis. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2013; 98(10): 4072-9. https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2013-1991
149. Yamoah K, et al. Novel Biomarker Signature That May Predict Aggressive Disease in African American Men With Prostate Cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2015; 33(25): 2789-96. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2014.59.8912
150. Yamoah, K et al. Novel Transcriptomic Interactions Between Immune Content and Genomic Classifier Predict Lethal Outcomes in High-grade Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2020. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33303244
151. Yang L, et al. Development and Validation of a 28-gene Hypoxia-related Prognostic Signature for Localized Prostate Cancer. *EBioMedicine* 2018; 31: 182-89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2018.04.019
152. Yoon, J et al. A comparative study of PCS and PAM50 prostate cancer classification schemes. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2021. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33531653
153. You S, et al. Integrated Classification of Prostate Cancer Reveals a Novel Luminal Subtype with Poor Outcome. *Cancer Res* 2016; 76(17): 4948-58. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-16-0902
154. Zhao SG, et al. High-throughput transcriptomic analysis nominates proteasomal genes as age-specific biomarkers and therapeutic targets in prostate cancer. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2015; 18(3): 229-36. https://doi.org/10.1038/pcan.2015.22
155. Zhao SG, et al. Development and validation of a 24-gene predictor of response to postoperative radiotherapy in prostate cancer: a matched, retrospective analysis. *Lancet Oncol* 2016; 17(11): 1612-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(16)30491-0
156. Zhao SG, et al. The Landscape of Prognostic Outlier Genes in High-Risk Prostate Cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2016; 22(7): 1777-86. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-15-1250
157. Zhao SG, et al. Associations of Luminal and Basal Subtyping of Prostate Cancer With Prognosis and Response to Androgen Deprivation Therapy. *JAMA Oncol* 2017; 3(12): 1663-72. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2017.0751
158. Zhao SG, et al. Clinical and Genomic Implications of Luminal and Basal Subtypes Across Carcinomas. *Clin Cancer Res* 2019; 25(8): 2450-57. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-18-3121
159. Zhao SG, et al. The Immune Landscape of Prostate Cancer and Nomination of PD-L2 as a Potential Therapeutic Target. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2019; 111(3): 301-10. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djy141

Reviews

160. Alam S, et al. Prostate cancer genomics: comparing results from three molecular assays. *Can J Urol* 2019;26(3):9758-62. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31180305
161. Alford AV, et al. The Use of Biomarkers in Prostate Cancer Screening and Treatment. *Rev Urol* 2017;19(4):221-34. https://doi.org/10.3909/riu0772
162. Al Hussein Al Awamlh B, et al. Genomics and risk stratification in high-risk prostate cancer. *Nat Rev Urol* 2019;16(11):641-42. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41585-019-0227-x
163. Al-Salama ZT. Apalutamide: A Review in Non-Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. *Drugs* 2019;79(14):1591-98. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40265-019-01194-x
164. Banerjee et al. A review on the role of tissue-based molecular biomarkers for active surveillance. *World J Urol* 2021. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33590277
165. Bostrom PJ, et al. Genomic Predictors of Outcome in Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2015;68(6):1033-44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2015.04.008
166. Bronimann, S et al. An overview of current and emerging diagnostic, staging and prognostic markers for prostate cancer. *Expert Rev Mol Diagn* 2020; 20: 841-850. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32552088
167. Carneiro A, et al. Are localized prostate cancer biomarkers useful in the clinical practice? *Tumour Biol* 2018;40(9):1010428318799255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1010428318799255
168. Clinton TN, et al. Tissue-based biomarkers in prostate cancer. *Expert Rev Precis Med Drug Dev* 2017;2(5):249-60. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808993.2017.1372687
169. Colicchia M, et al. Genomic tests to guide prostate cancer management following diagnosis. *Expert Rev Mol Diagn* 2017;17(4):367-77. https://doi.org/10.1080/14737159.2017.1302332
170. Cozar JM, et al. The role of miRNAs as biomarkers in prostate cancer. *Mutat Res* 2019;781:165-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mrrev.2019.05.005
171. Creed JH, et al. Commercial Gene Expression Tests for Prostate Cancer Prognosis Provide Paradoxical Estimates of Race-Specific Risk. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2019. https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-19-0407
172. Cucchiara V, et al. Genomic Markers in Prostate Cancer Decision Making. *Eur Urol* 2018;73(4):572-82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2017.10.036
173. da Costa JB, et al. Molecular tumor heterogeneity in muscle invasive bladder cancer: Biomarkers, subtypes, and implications

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

for therapy. *Urol Oncol* 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urolonc.2018.11.015
174. Dalela D, et al. Contemporary Role of the Decipher(R) Test in Prostate Cancer Management: Current Practice and Future Perspectives. *Rev Urol* 2016;18(1):1-9. https://doi.org/10.3909/riu0706
175. Dall'Era M, Evans C. Genomic and Biological Markers to Select Treatment for Patients with Prostate Cancer: Choose Wisely, My Friend. *J Urol* 2017;197(1):8-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2016.10.048
176. Davis JW. Novel commercially available genomic tests for prostate cancer: a roadmap to understanding their clinical impact. *BJU Int* 2014;114(3):320-2. https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.12695
177. Davis J. Use of genomic markers to risk stratify men with prostate cancer. *Trends in Urology & Men's Health* 2015;6(3):36-39. https://doi.org/10.1002/tre.461
178. De Marzo AM, et al. Premalignancy in Prostate Cancer: Rethinking What we Know. *Cancer Prev Res* 2016;9(8):648-56. https://doi.org/10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-15-0431
179. Duffy MJ. Biomarkers for prostate cancer: prostate-specific antigen and beyond. *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2020;58(3):326-39. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31714881
180. Eggener SE, et al. Molecular Biomarkers in Localized Prostate Cancer: ASCO Guideline. *J Clin Oncol* 2019: JCO1902768. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.19.02768
181. Falzarano SM, et al. Novel biomarkers and genomic tests in prostate cancer: a critical analysis. *Minerva Urol Nefrol* 2015;67(3):211-31. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26054411
182. Fine ND, et al. Genomic Classifiers for Treatment Selection in Newly Diagnosed Prostate Cancer. *BJU Int* 2019. https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.14799
183. Gadzinski AJ, Cooperberg MR. Prostate Cancer Markers. *Cancer Treat Res* 2018; 175:55-86. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93339-9_3
184. Gaudreau PO, et al. The Present and Future of Biomarkers in Prostate Cancer: Proteomics, Genomics, and Immunology Advancements. *Biomark Cancer* 2016;8(Suppl 2):15-33. https://doi.org/10.4137/BIC.S31802
185. Goldenberg SL, et al. A new era: artificial intelligence and machine learning in prostate cancer. *Nat Rev Urol* 2019;16(7):391-403. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41585-019-0193-3
186. Jairath, NK *et al.* A Systematic Review of the Evidence for the Decipher Genomic Classifier in Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2021; 79: 374-383. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33293078
187. Jalanko, T et al. Genomic Subtyping in Bladder Cancer. *Curr Urol Rep* 2020; 21: 9. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32166460
188. Kim SP, et al. Physician attitudes about genetic testing for localized prostate cancer: A national survey of radiation oncologists and urologists. *Urol Oncol* 2018;36(11):501 e15-01 e21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urolonc.2018.07.002
189. Kohaar I, et al. A Rich Array of Prostate Cancer Molecular Biomarkers: Opportunities and Challenges. *Int J Mol Sci* 2019;20(8). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms20081813
190. Kornberg Z, et al. Genomic biomarkers in prostate cancer. *Transl Androl Urol* 2018;7(3):459-71. https://dx.doi.org/10.21037%2Ftau.2018.06.02
191. Kretschmer A, Tilki D. Biomarkers in prostate cancer - Current clinical utility and future perspectives. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2017; 120:180-93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.critrevonc.2017.11.007
192. Kretschmer A, et al. [Molecular biomarkers and prognostic factors for prostate cancer]. *Urologe A* 2017;56(7):933-44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00120-017-0418-0
193. Kristiansen G. Markers of clinical utility in the differential diagnosis and prognosis of prostate cancer. *Mod Pathol* 2018;31(S1): S143-55. https://doi.org/10.1038/modpathol.2017.168
194. Lamy PJ, et al. Prognostic Biomarkers Used for Localised Prostate Cancer Management: A Systematic Review. *Eur Urol Focus* 2018;4(6):790-803. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2017.02.017
195. Loeb S, Ross AE. Genomic testing for localized prostate cancer: where do we go from here? *Curr Opin Urol* 2017;27(5):495-99. https://doi.org/10.1097/MOU.0000000000000419
196. Loeb S, Tosoian JJ. Biomarkers in active surveillance. *Transl Androl Urol* 2018;7(1):155-59. https://dx.doi.org/10.21037%2Ftau.2017.12.26
197. Martin NE. New developments in prostate cancer biomarkers. *Curr Opin Oncol* 2016;28(3):248-52. https://doi.org/10.1097/CCO.0000000000000279
198. Marrone M, et al. A 22 Gene-expression Assay, Decipher (R) (GenomeDx Biosciences) to Predict Five-year Risk of Metastatic Prostate Cancer in Men Treated with Radical Prostatectomy. *PLoS Curr* 2015;7. https://doi.org/10.1371/currents.eogt.761b81608129ed61b0b48d42c04f92a4
199. McCormick BZ, et al. Biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy: Current status of its use as a treatment endpoint and early management strategies. *Indian J Urol* 2019;35(1):6-17. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6334583/
200. McKay RR, et al. Recent Advances in the Management of High-Risk Localized Prostate Cancer: Local Therapy, Systemic Therapy, and Biomarkers to Guide Treatment Decisions. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book* 2020; 40:1-12. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32412803/
201. Morlacco A, Karnes RJ. Early salvage radiation therapy post-prostatectomy: key considerations. *Future Oncol* 2016;12(22):2579-87. https://doi.org/10.2217/fon-2016-0208
202. Moschini M, et al. Incorporation of tissue-based genomic biomarkers into localized prostate cancer clinics. *BMC Med* 2016; 14:67. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-016-0613-7
203. Na R, et al. Clinically available RNA profiling tests of prostate tumors: utility and comparison. *Asian J Androl* 2016;18(4):575-9. https://doi.org/10.4103/1008-682X.175096
204. Necchi, A et al. Converging Roads to Early Bladder Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2020; 78: 127-130. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32197887
205. Nguyen HG, Welty CJ, Cooperberg MR. Diagnostic associations of gene expression signatures in prostate cancer tissue. *Curr Opin Urol* 2015;25(1):65-70. https://doi.org/10.1097/MOU.0000000000000131
206. Norris, JM *et al.* Genetic landscape of prostate cancer conspicuity on multiparametric MRI: a protocol for a systematic review and bioinformatic analysis. *BMJ Open* 2020; 10: e034611. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31992607
207. Nowroozi, A *et al.* Adjuvant vs. salvage Radiation Therapy after Radical Prostatectomy: Role of Decipher(R) in the Era of Personalized Medicine. *Urol J* 2021. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33423246

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

208. Olleik G, et al. Evaluation of New Tests and Interventions for Prostate Cancer Management: A Systematic Review. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2018;16(11):1340-51. https://doi.org/10.6004/jnccn.2018.7055
209. Pisansky TM. Salvage Radiotherapy for Postoperative Biochemical Failure of Prostate Cancer: The Path Toward Personalized Medicine. *Eur Urol* 2016;70(4):597-98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2016.01.033
210. Reichard CA, Klein EA. Clinical and molecular rationale to retain the cancer descriptor for Gleason score 6 disease. *Nat Rev Urol* 2017;14(1):59-64. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrurol.2016.240
211. Reiter RE. Risk stratification of prostate cancer 2016. *Scand J Clin Lab Invest Suppl* 2016;245: S54-9. https://doi.org/10.1080/00365513.2016.1208453
212. Ross AE, D'Amico AV, Freedland SJ. Which, when and why? Rational use of tissue-based molecular testing in localized prostate cancer. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2016;19(1):1-6. https://doi.org/10.1038/pcan.2015.31
213. Ross AE, et al. Utility of Risk Models in Decision Making After Radical Prostatectomy: Lessons from a Natural History Cohort of Intermediate- and High-Risk Men. *Eur Urol* 2016;69(3):496-504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2015.04.016
214. Schulster M. Bladder Cancer Academy 2019 Selected Summaries. *Rev Urol* 2019;21(1):23-28. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6585182/
215. Sharma P, Zargar-Shoshtari K, Pow-Sang JM. Biomarkers for prostate cancer: present challenges and future opportunities. *Future Sci OA* 2016;2(1): FSO72. https://doi.org/10.4155/fso.15.72
216. Spahn M, et al. What is the Need for Prostatic Biomarkers in Prostate Cancer Management? *Curr Urol Rep* 2015;16(10):70. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11934-015-0545-3
217. Spratt DE. Performance and Utility of Prognostic Genomic Biomarkers After Prostatectomy: Decipher-ing the Data. *J Clin Oncol* 2017;35(25):2977-78. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.73.6470
218. Spratt DE, et al. A Systematic Review and Framework for the Use of Hormone Therapy with Salvage Radiation Therapy for Recurrent Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2018;73(2):156-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2017.06.027
219. Stoyanova R, et al. Prostate cancer radiomics and the promise of radiogenomics. *Transl Cancer Res* 2016;5(4):432-47. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29188191
220. Teo MY, et al. Drug development for noncastrate prostate cancer in a changed therapeutic landscape. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 2018;15(3):150. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrclinonc.2017.160
221. Tilki D, Evans CP. The Decipher Genomic Classifier Independently Improves Prognostication for Patients After Prostatectomy. *Eur Urol* 2018;73(2):176-77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2017.04.020
222. Vandekerkhove, G et al. Plasma ctDNA is a tumor tissue surrogate and enables clinical-genomic stratification of metastatic bladder cancer. *Nat Commun* 2021; 12: 184. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33420073
223. Vince RA, Jr., et al. Tissue-based genomics: which test and when. *Curr Opin Urol* 2019;29(6):598-604. https://doi.org/10.1097/MOU.0000000000000673
224. Zhuang L, Johnson MT. How Precisely Can Prostate Cancer Be Managed? *Int Neurourol J* 2016;20(Suppl 2):S120-30. https://doi.org/10.5213/inj.1632724.362
225. Zumsteg ZS, Spratt DE. Precision Medicine for Localized Prostate Cancer: Time to Move Beyond NCCN Risk Stratification? *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2019;103(1):92-94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2018.09.040

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: 5-FLUOROURACIL TESTING IN CANCER PATIENTS

Policy # 594

Implementation Date: 1/13/17
Review Dates: 12/21/17, 12/13/18, 4/5/23
Revision Dates: 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling
#590 Pharmacogenomic Testing for Drug Metabolism

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Cancer is the second leading cause of death in the United State behind heart disease. In the U.S., colorectal cancer ranks third among all cancers in both incidence and mortality. Approximately 150,000 new cases of large bowel cancer are diagnosed each year in the U.S., of which 104,000 are colon cancers, and the remainder rectal cancers. CRC will account for 10% of all cancer deaths. When found early these cancers can be cured with surgical resection. However, once they extend beyond the colon they may locate (metastasize) to other organs and are treated with chemotherapy. Approximately 15%–20% of patients have distant metastatic disease at the time of presentation.

Fluoropyrimidine drugs such as 5-fluorouracil (5-FU) and capecitabine (oral FU) are a mainstay in the treatment of numerous solid tumors, including colorectal cancers, breast, stomach, and pancreatic cancers. These drugs work to interfere of the synthetic pathway for thymidine, a critical component in DNA synthesis required for cell division. This interference in turn stops cancer cell proliferation. The levels of this drug may fluctuate in different patients due to genetic propensities of these individual patients. Theoretically, identifying individual doses may improve outcomes for patients as it may result in optimal levels of the medicines available in the patient's system to treat their condition. 5-FU is used alone or as part of combination therapies.

5-FU degradation occurs in all tissues, including tumor tissues, but is highest in the liver. In humans, 70%–90% of an administered dose of 5-FU is degraded by dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase (DYPD). Thymidylate synthase (TYMS or TS) is an essential enzyme for DNA synthesis. Variations causing overproduction of TYMS enzyme lead to excess TYMS and insufficient 5-FU to completely inhibit the enzyme and a resulting loss of efficacy with the 5-FU chemotherapeutic. Toxicity reactions due to reduced enzyme activity may include hand-foot syndrome, fever, mucositis, stomatitis, and severe diarrhea. Nausea, vomiting, rectal bleeding, and skin changes may also occur. Neurologic abnormalities include cerebellar ataxia (uncoordinated muscle movement) and changes in cognitive ability.

Myriad, the manufacturer of OnDose, states: "OnDose is a simple blood test that helps oncologists to optimize infusional 5-FU therapy on an individual basis. OnDose provides the data for pharmacokinetically-guided dose adjustments of infusional 5-FU to help optimize dosing for patients with colorectal cancer … a simple blood test requiring a small amount of blood (peripheral venous draw). The blood sample is collected in a supplied K2-EDTA tube. Then, a chemical stabilizer is added to the sample with a prefilled syringe and transfer device. After gently mixing, the sample is centrifuged by the clinician to obtain a 1 mL plasma sample. The plasma sample is then sent on the same day in a prepaid overnight package to Myriad Genetic Laboratories for analysis. Usually, within 7 days, results are returned through Myriads Results Now web-based system or via the mail to the physician's attention. The OnDose data can be used to help optimize the patient's dose for the next cycle of infusional 5-FU chemotherapy."

Genetic Testing: 5-Fluorouracil Testing in Cancer Patients, **continued**

TheraGuide 5-FU detects variations in the 2 genes coding for DPYD and TYMS. TheraGuide 5-FU provides comprehensive analysis of DPYD and TYMS gene variations to predict and help prevent 5-FU–related adverse events.

The DPYD gene is analyzed by full sequence analysis for deleterious mutations. The TYMS gene has variations in certain regions, which alter its expression and the enzyme that 5-FU/capecitabine targets, to disrupt DNA synthesis. Low levels of enzyme (2R/2R) are associated with up to a 2.5-fold risk of toxicity to 5-FU/capecitabine therapy.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth considers testing for genetic variants DPYD*2A (rs3918290), DPYD*13 (rs55886062), and rs67376798 A (on the positive chromosomal strand) as medically necessary, as indicated in individuals considering or currently on therapy with any 5-FU containing drug including, but not limited to:

- 5-fluorouracil (Fluorouracil, Adrucil)
- Capecitabine (Xeloda)
- Fluorouracil topical formulations (Carac, Efudex, Fluoroplex)

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

OnDose

Studies have demonstrated many patients whose dosing of 5-FU are based on BSA (body surface area) do not reach therapeutic levels or have a greater likelihood of toxicity. Research has repeatedly shown that the AUC (area under the curve) is an accurate method to achieve 5-FU levels which produce successful clinical responses.

Gamelin et al. enrolled 208 patients with advanced untreated colon cancer in a multicenter study. Patients received either 5-FU using BSA (1500 mg/m^2) at a fixed dose or had the AUC measured (by high pressure liquid chromatography) and dosing adjustments were made until stable pharmacokinetics was achieved. Dosage varied from 765–3300 mg/m^2 and the mean dose was 1790 mg/m^2. Tolerability was enhanced with the AUC arm of the study. Impressive differences in clinical outcomes were demonstrated with the AUC arm. Tumor response rates favored AUC adjusted patients 33.6% compared with 18.3%. Overall survival improved 40.5% in AUC patients compared with 29.6% in the fixed dose arm of the study. These results were not significant. Toxicity measured by frequency of diarrhea and hand-foot syndrome also favored the AUC dose adjustment arm. Despite these results criticisms concerning the trial and implications of the results exist.

Some believe the administration of 5-FU by bolus used in the Gamelin study instead of the more current and standard approach of 24–48-hour infusion would lead to different results. Also, combination therapy with other agents not used in the Gamelin study could have an impact on both survival and metabolism of 5-FU influencing the results.

Other researchers suggested that if OnDose is to be utilized in clinical practice additional studies using constant infusion along with combination therapy and using OnDose (immunological method for AUC calculation) should be done. Studies should include not only patients with colon cancer but also head and neck cancers and other patients using 5-FU therapy as part of the chemotherapeutic regimen.

Additional comments include the editorial by Walko at el. They commended Gamelin at al. for the Level 1 evidence-based medicine research but limited their recommendation. They were unsure there was strong enough evidence to support a “mandate” for AUC testing.

In conclusion, though the evidence supporting the clinical utility of 5-FU level testing is limited, it is generally supportive of the concept and suggests benefits to both therapeutic effect and toxicity.

TheraGuide

Multiple studies supporting the role of DPYD and TYMS enzymes in the metabolism of 5-FU and further refining the genotypes responsible for variation in metabolism, at least in European populations (example: Offer et al, 2014). Indeed, the Clinical Pharmacogenomics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) published its recommendations for use of variants in these genes to improve treatment of patients receiving fluoropyrimidines including 5-FU, capecitabine or tegafur (Caudle et al, 2013). These guidelines do not name Theraguide, but rather discussed use of individual polymorphisms in each gene. There are now two publications, from the same author(s), referencing use of Theraguide 5-FU in patients receiving 5-fluorouracil. Saif (2013) reported retrospectively on 227 patients who experienced 5-FU toxicity and found and increase frequency of DYPD variants in the toxicity group (12% vs 4%). In a separate case report, Saif et al. (2013) described 4 patients who had been tested with the Theraguide test who developed cardiotoxicity. TYMS variants were not examined in these studies. Neither of these Saif papers, nor the CPIC implementation recommendations reference studies where genotyping of DPYD and TYMS was applied prospectively to predict 5-FU toxicity with appropriate follow-up to demonstrate improved clinical outcomes.

An extensive body of literature that supports the conclusion that genotypic variants of dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase and thymidylate synthase (as well as other enzymes) are associated with toxicity to 5-FU-based chemotherapeutic agents. However, there were no studies of any sort in the peer-reviewed literature where the TheraGuide 5-FU test was applied. Furthermore, there were no studies identified where genotyping of DPYD and TYMS (in blood samples) was applied prospectively to predict 5-FU toxicity with appropriate follow-up.

A retrospective study by Schwab et al. reported a sensitivity of DPYD*2A genotyping for overall toxicity was 5.5% (95%CI, 0.02 to 0.11), with a positive predictive value of 0.46 (95% CI, 0.19 to 0.75; p = .01). Inclusion of additional DPYD variants improved prediction only marginally. No studies have been identified that report on the sensitivity, specificity or predictive value of TheraGuide 5-FU specifically.

The editorial comments by Ezzeldin and Disasio to the Schwab study suggest that “although FU metabolism uses defined biologic pathways and the availability of high through put techniques permit the rapid detection of many genetic and epigenetic variables, the current study by Schwab et al. does not fully address or explore these and other mechanisms potentially implicated in FU toxicity. Thus, even though the current study of patients with cancer exposed to FU monotherapy is a large study in contrast to many of the previously reported smaller studies, this study is still far from being informative or comprehensive. Taken collectively, genetic tests proposed for the prediction of patients at risk of developing toxicity to FU remain underdeveloped, with a high percentage of false-negative predictions because of the absence of a comprehensive molecular approach that could account for all elements associated with FU toxicity (genetic, epigenetic, and non-genetic), including impairment of cell signaling pathways and/or DNA damage response, which may significantly influence the cellular response to FU.”

There is also an extensive body of literature that demonstrates the complexity of predicting response to chemotherapeutic agents. For example, both Ogura and Kralovanszky et al. demonstrated that a relatively small proportion of patients with deficiencies in DPYD enzyme activity had a molecular basis. Ciccoline et al. demonstrated that in no cases of 5-FU-associated toxicity, with drug exposures up to 15 times higher than in the non-toxic population, were mutations in the most common DPD mutation found, including those with the most severe or lethal toxicities.

Another issue of concern is the poor predictive value of biomarkers in individual patients. That is, if TheraGuide 5-FU (or similar genotyping) is used across a broad spectrum of patients who are scheduled to undergo 5-FU-based chemotherapy, the test will likely fail to predict many severe toxic responses to chemotherapy and call many who would not have gone on to have severe toxic responses as likely toxic responders. This notion is born out in the Schwab et al. study. Test performance, as measured by patient survival, could vary immensely depending on the way it is applied in the clinic.

If patient survival is considered a primary outcome, then it may be important to consider that adjuvant 5-FU agents have a relatively small impact on survival in many current chemotherapy regimens. Thus, the biggest impact this testing may have is on reduction of 5-FU-related toxicity; if predictive value of the tests is high enough.

A large body of evidence suggest both a possible role along with substantial questions about genotyping of DPYD and TYMS in prediction of FU toxicity. The weight of the evidence suggests that such testing would likely have poor predictive value of toxicity, and little is known of its value in prediction of patient survival. No published literature currently exists whereby the TheraGuide 5-FU test has been used to predict FU-based toxicity; thus, its usefulness remains unproven.

Review of the literature in mid-2016 continues to find clear association between DPYD variants and the Fluoropyrimidine toxicity that affect 10–30% of cancer patients that receive these drugs. In addition, mounting evidence about the utility and cost effectiveness were found as well.

Utility was seen in a study by Lunenburg et al. in 2016 who prospectively genotyped 275 patients for DPYD prior to their first fluoropyrimidine treatment and found 5% had variants the required a 25–50% dose reductions. None of these patients developed toxicity. A larger, prospective, multi-center study was conducted by Deenen et al. in 2016 on 2038 patients and variants were found in 1% of patients who were dose adjusted. In this group the risk of grade III toxicity was significantly reduced to 28% compared to 73% in historical controls ($p < 0.001$) and the drug induced rate was reduced from 10% to 0.

The group also evaluated the cost-effectiveness and found that the overall cost for screening was less than for usual care. Another cost simulation study by Cortejoso et al. in 2016 also argue that testing of 1000 patients at their center will be cost-effective in preventing neutropenia given their costs for genotyping and treatment of neutropenia given the published rates of neutropenia.

The Lunenburg reviewed concluded that there is “convincing evidence to implement prospective DPYD genotyping with an upfront dose adjustment in DPD deficient patients. Immediate benefit in patient care can be expected through decreasing toxicity, while maintaining efficacy.”

Although none of the studies they cite were randomized, they point out that such studies have been attempted but have been halted due to deaths in the standard care arm, suggesting that randomized control studies will not be forthcoming (and serving as further argument for the utility of this testing).

Billing/Coding Information

Genetic Testing: 5-Fluorouracil Testing in Cancer Patients, **continued**

CPT CODES

81232	DPYD (dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase) (eg, 5-fluorouracil/5-FU and capecitabine drug metabolism), gene analysis, common variant(s) (eg, *2A, *4, *5, *6)
81346	TYMS (thymidylate synthetase) (eg, 5-fluorouracil/5-FU drug metabolism), gene analysis, common variant(s) (eg, tandem repeat variant)
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

HCPCS CODES

G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report
S3722	Dose optimization by area under the curve (AUC) analysis, for infusional 5-fluorouracil

Key References

1. American Cancer Society. (2010) What is Cancer? Last Update: 2010. American Cancer Society. Available: http://www.cancer.org/Cancer/CancerBasics/what-is-cancer. Date Accessed: August 10, 2010.
2. Bocci G, Barbara C, Vannozzi F, et al. "A pharmacokinetic-based test to prevent severe 5-fluorouracil toxicity." Clin Pharmacol Ther 80.4 (2006): 384-95.
3. Boisdron-Celle M, Remaud G, Traore S, et al. "5-Fluorouracil-related severe toxicity: a comparison of different methods for the pretherapeutic detection of dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase deficiency." Cancer Lett 249.2 (2007): 271-82.
4. Caudle, K. E., et al. (2013). "Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium guidelines for dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase genotype and fluoropyrimidine dosing." Clin Pharmacol Ther 94(6): 640-645.
5. Chemotherapy.com. (2010) Understanding Cancer. Last Update: May 12, 2009. Chemotherapy.com. Available: http://www.chemotherapy.com/understanding_cancer/understanding_cancer.jsp. Date Accessed: August 10, 2010.
6. Ciccolini J, Mercier C, Evrard A, et al. "A rapid and inexpensive method for anticipating severe toxicity to fluorouracil and fluorouracil-based chemotherapy." Ther Drug Monit 28.5 (2006): 678-85.
7. Clark J, Grothey A. Systemic chemotherapy for nonoperable metastatic colorectal cancer: Treatment recommendations. November 1, 2007. Available: http://www.utdol.com/online/content/topic.do?topicKey=gicancer/25691&selectedTitle=1~150&source=search_result. Date Accessed: May 20, 2008.
8. Clark, JW, Grothey, A. (2010) Systemic chemotherapy for nonoperable metastatic colorectal cancer: Treatment recommendations. 18.2. Last Update: June 16, 2010. UpToDate. Available: http://www.uptodate.com/online/content/topic.do?topicKey=gicancer/25691&selectedTitle=1~150&source=search_result. Date Accessed: August 20, 2010.
9. Cortejoso, L., X. Garcia-Gonzalez, M. I. Garcia, P. Garcia-Alfonso, M. Sanjurjo and L. A. Lopez-Fernandez (2016). "Cost-effectiveness of screening for DPYD polymorphisms to prevent neutropenia in cancer patients treated with fluoropyrimidines." Pharmacogenomics 17(9): 979-984.
10. Deenen, M. J., D. Meulendijks, A. Cats, M. K. Sechterberger, J. L. Severens, H. Boot, P. H. Smits, H. Rosing, C. M. Mandigers, M. Soesan, J. H. Beijnen and J. H. Schellens (2016). "Upfront Genotyping of DPYD*2A to Individualize Fluoropyrimidine Therapy: A Safety and Cost Analysis." J Clin Oncol 34(3): 227-234.
11. Di Paolo A, Lencioni M, Amatori F, et al. "5-Fluorouracil Pharmacokinetics Predicts Disease-free Survival in Patients Administered Adjuvant Chemotherapy for Colorectal Cancer." Clin Cancer Res 14.9 (2008): 2749-55.
12. Diasio RB, Johnson MR. "The role of pharmacogenetics and pharmacogenomics in cancer chemotherapy with 5-fluorouracil." Pharmacology 61.3 (2000): 199-203.
13. Ezzeldin HH, Diasio RB. "Predicting fluorouracil toxicity: can we finally do it?" J Clin Oncol 26.13 (2008): 2080-2.
14. Fourie J, Mattison LK, Wood TE, Posey JA, III, Modak A, Diasio RB. "The 2-13C-5-fluorouracil breath test (FUBT) as a novel, rapid method for assessment of dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase (DPD) activity in cancer patients: Initial characterization and comparison to the 2-13C-uracil breath test (UraBT)." J Clin Oncol (Meeting Abstracts) 25.18_suppl (2007): 2551-.
15. Gamelin, E, Boisdron-Celle, M, Delva, R, et al. (1998). Long-term weekly treatment of colorectal metastatic cancer with fluorouracil and leucovorin: results of a multicentric prospective trial of fluorouracil dosage optimization by pharmacokinetic monitoring in 152 patients. J Clin Oncol 16.4: 1470-8.
16. Gamelin, E, Delva, R, Jacob, J, et al. (2008). Individual fluorouracil dose adjustment based on pharmacokinetic follow-up compared with conventional dosage: results of a multicenter randomized trial of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol 26.13: 2099-105.
17. Gamelin, EC, Danquechin-Dorval, EM, Dumesnil, YF, et al. (1996). Relationship between 5-fluorouracil (5-FU) dose intensity and therapeutic response in patients with advanced colorectal cancer receiving infusional therapy containing 5-FU. Cancer 77.3: 441-51.
18. Iacopetta B. "Methyl-group metabolism and the response of colorectal cancer to 5-fluorouracil." Crit Rev Oncog 12.1-2 (2006): 115-26.
19. Ichikawa W, Takahashi T, Suto K, Sasaki Y, Hirayama R. "Orotate phosphoribosyltransferase gene polymorphism predicts toxicity in patients treated with bolus 5-fluorouracil regimen." Clin Cancer Res 12.13 (2006): 3928-34.
20. Ichikawa W. "Prediction of clinical outcome of fluoropyrimidine-based chemotherapy for gastric cancer patients, in terms of the 5-fluorouracil metabolic pathway." Gastric Cancer 9.3 (2006): 145-55.

21. Jatoi A, Martenson JA, Foster NR, et al. "Paclitaxel, carboplatin, 5-fluorouracil, and radiation for locally advanced esophageal cancer: phase II results of preliminary pharmacologic and molecular efforts to mitigate toxicity and predict outcomes: North Central Cancer Treatment Group (N0044)." Am J Clin Oncol 30.5 (2007): 507-13.
22. Kaldate, R. R., A. Haregewoin, et al. (2012). "Modeling the 5-fluorouracil area under the curve versus dose relationship to develop a pharmacokinetic dosing algorithm for colorectal cancer patients receiving FOLFOX6." Oncologist 17(3): 296-302.
23. Kralovanszky J, Adleff V, Hitre E, et al. "[Pharmacogenetic studies on the prediction of efficacy and toxicity of fluoropyrimidine-based adjuvant therapy in colorectal cancer]." Magy Onkol 51.2 (2007): 113-25.
24. Lawrence, S, Ahnen, D. (2005) Clinical Manifestations, diagnosis, and staging of colorectal cancer. Last Update. UptoDate. Available: http://www.uptodate.com/online/content/topic.do?topicKey=gicancer/2111&selectedTitle=1~150&source=search_result. Date Accessed: August 20, 2010.
25. Little J, Sharp L. "Colorectal neoplasia and genetic polymorphisms associated with folate metabolism." Eur J Cancer Prev 11.1 (2002): 105-10.
26. Lunenburg, C. A., L. M. Henricks, H. J. Guchelaar, J. J. Swen, M. J. Deenen, J. H. Schellens and H. Gelderblom (2016). "Prospective DPYD genotyping to reduce the risk of fluoropyrimidine-induced severe toxicity: Ready for prime time." Eur J Cancer 54: 40-48.
27. Lunenburg, C. A., M. C. van Staveren, H. Gelderblom, H. J. Guchelaar and J. J. Swen (2016). "Evaluation of clinical implementation of prospective DPYD genotyping in 5-fluorouracil- or capecitabine-treated patients." Pharmacogenomics 17(7): 721-729.
28. Marsh S, McLeod HL. "Cancer pharmacogenetics." Br J Cancer 90.1 (2004): 8-11.
29. Martinez-Balibrea E, Abad A, Aranda E, et al. "Pharmacogenetic approach for capecitabine or 5-fluorouracil selection to be combined with oxaliplatin as first-line chemotherapy in advanced colorectal cancer." Eur J Cancer 44.9 (2008): 1229-1237.
30. Matsui T, Omura K, Kawakami K, Morita S, Sakamoto J. "Genotype of thymidylate synthase likely to affect efficacy of adjuvant 5-FU based chemotherapy in colon cancer." Oncol Rep 16.5 (2006): 1111-5.
31. Matzakos, TL, S. (2010) Epidemiology and risk factors for colorectal cancer. Last Update. Up to DateDate Accessed: August 20, 2010,
32. Mercier, C, Ciccolini, J. (2006). Profiling dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase deficiency in patients with cancer undergoing 5-fluorouracil/capecitabine therapy. Clin Colorectal Cancer 6.4: 288-96.
33. Myriad Genetics. A test to predict toxicity to 5-FU/capecitabine-based chemotherapy. 2008. Available: http://www.myriadtests.com/hcp/about_theraguide.php. Date Accessed: May 9, 2008.
34. Myriad. (2010) OnDose Frequently Asked Questions. Last Update: 2010. Myriad. Available: http://www.myriadtests.com/index.php?page_id=312. Date Accessed: August 10, 2010.
35. Nishioka M, Miyamoto H, Kurita N, et al. "Pyrimidine nucleoside phosphorylase and dihydropyrimidine dihydrogenase activities as predictive factors for the efficacy of doxifluridine together with mitomycin C as adjuvant chemotherapy in primary colorectal cancer." Hepatogastroenterology 54.76 (2007): 1089-93.
36. Nordgard SH, Alnaes GI, Hihn B, et al. "Pathway based analysis of SNPs with relevance to 5-FU therapy: relation to intratumoral mRNA expression and survival." Int J Cancer 123.3 (2008): 577-85.
37. Offer, S. M., et al. (2014). "Comparative functional analysis of DPYD variants of potential clinical relevance to dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase activity." Cancer Res 74(9): 2545-2554.
38. Ogura K. "[Dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase activity and its genetic aberrations]." Gan To Kagaku Ryoho 33.8 (2006): 1041-8.
39. Ploylearmsaeng SA, Fuhr U, Jetter A. "How may anticancer chemotherapy with fluorouracil be individualised?" Clin Pharmacokinet 45.6 (2006): 567-92.
40. Roche Laboratories I. "Patient information-Xeloda." (2008).
41. Saif, M. W. (2013). "Dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase gene (DPYD) polymorphism among Caucasian and non-Caucasian patients with 5-FU- and capecitabine-related toxicity using full sequencing of DPYD." Cancer Genomics Proteomics 10(2): 89-92.
42. Saif, M. W., et al. (2013). "Bolus 5-fluorouracil as an alternative in patients with cardiotoxicity associated with infusion 5-fluorouracil and capecitabine: a case series." In Vivo 27(4): 531-534.Wilhelm, M., L. Mueller, M. C. Miller, K. Link, S. Holdenrieder, T. Bertsch, V. Kunzmann, O. J. Stoetzer, I. Suttmann, J. Braess, J. Birkmann, M. Roessler, B. Moritz, S. Kraff, S. J. Salamone and U. Jaehde (2016). "Prospective, Multicenter Study of 5-Fluorouracil Therapeutic Drug Monitoring in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer Treated in Routine Clinical Practice." Clin Colorectal Cancer.
43. Saif, MW, Choma, A, Salamone, SJ, et al. (2009). Pharmacokinetically guided dose adjustment of 5-fluorouracil: a rational approach to improving therapeutic outcomes. J Natl Cancer Inst 101.22: 1543-52.
44. Schwab M, Zanger UM, Marx C, et al. "Role of genetic and nongenetic factors for fluorouracil treatment-related severe toxicity: a prospective clinical trial by the German 5-FU Toxicity Study Group." J Clin Oncol 26.13 (2008): 2131-8.
45. Technology Evaluation Center. (2010) Special Report: Laboratory Testing to Allow Area Under the Curve (AUC) –Targeted 5-Fluorouracil Dosing for Patients Administered Chemotherapy for Cancer. June.
46. Terrazzino S, Agostini M, Pucciarelli S, et al. "A haplotype of the methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase gene predicts poor tumor response in rectal cancer patients receiving preoperative chemoradiation." Pharmacogenet Genomics 16.11 (2006): 817-24.
47. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Label information Xeloda (capecitabine). 2015. www.fda.gov.
48. van Kuilenburg AB, Haasjes J, Richel DJ, et al. "Clinical implications of dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase (DPD) deficiency in patients with severe 5-fluorouracil-associated toxicity: identification of new mutations in the DPD gene." Clin Cancer Res 6.12 (2000): 4705-12.
49. van Kuilenburg AB. "Screening for dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase deficiency: to do or not to do, that's the question." Cancer Invest 24.2 (2006): 215-7.
50. Walko, CM, McLeod, HL. (2008). Will we ever be ready for blood level-guided therapy? J Clin Oncol 26.13: 2078-9.
51. Ychou, M, Duffour, J, Kramar, A, et al. (2003). Individual 5-FU dose adaptation in metastatic colorectal cancer: results of a phase II study using a bimonthly pharmacokinetically intensified LV5FU2 regimen. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol 52.4: 282-90.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are

Genetic Testing: 5-Fluorouracil Testing in Cancer Patients, **continued**

determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: AGE-RELATED MACULAR DEGENERATION

Policy # 530

Implementation Date: 6/27/13
Review Dates: 4/17/14, 5/7/15, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 7/18/18, 4/14/19, 3/7/23
Revision Dates: 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:

#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Age-related macular degeneration (AMD) is a progressive eye disorder most often found in individuals over age 50. Age, family history, and gender are the most common variables contributing to its development. It is a major cause of blindness and visual impairment in older adults (age > 50 years). There are two types of AMD: wet and dry. Central geographic atrophy, the "dry" form of advanced AMD, results from atrophy of the retinal pigment epithelial layer below the retina, which causes vision loss through loss of photoreceptors (rods and cones) in the central part of the eye. No medical or surgical treatment is available for this condition. Neovascular or exudative AMD, the "wet" form of advanced AMD, causes vision loss due to abnormal growth of fragile and leaky blood vessels in the macula. Several intraocular therapies have been approved in recent years to treat this condition. These therapies may slow the vision loss through their reduction in new blood vessel production and associated macular edema

Several genetic tests have been developed to assess for the potential development of 'wet' AMD or the probability of it progressing. These include Macula risk, RetnaGene, deCode Complete Scna, and 23andMe; ARUP provides a test as well. These differ in the number of genetic markers as well as the methods used for calculation of risk. The macula test uses four gene markers as well as smoking history to predict the risk of advance AMD and categorize them into five risk factors (one to five, with five being the highest). RetnaGene test uses 13 single nucleotide polymorphisms in the major AMD gene and is specific for risk of the neovascular form of AMD. Risk score is ranked high, medium, and low. Decode genetics offers a genetic test as part of a complete scan for 50 different conditions. The 23andMe test is a retail product for the general population.

RetnaGene (marketed by Sequenom Labs) is a laboratory-developed genetic test that evaluates the risk of patients with early or intermediate AMD progressing to advance choroidal neovascular disease within 2, 5, and 10 years. The test is done by either a blood sample or swabbing the inside of the cheek. It combines a patient's disease stage with genetic predisposition, age, and smoking history to provide the probability of converting to "wet" AMD.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

SelectHealth does NOT cover genetic testing for age-related macular edema. It is considered experimental/investigational due to the lack of demonstrated clinical utility.

Genetic Testing: Age-Related Macular Degeneration, **continued**

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Laboratory-developed genetic testing evaluates the risk of patients with early or intermediate age-related macular degeneration (AMD). These tests are done by either a blood sample or swabbing the inside of the cheek. It combines a patient's disease stage with genetic predisposition, age, and smoking history to provide the probability of converting to AMD. Studies demonstrating the value of predictive testing for AMD are limited. Published studies have not identified the clinical validity or clinical utility of genetic testing in predicting the speed of advancement of AMD in those already at increased risk based on age or early evidence of AMD. This concept has been validated in a study by Hagstrom et al. in 2013. This study analyzed 834 patients; each patient was genotyped for the four genetic variants that are associated with AMD. After one year of treatment, researchers compared genotypic frequencies to therapeutic response. The study determined the genetic tests didn't serve a significant purpose helping with treatment.

Ivana et al. also reviewed genetic testing for AMD. This study found that at the present time there does not appear to be significant ethical, legal, and social implications of genetic testing for AMD, but should only be considered for early stage disease and not for young pre-symptomatic individuals. However, it was possible to assess the risk of advanced AMD without necessarily doing the genetic test and continue to explore how the results of testing will be applied to the management of patients with AMD.

In addition to the lack of definitive published evidence, statements from specialty societies regarding the use of genetic testing for AMD do not support this testing. All saying similar statements, for example, the American Academy of Ophthalmology (AAO) has reiterated its position that eye physicians and surgeons should avoid genetic testing on age-related macular degeneration (AMD). They request testing avoidance until specific trials have shown a benefit of its use. Recommending genotyping of such patients should only be for research studies because this genetic testing has not been shown to prove a clinical outcome.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0205U	Ophthalmology (age-related macular degeneration), analysis of 3 gene variants (2 CFH gene, 1 ARMS2 gene), using PCR and MALDI-TOF, buccal swab, reported as positive or negative for neovascular age-related macular-degeneration risk associated with zinc supplements
81401	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 2 (eg, 2-10 SNPs, 1 methylated variant, or 1 somatic variant [typically using nonsequencing target variant analysis], or detection of a dynamic mutation disorder/triplet repeat)
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

Genetic Testing: Age-Related Macular Degeneration, **continued**

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. AMD Genetic Testing Should Be Avoided for Now http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/774555
2. AMD Risk Factors http://www.aaofoundation.org/what/AMD/RiskFactors.cfm
3. American Academy of Ophthalmology Discourages Genetic Testing for Age-Related Macular Degeneration http://www.aao.org/newsroom/release/20121111d.cfm
4. Assel MJ, Li F, Wang Y, Allen AS, Baggerly KA, Vickers AJ. *Ophthalmology*, 2018 Mar;125(3):391-397. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2017.09.008. Epub; 2017, Oct 9.
5. DeAngelis MM, Silveira AC, Carr EA, Kim IK. Genetics of age-related macular degeneration: current concepts, future directions. *Semin Ophthalmol*, 2011, May 26; (3):77-93.
6. Genetic Testing for AMD Inches Forward http://www.revophth.com/content/d/retina/c/35327/
7. http://www.revoptom.com/cmsdocuments/2013/4/0413_retinaguide.pdf
8. RetnaGene AMD http://www.sequenomcmm.com/Home/health-care-providers/AMD
9. Risk Factors for Age-Related Macular Degeneration http://www.medscape.org/viewarticle/532642
10. Stone, E. M. (2015). "Genetic testing for age-related macular degeneration: not indicated now." *JAMA Ophthalmol*, 133(5): 598-600.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: APOLIPOPROTEIN (APOE) TESTING

Policy # 339

Implementation Date: 4/19/07
Review Dates: 4/24/08, 4/26/09, 5/19/11, 6/21/12, 5/7/15, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 6/21/18, 4/12/19, 2/14/23
Revision Dates: 2/18/10, 5/29/13, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:

#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Dementia is a disorder that is characterized by impairment of memory and at least one other cognitive domain (aphasia, apraxia, agnosia, executive function). The term dementia does not imply a specific cause or pathologic process. Indeed, symptoms of dementia may arise from a number of etiologies. This policy addresses genetic testing for Alzheimer's and frontotemporal dementias.

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is the most common form of dementia in the elderly, accounting for 60% to 80% of cases, and it is estimated to affect more than 4.2−5.8 million Americans. Because of increased life expectancy, the number of people living with AD is expected to triple.

Four major types of familial AD have been identified. Types 1, 3, and 4 are classified as early-onset AD because their signs and symptoms appear before age 65. Of early onset cases, 61% have a family history of AD (i.e., early onset familial Alzheimer's disease [EOFAD]) and less than 2% of all AD cases can be attributed to EOFAD. The diagnosis of EOFAD is made in families with multiple cases of AD in which the mean age of onset is before age 60−65 years. Type 2 AD is classified as late-onset AD because its signs and symptoms appear after age 65. Other than age of onset, these 2 forms of AD present very similarly.

Frontotemporal dementia (FTD) is a heterogeneous term for spectrum of diagnoses that includes disorders such as Pick's disease, progressive non-fluent aphasia, semantic dementia, FTD with Parkinsonism-17, FTD/motor-neuron disease, and progressive supranuclear palsy. FTD is characterized by focal atrophy of the frontal and temporal lobes in the absence of Alzheimer pathology. Onset usually occurs between the ages of 35−75 years, and only rarely after age 75; the mean age of onset is the sixth decade. The exact prevalence is unknown, though some estimates place FTD at 10% of dementia cases.

Clinically, the disorder presents in a variety of ways, but 2 signs are typically associated with FTD: 1) gradual and progressive behavioral change, and 2) gradual and progressive language dysfunction. The most common presenting symptom is word-finding difficulty. However, decreased fluency or hesitancy in producing speech, difficulty with language comprehension, and motor speech difficulties (e.g., dysarthria) are also common.

Coronary heart disease risk assessment is another clinical circumstance in which ApoE is being used. ApoE plays a key role in lipoprotein metabolism and cardiovascular disease, which remove excess cholesterol from the blood and transports cholesterol to the liver for processing. ApoE genetic testing has been proposed for use in predicting risk of cardiovascular disease (e.g., heart attack, stroke) hyperlipoproteinemia type III, and therapy response. Testing for ApoE may sometimes be ordered to help guide lipid treatment. In cases of high cholesterol and triglyceride levels, statins are usually considered the treatment of choice to decrease the risk of developing CVD; however, there is a wide variability in the response to these lipid-lowering drugs that is in part influenced by the Apo E genotype. Some evidence

suggests though appropriately responsive to a low-fat diet, people with ApoE e4 may be less likely than those with ApoE e2 to respond to statins by decreasing their levels of LDL-C and may require adjustments to their treatment plans. At present, the clinical utility of this type of information is yet to be totally understood. Dietary adjustment and statin drugs are the preferred agents for lipid-lowering therapy.

ApoE testing may also be ordered occasionally to help diagnose type III hyperlipoproteinemia in a person with symptoms that suggest the disorder and to evaluate the potential for the condition in other family members.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

SelectHealth does NOT cover genetic testing for Alzheimer's disease or *any* type of dementia. This meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

SelectHealth does NOT cover Apolipoprotein E (apoE) testing for assessing increased risk of cardiovascular disease. This meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Alzheimer's disease. The early-onset forms of AD (types 1, 3, and 4) are inherited in an autosomal dominant pattern (i.e., 1 copy of the altered gene in each cell is sufficient to cause the disorder). In most cases, an affected person inherits the altered gene from one affected parent. Researchers have identified three missense gene mutations that cause these forms of AD: the APP gene on chromosome 21 (21q21), the PSEN1 gene on chromosome 14 (14q24.3), and the PSEN2 gene on chromosome 1 (1q31-q42). Penetrance for these genes is around 100%.

The APP gene codes for the amyloid precursor protein and the PSEN1 and PSEN2 genes code for the presenilin-1 and presenilin-2 proteins, respectively. These proteins are part of a process in which amyloid precursor protein is cut into smaller segments (peptides). One of these peptides, soluble amyloid precursor protein (sAPP), has growth-promoting properties and may play a role in the formation of nerve cells in both embryonic and adult brain tissue.

More than 140 PSEN1 mutations have been identified in patients with type 3 AD and approximately 11 PSEN2 mutations have been shown to cause type 4 AD. At least 22 APP mutations have been described in patients with type 1 AD. Mutations to these genes appear to negatively affect the processing of amyloid precursor protein, which leads to increased production of amyloid beta peptide, which can build up in the

brain and form the amyloid plaques characteristic of AD. Amyloid plaques may lead to the death of nerve cells and the progressive signs and symptoms of this disorder.

PSEN1 mutations account for 30%−70% of cases of early-onset familial AD. PSEN2 mutations account for less than 5% of early-onset familial AD cases. APP mutations are responsible for about 2%−15% of all early-onset familial AD cases. Kindreds with autosomal dominant EOFAD with no identifiable mutations in the PSEN1, PSEN2, or APP genes have been described; thus, it is likely that other causative genes will be identified. Penetrance of PSEN1 is 100% by age 65. Penetrance of PSEN2 is 95%.

The genetic causes of late-onset (type 2) familial AD are less clear. This disorder is likely related to mutations in one or more risk factor genes in combination with lifestyle and environmental factors. Mutations to the APOE gene on chromosome 19 (19q13.2) are associated with increased risk for late-onset familial AD. The APOE gene codes for apolipoprotein E and packages and transports cholesterol (and other fats) through the bloodstream, and then delivers them to the appropriate locations in the body for processing and use. Apolipoprotein E is a major component of very low-density lipoproteins (VLDLs), which remove excess cholesterol from the blood to the liver for processing.

There are 3 common APOE alleles (ε2, ε3, ε4) and 6 possible genotypes. Evidence for a genetic risk factor in late onset AD is strongest for the ε4 allele of APOE. The APOE ε4 allele is associated with an increased number of amyloid plaques in the brain tissue of people with AD. There appears to be a dose-response effect of ε4: each additional copy is associated with an increased risk of AD and earlier age of onset; 68 years in ε4 homozygotes, 77 years for heterozygotes, and about 85 years for no ε4 allele. However, while the APOE ε4 allele conveys an increased risk of developing AD, not all people with AD disease have the ε4 allele, nor will all people with the ε4 allele develop the disease. APOE mutations appear to predispose to the psychiatric complications associated with AD and ε4 may also affect the risk for development of vascular dementia.

A 2003 Hayes Directory on gene mutations portending risk for AD concluded that genetic testing for APP and Presenilin mutations has utility in suspected cases of early onset AD but that testing is of limited additional clinical value in young (under age 50) symptomatic patients with a confirmed autosomal dominant family history of AD. The review also gave a 'B' rating for use of this testing to predict risk for AD in asymptomatic patients younger than 50 with a confirmed history of early-onset AD. The basis for the 'B' rating lies in the benefits conferred by a positive test result; namely, that such information affords patients the luxury of making health and family decisions in the context of almost certain disease risk. No literature has been published which suggests that genetic testing for early onset AD has any impact on clinical management of the disease.

The genetic causes of late-onset (type 2) familial AD are less clear. This disorder is likely related to mutations in one or more risk factor genes in combination with lifestyle and environmental factors. Mutations to the APOE gene on chromosome 19 (19q13.2) are associated with increased risk for late-onset familial AD. There are 3 common APOE alleles (ε2, ε3, ε4) and 6 possible genotypes. Evidence for a genetic risk factor in late onset AD is strongest for the ε4 allele of APOE. The APOE ε4 allele is associated with an increased number of amyloid plaques in the brain tissue of people with AD. There appears to be a dose-response effect of ε4: each additional copy is associated with an increased risk of AD and earlier age of onset; 68 years in ε4 homozygotes, 77 years for heterozygotes, and about 85 years for no ε4 allele. However, while the APOE ε4 allele conveys an increased risk of developing AD, not all people with AD disease have the ε4 allele, nor will all people with the ε4 allele develop the disease.

The literature offers minimal support for genetic testing for APOE alleles either to diagnose AD or identify persons at risk for developing the disease. While the literature suggests a potential use of APOE genotyping to predict the rate of cognitive decline or treatment response AD patients, the research is not consistent in this area. A positive APOE test may also provide confirmatory evidence of an AD diagnosis, but there is little evidence to suggest that such information would have any impact on subsequent treatment decisions. Given the high prevalence of ε4 alleles in the population, APOE genotyping in asymptomatic individuals, is unlikely to further clarify an individual's risk for AD over other information such as family history or cognitive test results. Consequently, APOE genetic testing is more appropriately used in a research context as opposed to a clinical tool for diagnosing AD.

The American College of Medical Genetics practice guideline for genetic testing in Alzheimer's disease (Goldman et al) recommends against testing for APOE alleles. If a genetic cause for EOAD is found, its clinical utility is debatable since there are no medical treatments for EOAD. However, it may be beneficial for asymptomatic individuals in the same family to be tested (for planning purposes) and on a societal level identifying individuals with these known mutations may allow participation in research studies or

trials to try and discover more about causes/treatments for AD. A case for testing in families with autosomal AD and possible parameters/guidelines are in the ACMG guideline (Goldman et al).

Frontotemporal Dementia. While 40%−50% of FTD patients have some family history of dementia or neurodegenerative disease, only 5%−10% of FTD patients have a family history suggestive of an autosomal dominant pattern of inheritance, i.e. a clear pattern of FTD-type diagnoses being passed from parent to child, with virtually every patient having an affected parent and each child of an affected person having a 50% chance to inherit the disorder. The age of onset can often be younger with familial and inherited forms of FTD (30s and 40s) and the disease may progress more rapidly.

Mutations of the microtubule-associated protein tau (MAPT) gene on chromosome 17 (17q21-22) are responsible for about 10% of familial FTD cases but up to 50% of autosomal dominant FTD. MAPT codes for the tau protein. Thirty to 40 different MAPT mutations causing FTD have been identified most of which are located between exons 9 and 13. Mutations form mutant tau proteins in cells or change the proportion of the forms of tau normally expressed in the brain. These changes promote tau aggregation into filaments and harm the ability of tau to bind to microtubules.

MAPT mutations are associated with one inherited form of FTD called Frontotemporal Dementia with Parkinsonism-17 (FTDP-17). MAPT mutations account for approximately 70% of autosomal dominant FTDP-17 and 33% of cases with a positive family history.

In some families with frontotemporal dementia showing with an inheritance pattern suggestive of linkage to chromosome 17q21.1, neither mutations in the MAPT gene nor tau pathology at neuropathologic examination has been found. Moreover, heterogeneity in clinical presentation is observed even within families with the same MAPT mutation. These findings suggest that additional gene mutations and other risk factors likely play a role in development of FTD and its phenotypic expression. Indeed, recent studies point to mutations of the progranulin gene as playing some role in the development of sporadic ubiquitin-associated FTD.

The primary literature on genetic testing for FTD is still in the early stages with articles focused primarily on describing genetic mutations. Although there are no systematic reviews on genetic testing and FTD, several literature reviews have been published, which summarize the extant research on the genetics of FTD and the clinical utility of testing. These reviews suggest several conclusions about the state of genetic testing for FTD:

- FTD is a complex disorder with a heterogeneous presentation and poorly understood neuropathology. Knowledge about the genetics of this disorder is rapidly emerging.
- Persons with a family history of dementia or neurodegenerative disorders are at higher risk for developing FTD than the general population. Individuals with a clear history of FTD are at extremely high risk.
- Tau pathology occurs in a percentage FTD cases and is particularly common in persons with an autosomal dominant pattern of FTD.
- MAPT mutations linked to tau pathology are associated with FTD, particularly among persons with a family history of autosomal dominant FTD. Goldman et al. estimates the risk of having a tau mutation to be 80% in persons with more than three family members with a history of fulminate FTD.
- The penetrance of the many MAPT mutations is variable, though penetrance of some may be 100%.
- Many additional genes and other risk factors likely play a role in the development of FTD and its phenotypic expression.
- For a particularly rare form of FTD, FTDP-17, genetic testing for certain MAPT mutations may be informative.
- The clinical utility of genetic testing for FTD in most patients with dementia has not been established.

A literature review performed in February 2010 identified a study by Mihaescu at al. recognized that genotyping is not considered useful for screening, presymptomatic testing, or diagnosing Alzheimer’s disease. They concluded their study by stating “Most research on genome-based applications in AD is still in the first phase of the translational research framework, which means that massive research is still needed before their implementation can be considered.”

Apolipoprotein E (apoE) testing for risk of coronary heart disease. Multiple studies and reviews have evaluated the relationship between apo E genotypes (particularly the apo E4 allele) and both LDL-cholesterol and the incidence of CHD. However, these reports may have been both underpowered to detect the true relationship and also subject to publication bias. The largest meta-analysis of the impact of the presence of the apo E allele on LDL-cholesterol levels and CHD risk came to the conclusions that there was an approximately linear relationship of apoE genotypes (when ordered E2/E2, E2/E3, E3/E3, E3/E4, and E4/E4) with LDL-cholesterol. There was a weakly inverse relationship of these genotypes with HDL-cholesterol level and a non-linear relationship with triglycerides, with the E3/E3 genotype having the lowest triglyceride levels. The lack of predictability in use of ApoE as a screening test for clinically defined atherosclerotic disease was also verified in systematic review published in 2002. The study suggests that apoE genotype may be related with lipid levels and CAD but is probably not useful in providing additional clinically relevant information beyond established risk factors. Apo E is considered not an effective predictor of CAD, when compared to other established procedures.

Similarly, the role of apolipoprotein E (APOE) phenotypes in cerebrovascular disease and ischemic stroke is unsettled. This apolipoprotein is a ligand for hepatic chylomicron and VLDL remnant receptors, leading to clearance of these lipoproteins from the circulation, and for LDL receptors. The APOE e4 allele has been reported to be a stroke risk factor in some but not other studies.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

81401	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 2

HCPCS CODES

S3852	DNA analysis for APOE epsilon 4 allele for susceptibility to Alzheimer's disease
0355U	APOL1 (apolipoprotein L1) (eg, chronic kidney disease), risk variants (G1, G2)

Key References

1. Aggarwal NT, Wilson RS, Beck TL, Bienias JL, Berry-Kravis E, Bennett DA. The apolipoprotein E epsilon4 allele and incident Alzheimer's disease in persons with mild cognitive impairment. Neurocase 11.1 (2005): 3-7.
2. Babic T, Mahovic Lakusic D, Sertic J, Petrovecki M, Stavljenic-Rukavina A. ApoE genotyping and response to galanthamine in Alzheimer's disease--a real life retrospective study. Coll Antropol 28.1 (2004): 199-204.
3. Basun H, Corder EH, Guo Z, Lannfelt L, Corder LS, Manton KG, Winblad B, Viitanen M Apolipoprotein E polymorphism and stroke in a population sample aged 75 years or more. Stroke. 1996;27(8):1310.
4. Bennet AM, Di Angelantonio E, Ye Z, Wensley F, Dahlin A, Ahlbom A, Keavney B, Collins R, Wiman B, de Faire U, Danesh J Association of apolipoprotein E genotypes with lipid levels and coronary risk. JAMA. 2007;298(11):1300.
5. Bird TD. Alzheimer Disease Overview. 2005. GeneClinics. Available: http://geneclinics.org/servlet/access?db=geneclinics&site=gt&id=8888891&key=SYm8NGkWWp5MZ&gry=&fcn=y&fw=qqcl&filename=/profiles/alzheimer/index.html. Date Accessed: January 30, 2007.
6. Bird TD. Early-Onset Familial Alzheimer Disease. 2005. GeneClinics. Available: http://geneclinics.org/servlet/access?db=geneclinics&site=gt&id=8888891&key=UsiYldmu9bVP8&gry=&fcn=y&fw=jbhN&filename=/profiles/alzheimer-early/index.html. Date Accessed: December 19, 2006.
7. Bizzarro A, Marra C, Acciarri A, et al. Apolipoprotein E epsilon4 allele differentiates the clinical response to donepezil in Alzheimer's disease. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 20.4 (2005): 254-61.
8. Berkely HeartLab Apolipoprotein E (apoE) Genotype for Cardiovascular Disease Management http://www.bhlinc.com/clinicians/clinical-references/reference-manual/chapter19
9. Bunce D, Fratiglioni L, Small BJ, Winblad B, Backman L. APOE and cognitive decline in preclinical Alzheimer disease and non-demented aging. Neurology 63.5 (2004): 816-21.
10. Casas JP, Hingorani AD, Bautista LE, Sharma P Meta-analysis of genetic studies in ischemic stroke: thirty-two genes involving approximately 18,000 cases and 58,000 controls. Arch Neurol. 2004;61(11):1652.
11. Caselli RJ, Reiman EM, Osborne D, et al. Longitudinal changes in cognition and behavior in asymptomatic carriers of the APOE e4 allele. Neurology 62.11 (2004): 1990-5.
12. Cervilla J, Prince M, Joels S, Lovestone S, Mann A. Premorbid cognitive testing predicts the onset of dementia and Alzheimer's disease better than and independently of APOE genotype. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 75.8 (2004): 1100-6.
13. Devanand DP, Pelton GH, Zamora D, et al. Predictive utility of apolipoprotein E genotype for Alzheimer disease in outpatients with mild cognitive impairment. Arch Neurol 62.6 (2005): 975-980.
14. Frikke-Schmidt R, Tybjaerg-Hansen A, Steffensen R, Jensen G, Nordestgaard BG Apolipoprotein E genotype: epsilon32 women are protected while epsilon43 and epsilon44 men are susceptible to ischemic heart disease: the Copenhagen City Heart Study. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2000;35(5):1192.
15. Frikke-Schmidt R, Nordestgaard BG, Thudium D, Moes Grønholdt ML, Tybjaerg-Hansen A APOE genotype predicts AD and other dementia but not ischemic cerebrovascular disease. Neurology. 2001;56(2):194.
16. Genetics Home Reference. Alzheimer disease. 2006. National Library of Medicine. Available: http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/condition=alzheimerdisease. Date Accessed: December 19, 2006.

Genetic Testing: Apolipoprotein (APOE)Testing, **continued**

17. Genetics Home Reference. APOE. 2006. National Library of Medicine. Available: http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/gene=apoe. Date Accessed: December 19, 2006.
18. Genetics Home Reference. APP. 2006. National Library of Medicine. Available: http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/gene=app. Date Accessed: December 19, 2006.
19. Genetics Home Reference. PSEN1. 2006. National Library of Medicine. Available: http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/gene=psen1. Date Accessed: December 19, 2006.
20. Genetics Home Reference. PSEN2. 2006. National Library of Medicine. Available: http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/gene=psen2. Date Accessed: December 19, 2006.
21. Goldman, J. S., S. E. Hahn, J. W. Catania, S. LaRusse-Eckert, M. B. Butson, M. Rumbaugh, M. N. Strecker, J. S. Roberts, W. Burke, R. Mayeux, T. Bird, G. American College of Medical and C. the National Society of Genetic (2011). "Genetic counseling and testing for Alzheimer disease: joint practice guidelines of the American College of Medical Genetics and the National Society of Genetic Counselors." Genet Med. 13(6): 597-605.
22. Goldman, J. S., S. E. Hahn, J. W. Catania, S. LaRusse-Eckert, M. B. Butson, M. Rumbaugh, M. N. Strecker, J. S. Roberts, W. Burke, R. Mayeux, T. Bird, G. American College of Medical and C. the National Society of Genetic (2011). "Genetic counseling and testing for Alzheimer disease: joint practice guidelines of the American College of Medical Genetics and the National Society of Genetic Counselors." Genet Med. 13(6): 597-605.
23. Gorevic PD. Genetic factors in the amyloid diseases. 2006. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=othrheum/13759. Date Accessed: December 19, 2006.
24. Hayden KM, Zandi PP, Lyketsos CG, et al. Apolipoprotein E genotype and mortality: findings from the Cache County Study. J Am Geriatr Soc 53.6 (2005): 935-42.
25. Hayes Directory. Genetic Testing for Susceptibility to Alzheimer's Disease. Lansdale, PA: Winifred S. Hayes, Inc., 2003.
26. Hsiung GY, Sadovnick AD, Feldman H. Apolipoprotein E epsilon4 genotype as a risk factor for cognitive decline and dementia: data from the Canadian Study of Health and Aging. Cmaj 171.8 (2004): 863-7.
27. Huang W, Qiu C, von Strauss E, Winblad B, Fratiglioni L. APOE genotype, family history of dementia, and Alzheimer disease risk: a 6-year follow-up study. Arch Neurol 61.12 (2004): 1930-4.
28. June E. Eichner,1 S. Terence Dunn,2 Ghazala Perveen,1 David M. Thompson,1 Kenneth E. Stewart,1 and Berrit Apolipoprotein E Polymorphism and Cardiovascular Disease: A HuGE Review. *Am J Epidemiol* 2002; 155:487–95.
29. Khachaturian AS, Corcoran CD, Mayer LS, Zandi PP, Breitner JC. "Apolipoprotein E epsilon4 count affects age at onset of Alzheimer disease, but not lifetime susceptibility: The Cache County Study." Arch Gen Psychiatry 61.5 (2004): 518-24.
30. Klages JD, Fisk JD, Rockwood K. "APOE genotype, memory test performance, and the risk of Alzheimer's disease in the Canadian Study of Health and Aging." Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 15.1 (2003): 1-5.
31. Kleiman T, Zdanys K, Black B, et al. "Apolipoprotein E epsilon4 allele is unrelated to cognitive or functional decline in Alzheimer's disease: retrospective and prospective analysis." Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 22.1 (2006): 73-82.
32. Knopman DS, DeKosky ST, Cummings JL, et al. "Practice parameter: diagnosis of dementia (an evidence-based review). Report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology 56.9 (2001): 1143-53.
33. Kuljis RO. Alzheimer Disease. 2005. EMedicine Website. Available: http://www.emedicine.com/neuro/topic13.htm. Date Accessed: August 18, 2006.
34. Lab Tests Online. PSEN1. 2005. American Association for Clinical Chemistry. Available: http://www.labtestsonline.org/understanding/analytes/psen1/glance.html. Date Accessed: December 19, 2006.
35. Lab Test Online ApoE Genotypingh ApoE cardiac risk; ApoE 2 mutations; APOE4 genotype ttp://labtestsonline.org/understanding/analytes/apoe/tab/test
36. Lavados M, Farias G, Rothhammer F, et al. ApoE alleles and tau markers in patients with different levels of cognitive impairment. Arch Med Res 36.5 (2005): 474-9.
37. Lee DY, Youn JC, Choo IH, et al. Combination of clinical and neuropsychologic information as a better predictor of the progression to Alzheimer disease in questionable dementia individuals. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 14.2 (2006): 130-138.
38. Marra C, Bizzarro A, Daniele A, et al. Apolipoprotein E epsilon4 allele differently affects the patterns of neuropsychological presentation in early- and late-onset Alzheimer's disease patients. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 18.2 (2004): 125-31.
39. McCarron MO, Delong D, Alberts MJ APOE genotype as a risk factor for ischemic cerebrovascular disease: a meta-analysis. Neurology. 1999;53(6):1308.
40. Mihaescu R, Detmar SB, Cornel MC, et al. (2010) Translational Research in Genomics of Alzheimer's Disease: A Review of Current Practice and Future Perspectives. J Alzheimers Dis. Feb 24.
41. Murrell JR, Price B, Lane KA, et al. Association of apolipoprotein E genotype and Alzheimer disease in African Americans. Arch Neurol 63.3 (2006): 431-4.
42. Petersen RC, Stevens JC, Ganguli M, Tangalos EG, Cummings JL, DeKosky ST. Practice parameter: early detection of dementia: mild cognitive impairment (an evidence-based review). Report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology 56.9 (2001): 1133-42.
43. Post SG, Whitehouse PJ, Binstock RH, et al. The clinical introduction of genetic testing for Alzheimer disease. An ethical perspective. JAMA 277.10 (1997): 832-6.
44. Press D, Alexander M. Treatment of Dementia. 2006. UpToDate Online. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=nuroegen/2315&type=A&selectedTitle=4~38. Date Accessed: August 18, 2006.
45. Rigaud A-S, Traykov L, Latour F, Couderc Rm, Moulin F, Forette Fo. Presence or absence of at least one epsilon 4 allele and gender are not predictive for the response to donepezil treatment in Alzheimer's disease. Pharmacogenetics 12.5 (Print) (2002): 415-420.
46. Schneider JA, Bienias JL, Wilson RS, Berry-Kravis E, Evans DA, Bennett DA. The apolipoprotein E epsilon4 allele increases the odds of chronic cerebral infarction [corrected]detected at autopsy in older persons. Stroke. 2005;36(5):954.
47. Shadlen M-F, Larson EB. Dementia syndromes. 2006. UpToDate Online. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=nuroegen/5175&type=A&selectedTitle=2~38. Date Accessed: August 11, 2006.
48. Shadlen M-F, Larson EB. Risk factors for dementia. 2006. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=nuroegen/5651&type=A&selectedTitle=2~13. Date Accessed: December 19, 2006.
49. Statement on use of apolipoprotein E testing for Alzheimer disease. American College of Medical Genetics/American Society of Human Genetics Working Group on ApoE and Alzheimer disease. JAMA 274.20 (1995): 1627-9.

Genetic Testing: Apolipoprotein (APOE)Testing, **continued**

50. Sturgeon JD, Folsom AR, Bray MS, Boerwinkle E, Ballantyne CM, Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study Investigators Apolipoprotein E genotype and incident ischemic stroke: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. Stroke. 2005;36(11):2484.
51. Tervo S, Kivipelto M, Hanninen T, et al. Incidence and risk factors for mild cognitive impairment: a population-based three-year follow-up study of cognitively healthy elderly subjects. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 17.3 (2004): 196-203.
52. Tschanz JT, Welsh-Bohmer KA, Lyketsos CG, et al. Conversion to dementia from mild cognitive disorder: the Cache County Study. Neurology 67.2 (Electronic) (2006): 229-234.
53. Walden CC, Hegele RA. Apolipoprotein E in hyperlipidemia. Ann Intern Med. 1994;120(12):1026Wilson PW, Myers RH, Larson MG, Ordovas JM, Wolf PA, Schaefer EJ Apolipoprotein E alleles, dyslipidemia, and coronary heart disease. The Framingham Offspring Study. JAMA. 1994;272(21):1666.
54. Yip AG, McKee AC, Green RC, et al. APOE, vascular pathology, and the AD brain. Neurology 65.2 (2005): 259-65.
55. Zhu L, Fratiglioni L, Guo Z, Basun H, Corder EH, Winblad B, Viitanen M Incidence of dementia in relation to stroke and the apolipoprotein E epsilon4 allele in the very old. Findings from a population-based longitudinal study. Stroke. 2000;31(1):53.

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: *BRAF* MUTATION TESTING

Policy # 434

Implementation Date:	2/9/10
Review Dates:	5/19/11, 4/12/12, 6/20/13, 4/17/14, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 9/18/18, 4/17/19, 3/1/23
Revision Dates:	5/7/15, 11/11/15, 12/19/18, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123: Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the “Policy” section for more information.

Description

Colon and rectal cancer, collectively known as colorectal cancer (CRC), is the third most common cancer in the United States. Although recent improvements in screening and increased understanding of the genetics behind some types of CRC have reduced the incidence of this cancer, the morbidity and mortality associated with CRC are significant. Surgery is the usual approach for CRC tumors that have not metastasized and is often curative. Before or after surgery, chemotherapy, sometimes with radiotherapy, is given to patients with stage III (localized extension through colon wall) or IV (metastatic) cancer (the use of chemotherapy in those with stage II cancer is controversial). Several single or multiagent chemotherapy regimens may be chosen based on the drugs that are currently approved for treating metastatic CRC: bevacizumab, capecitabine, cetuximab, fluorouracil, irinotecan, oxaliplatin, and panitumumab. Cetuximab (Erbitux) and panitumumab (Vectibix) are anti–epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) monoclonal antibodies that are generally used for second- or third-line treatment in patients with metastatic disease following failure of first-line chemotherapy. Patients who cannot tolerate standard first-line chemotherapy regimens may receive cetuximab monotherapy as first-line treatment.

Studies have demonstrated for some patients a lack of response to this treatment; however, this may be related to certain gene mutations, which can occur in the tumor cells to certain medications, even when wild type KRAS is present. The most notable mutation affecting response to therapy is the (somatic) mutation in the KRAS gene. Patients having the mutation in this gene will not respond to EGFR medications such as Vectibix and Erbitux. These findings suggest other factors, such as alterations in other EGFR effectors, including members of the RAS-MAPK or PI3K pathways that could drive resistance to anti-EGFR therapy. Thus, v-raf murine sarcoma viral oncogene homolog B1 (BRAF) gene, the phosphatase and tensin homolog gene (PTEN), the PIK3CA gene, the p53 tumor suppressor gene, and amplification or polysomy of the EGFR gene itself have all been proposed as contributors to resistance to therapy.

BRAF is the principal downstream effector of KRAS, and its oncogenic V600E mutation is mutually exclusive with KRAS mutations in CRC. Some published evidence has suggested that mutation of this gene results in loss of effectiveness of the EGFR inhibitors.

When the BRAF mutation occurs in CRC tumor tissue it is generally a spontaneous mutation also called a somatic mutation. BRAF V600E mutation analysis is detected in tumor tissue by Polymerase Chain Reaction/Fluorescence (PCR). The test can also be performed on metastatic tissue to better reflect the BRAF status of that tissue, which is, arguably, the primary target of anti-neoplastic therapy.

An inherited condition that also leads to colorectal cancer is Lynch syndrome (LS), also known as hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer (HNPCC). This is an inherited condition involving a germ line mutation in the MLH1 promoter region and increases the risk of colorectal cancer and other cancers. An estimated 2%–4% of colon cancers are thought to be caused by Lynch syndrome. It also increases risk for a variety of other cancers. Families that have Lynch syndrome usually have more cases of CRC than would be expected, and this also occurs at an earlier age than it might in the general population.

Genetic Testing: *BRAF* Mutation Testing, continued

BRAF mutation testing is included in the testing cascade protocol for LS among CRC cases as a reliable means of ruling out the presence of LS. Thus, individuals found with the BRAF mutation are unlikely to have LS, and therefore, can avoid the need for expensive alternative genetic testing.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers BRAF V600 mutation testing when used as part of Intermountain's testing protocol for Lynch (HNPCC*) syndrome among CRC cases, when the initial immunohistochemistry screen is abnormal for the MLH1 protein, and when the following specific criteria for BRAF V600 are met:

SelectHealth covers BRAF V600 when determining the use of medication:

A. in persons with unresectable or metastatic melanoma who are being considered for treatment with vemurafenib (Zelboraf), dabrafenib (Tafinlar), or encorafenib (Braftovi); or
B. in persons with recurrent or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer who are being considered for treatment with dabrafenib (Tafinlar), pembrolizumab (Keytruda), or vemurafenib (Zelboraf); or
C. in persons with thyroid carcinoma who are being considered for treatment with dabrafenib (Tafinlar) or vemurafenib (Zelboraf).

SelectHealth does NOT cover BRAF mutation testing when the purpose of testing is for treatment decisions in colorectal cancer. The role and clinical utility of BRAF V600 mutation testing in treatment decisions among metastatic colon cancer has not been established.

*HNPCC related tumors include colorectal, endometrial, gastric, ovarian, pancreas, ureter, and renal pelvis, biliary tract, brain (usually glioblastoma) and small intestinal cancers, as well as sebaceous gland adenomas and keratoacathomas.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date

Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Published literature on the use of BRAF mutation analysis, among mCRC patients with wild-type K-RAS (somatic) gene status, in guiding treatment decisions provides early but compelling evidence of its prognostic value, i.e., the presence of a BRAF V600E mutation predicts a poor course of the disease independent of treatment. Since current evidence is limited to single-arm studies, nothing can be said about the value of BRAF testing in predicting the response to specific anti-neoplastic regimens, including the anti-EGFR drugs.

The most dominant study supporting the role of BRAF mutation in predicting a response to chemotherapy was provided by Di Nicolantonio et al. Retrospective data on 113 tumors treated with either EGFR antibodies demonstrated that none of the BRAF V600E mutations responded to therapy and that none of the responders had the BRAF mutation.

The study by Tol et al. reported on 560 tumors and found 8.7% had the BRAF V600E mutation. BRAF mutated tumors had a worse prognosis but the response rate to EGFR antibodies was similar. This larger study contrasts with the Di Nicolantonio report.

Determination of the predictive value of a biomarker requires, at minimum, retrospective validation by a well-designed RCT. This would distinguish the association of the biomarker versus the multitude of other factors that may influence the decision to treat or not treat a patient. Such a study, which has not yet been published, would then provide sufficient evidence, preferably duplicated in another quality study, to warrant performing a prospective RCT in a practical setting. The analysis should permit determination of the added value of including the biomarker of interest (e.g., BRAF) to the current best model of prediction.

Remaining questions include the role of these other molecular markers, the role of clinical markers and their relationships with molecular markers, standardization and reliability of test assays, the value of testing the primary tumor versus or in addition to metastatic tumor tissue, the timing of biomarker measurement, and the most appropriate outcomes to assess the success and failure of decision-treatment protocols. It must be kept in mind that virtually all mCRC patients treated with any of the anti-EGFR drugs will develop resistance; thus, either their disease will thereafter progress rapidly, or the patient will be offered yet another line of therapy.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the indications outlined above

CPT CODES

81210	BRAF (v-raf murine sarcoma viral oncogene homolog B1) (e.g., colon cancer), gene analysis, V600E variant

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. Anguera, G., & Majem, M. (2018, February). *BRAF inhibitors in metastatic non-small cell lung cancer*. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5864601/
2. De Roock W, Biesmans B, De Schutter J, Tejpar S. Clinical biomarkers in oncology: focus on colorectal cancer. Mol Diagn Ther 13.2 (2009): 103-14.
3. Di Nicolantonio F, Martini M, Molinari F, et al. Wild-type BRAF is required for response to panitumumab or cetuximab in metastatic colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol 26.35 (2008): 5705-12.

4. Engstrom PF, Arnoletti JP, Benson AB, 3rd, et al. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: colon cancer. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 7.8 (2009): 778-831.
5. Garcia-Saenz JA, Sastre J, Diaz-Rubio Garcia E. Biomarkers and anti-EGFR therapies for KRAS wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer. Clin Transl Oncol 11.11 (2009): 737-47.
6. Kendall A, Lord R, Maisey N. Anti-Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor Antibodies in the Treatment of Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. Recent Pat Anticancer Drug Discov (2009).
7. Laurent-Puig P, Cayre A, Manceau G, et al. Analysis of PTEN, BRAF, and EGFR status in determining benefit from cetuximab therapy in wild-type KRAS metastatic colon cancer. J Clin Oncol 27.35 (2009): 5924-30.
8. Lawrence, L. (2018, June 7). *Role of BRAF Mutations in Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Still Evolving, Emerging*. Retrieved from https://www.cancertherapyadvisor.com/lung-cancer/lung-cancer-nsclc-braf-mutation-role-still-emerging-evolving/article/771952/
9. Loupakis F, Ruzzo A, Cremolini C, et al. KRAS codon 61, 146 and BRAF mutations predict resistance to cetuximab plus irinotecan in KRAS codon 12 and 13 wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer. Br J Cancer 101.4 (2009): 715-21.
10. Mandrekar SJ, Sargent DJ. Clinical trial designs for predictive biomarker validation: theoretical considerations and practical challenges. J Clin Oncol 27.24 (2009): 4027-34.
11. Meriggi F, Di Biasi B, Abeni C, Zaniboni A. Anti-EGFR therapy in colorectal cancer: how to choose the right patient. Curr Drug Targets 10.10 (2009): 1033-40.
12. Molinari F, Martin V, Saletti P, et al. Differing deregulation of EGFR and downstream proteins in primary colorectal cancer and related metastatic sites may be clinically relevant. Br J Cancer 100.7 (2009): 1087-94.
13. Oden-Gangloff A, Di Fiore F, Bibeau F, et al. TP53 mutations predict disease control in metastatic colorectal cancer treated with cetuximab-based chemotherapy. Br J Cancer 100.8 (2009): 1330-5.
14. Perrone F, Lampis A, Orsenigo M, et al. PI3KCA/PTEN deregulation contributes to impaired responses to cetuximab in metastatic colorectal cancer patients. Ann Oncol 20.1 (2009): 84-90.
15. Sartore-Bianchi A, Di Nicolantonio F, Nichelatti M, et al. Multi-determinants analysis of molecular alterations for predicting clinical benefit to EGFR-targeted monoclonal antibodies in colorectal cancer. PLoS One 4.10 (2009): e7287.
16. Sartore-Bianchi A, Martini M, Molinari F, et al. PIK3CA mutations in colorectal cancer are associated with clinical resistance to EGFR-targeted monoclonal antibodies. Cancer Res 69.5 (2009): 1851-7.
17. Scartozzi M, Bearzi I, Mandolesi A, et al. Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor (EGFR) gene copy number (GCN) correlates with clinical activity of irinotecan-cetuximab in K-RAS wild-type colorectal cancer: a fluorescence in situ (FISH) and chromogenic in situ hybridization (CISH) analysis. BMC Cancer 9 (2009): 303.
18. Siena S, Sartore-Bianchi A, Di Nicolantonio F, Balfour J, Bardelli A. Biomarkers predicting clinical outcome of epidermal growth factor receptor-targeted therapy in metastatic colorectal cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 101.19 (2009): 1308-24.
19. Souglakos J, Philips J, Wang R, et al. Prognostic and predictive value of common mutations for treatment response and survival in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. Br J Cancer 101.3 (2009): 465-72.
20. Tol J, Nagtegaal ID, Punt CJ. BRAF mutation in metastatic colorectal cancer. N Engl J Med 361.1 (2009): 98-9.
21. Two-Drug Combination Approved for Lung Cancers with BRAF Mutations. (2017, July 18). Retrieved from https://www.cancer.gov/news-events/cancer-currents-blog/2017/fda-trametinib-dabrafenib-lung-cancer

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: BREAST CANCER

Policy # 664
Implementation Date: 7/1/23
Review Dates:
Revision Dates: 11/8/23, 4/19/24

Related Medical Policies:
#676: Genetic Testing Ovarian Cancer

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Genetic testing is available for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. Genetic testing for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer looks for mutations in the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes. A doctor might suggest testing using a multigene panel, which looks for mutations in several genes at the same time, including BRCA1 and BRCA2. If someone is of Ashkenazi Jewish or Eastern European ancestry, a doctor might suggest testing for three specific BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations, called founder mutations. These are the most common mutations in people of Ashkenazi Jewish or Eastern European ancestry.

The breast cancer 1 (BRCA1) and breast cancer 2 (BRCA2) genes are the genes most affected in hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. Normally, the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes protect someone from getting certain cancers. But certain mutations in the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes prevent them from working properly, so that if someone inherits one of these mutations, they are more likely to get breast, ovarian, and other cancers. An individual and their family members are more likely to have a BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutation if their family has a strong history of breast or ovarian cancer. Because BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations are inherited, family members with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations usually share the same mutation.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when recommended by a genetic counselor, medical geneticist, or other provider with recognized expertise in this area; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

Select Health covers panel testing for high-penetrance breast cancer susceptibility genes, which must include the following genes (BRCA1/2, CDH1, PALB2, PTEN, STK11, and TP53) (an expanded panel is also acceptable), when one of the following criteria are met (A−G):

A. Personal history of breast cancer diagnosed ≤ 50 years; **OR**

B. Personal history of breast cancer at any age and one of the following (1−8):

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

1. To aid in systemic treatment decisions using PARP inhibitors[a] for breast cancer in the metastatic setting, or
2. To aid in adjuvant treatment decisions with olaparib for high-risk, HER2-negative breast cancer; or
3. Triple-negative breast cancer; or
4. Multiple primary breast cancers (synchronous or metachronous); or
5. Lobular breast cancer with personal or family history of diffuse gastric cancer; or
6. Male breast cancer; or
7. Ashkenazi Jewish ancestry; or
8. ≥ 1close blood relative[b] with any of the following (i−vii):
   i. Breast cancer at age ≤ 50; or
   ii. Male breast cancer; or
   iii. Ovarian cancer; or
   iv. Pancreatic cancer; or
   v. Prostate cancer at any age with metastatic[c], or high- or very-high-risk group*; or
   vi. ≥ 3 total diagnoses of breast cancer in patient and/or close blood relatives; or
   vii. ≥ 2 close blood relatives with either breast or prostate cancer (any grade); **OR**

C. Personal history of epithelial ovarian cancer (including fallopian tube cancer or peritoneal cancer) at any age; **OR**

D. Personal history of exocrine pancreatic cancer; **OR**

E. Personal history of prostate cancer and any of the following (1−4):
1. Metastatic or high- or very-high-risk group per NCCN.
2. ≥1 close blood relative[b] with one of the following (i−v):
   i. Breast cancer at age < 50 years; or
   ii. Triple-negative breast cancer at any age; or
   iii. Male breast cancer at any age; or
   iv. Pancreatic cancer at any age; or
   v. Metastatic or very-high-risk group prostate cancer.
3. ≥ 3 close blood relatives[b] with prostate cancer (any grade) and/or breast cancer at any age on the same side of the family including the patient with prostate cancer;
4. Ashkenazi Jewish ancestry; **OR**

F. An affected individual (not meeting testing criteria listed above) or unaffected individual with a first- or second-degree blood relative meeting any of the criteria listed above (except unaffected individuals whose relatives meet criteria only for systemic therapy decision-making[d]); **OR**

G. An affected or unaffected individual, who otherwise does not meet the criteria above, but has a probability > 5% of a BRCA1/2 pathogenic variant based on prior probability models (e.g., Tyrer-Cuzick, BRCAPro, CanRisk); must be performed by the ordering physician.

Note: If the affected relative has pancreatic cancer or prostate cancer only first-degree relatives should be offered testing unless indicated based on additional family history.

a- The two FDA approved PARP inhibitors - olaparib and talazoparib are included as a category 1, preferred options for those with germline BRCA1/2 mutations. The NCCN Panel recommends assessing for germline BRCA1/2 mutations in all patients with recurrent or metastatic breast cancer to identify candidates for PARP inhibitor therapy. While olaparib and talazoparib are FDA indicated in HER2-negative disease, the NCCN Panel supports use in any breast cancer subtype associated with germline BRCA1/2 mutations.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

b- Close blood relatives include first-, second-, and third-degree relatives on the same side of the family.

c- Metastatic prostate cancer is biopsy-proven and/or with radiographic evidence and includes distant metastasis and regional bed or nodes. It is not a biochemical recurrence only. Prostate cancer-specific mortality should be a surrogate for metastatic disease for family history purposes.

d- This may be extended to an affected third-degree relative if related through two male relatives (e.g., paternal grandfather's mother or sister). If the affected first-degree relative underwent genetic testing and is negative for detectable P/LP variants and there is no other family history of cancer, there is a low probability that any finding will have documented clinical utility.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

CPT Codes

0037U Targeted genomic sequence analysis, solid organ neoplasm, DNA analysis of 324 genes, interrogation for sequence variants, gene copy number amplifications, gene rearrangements, microsatellite instability and tumor mutational burden [FoundationOne CDx]

0102U Hereditary breast cancer-related disorders (eg, hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer); genomic sequence analysis panel utilizing a combination of NGS, Sanger, MLPA and array CGH, with MRNA analytics to resolve variants of unknown significance when indicated [17 genes (sequencing and deletion/duplication)]

0103U Hereditary ovarian cancer (eg, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer); genomic sequence analysis panel utilizing a combination of NGS, Sanger, MLPA and array CGH, with MRNA analytics to resolve variants of unknown significance when indicated [24 genes (sequencing and deletion/duplication); EPCAM (deletion/duplication only)]

0131U Hereditary breast cancer–related disorders (eg, hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (13 genes) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure) (Use 0131U in conjunction with 81162, 81432, 0102U)

0129U Hereditary breast cancer-related disorders (eg, hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer), genomic sequence analysis and deletion/duplication analysis panel (ATM, BRCA1, BRCA2, CDH1, CHEK2, PALB2, PTEN, and TP53)

0132U Hereditary ovarian cancer–related disorders (eg, hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (17 genes) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure) (Use 0132U in conjunction with 81162, 81432, 0103U)

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

0134U Hereditary pan cancer (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer, hereditary colorectal cancer), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (18 genes) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

0135U Hereditary gynecological cancer (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer, hereditary colorectal cancer), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (12 genes) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

0137U PALB2 (partner and localizer of BRCA2) (eg, breast and pancreatic cancer) mRNA sequence analysis (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

0138U BRCA1(BRCA1, DNA repair associated), BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) mRNA sequence analysis (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

0172U Oncology (solid tumor as indicated by the label), somatic mutation analysis of BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated), BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) and analysis of homologous recombination deficiency pathways, DNA, formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm quantifying tumor genomic instability score

0235U PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome), full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions

81162 BRCA1, BRCA2 (breast cancer 1 and 2) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full sequence analysis and full duplication/deletion analysis

81163 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated), BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

81164 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated), BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full duplication/deletion analysis (ie, detection of large gene rearrangements)

81165 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

81166 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full duplication/deletion analysis (ie, detection of large gene rearrangements)

81167 BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full duplication/deletion analysis (ie, detection of large gene rearrangements)

81212 BRCA1, BRCA2 (breast cancer 1 and 2) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; 185delAG, 5385insC, 6174delT variants

81215 BRCA1 (breast cancer 1) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; known familial variant

81216 BRCA2 (breast cancer 2) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

81217 BRCA2 (breast cancer 2) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; known familial variant

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

81307 PALB2 (partner and localizer of BRCA2) (eg, breast and pancreatic cancer) gene analysis; full gene sequence

81308 PALB2 (partner and localizer of BRCA2) (eg, breast and pancreatic cancer) gene analysis; known familial variant

81321 PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

81322 PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome) gene analysis; known familial variant

81323 PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome) gene analysis; duplication/deletion variant

81351 TP53 (tumor protein 53) (eg, Li-Fraumeni syndrome) gene analysis; full gene sequence

81352 TP53 (tumor protein 53) (eg, Li-Fraumeni syndrome) gene analysis; targeted sequence analysis (eg, 4 oncology)

81353 TP53 (tumor protein 53) (eg, Li-Fraumeni syndrome) gene analysis; known familial variant

81404 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 5 (eg, analysis of 2-5 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 6-10 exons, or characterization of a dynamic mutation disorder/triplet repeat by Southern blot analysis)

81405 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 6 (eg, analysis of 6-10 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 11-25 exons, regionally targeted cytogenomic array analysis)

81406 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 7 (eg, analysis of 11-25 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 26-50 exons, cytogenomic array analysis for neoplasia)

81432 Hereditary breast cancer-related disorders (eg, hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 10 genes, always including BRCA1, BRCA2, CDH1, MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, PALB2, PTEN, STK11, and TP53

81433 Hereditary breast cancer-related disorders (eg, hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer); duplication/deletion analysis panel, must include analyses for BRCA1, BRCA2, MLH1, MSH2, and STK11

81449 Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, 5-50 genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, MET, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed; RNA analysis

81445 Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, 5-50 genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, MET, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed; DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis

81455 Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis

81456 Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis

81450 Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 5-50 genes (eg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis

81451 Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 5-50 genes (eg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

88271 - 88275 Molecular cytogenetics

Key References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Genetic Testing for Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer.
2. NCCN Guidelines. Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Breast, Ovarian, and Pancreatic. Version 2.2023 – January 10, 2023.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: CARDIOMYOPATHY

Policy # 665
Implementation Date: 7/1/23
Review Dates:
Revision Dates: 12/6/23

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Genetic testing is informative and useful for the clinical management of various inherited cardiovascular diseases such as cardiomyopathies, arrhythmic disorders, thoracic aortic aneurysms and dissections, and familial hypercholesterolemia (FH).

The 2018 Heart Failure Society of America guideline on cardiomyopathies, a conjoint publication sharing the same writing group as the 2018 ACMG clinical practice resource, offered several recommendations. A family history of at least 3 generations should be obtained for all patients with a primary cardiomyopathy. Second, clinical screening for cardiomyopathy is recommended for at-risk first-degree relatives. Third, patients with genetic, familial, or other unexplained forms of cardiomyopathy should be referred to expert centers. Genetic counseling is recommended for all patients with cardiomyopathy and their family members.

The authors also recommended that genetic testing be offered to all patients diagnosed with all recognized forms of cardiomyopathy. In a family, testing should be directed to the most clearly affected family member. If that individual is found to have a gene variant that is judged to be pathogenic or likely pathogenic, then cascade genetic testing for that variant should be offered to at-risk family members. For infants with cardiomyopathy, in addition to any routine newborn screening tests that might have been performed, the specialized evaluation is likely to include genetic testing and should also include an evaluation for syndromic or metabolic conditions for which a specific intervention or therapy might be warranted.

Another recommendation addressed secondary findings: Focused cardiovascular phenotyping should be performed when pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants in ACMG-designated cardiomyopathy genes are identified in an individual. In those individuals, focused cardiovascular phenotyping should be undertaken. If a concordant cardiovascular phenotype is identified, then cascade genetic testing of family members is recommended. If no phenotype is identified, then surveillance screening for the individual should be considered. Even if no phenotype is identified, cascade phenotypic testing of at-risk family members may be considered, depending on the gene in question, the type of variant identified, and its likelihood to be relevant for disease. If family members are found to have evidence of cardiomyopathy phenotypes, genetic testing for the variant may help to establish evidence for disease causality of the variant (i.e., segregation).

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Effective July 1, 2023

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

Select Health covers genetic testing for cardiomyopathy when either I or II are met:

I. **Select Health considers genetic testing for cardiomyopathy as medically necessary,** if recommended by Intermountain Heart Institute;

OR

II. For all other clinicians, Select Health considers genetic testing for cardiomyopathy as medically necessary, when the following criteria are met:

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

3. Select Health considers genetic testing for the following panel tests for cardiomyopathy as medically necessary, when the following criteria are met:

a) Known familial mutation analysis is performed when a causative mutation has been identified in a close 1st or 2nd degree relative of the individual requesting testing. (For known familial mutations, a targeted mutation panel that includes the familial mutation may be performed.)

AND meets specific criteria for each panel below:

A. Arrhythmogenic Right Ventricular Cardiomyopathy (ARVC) Panels

Genetic testing for arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy (ARVC) via a multigene panel is considered medically necessary when:

1. The member has a confirmed diagnosis of ARVC by electrocardiogram, MRI, or angiogram, meeting the task force criteria for at least possible ARVC (defined as having one major or two minor criteria) [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2848326/table/EHQ025TB1/?report=objectonly],

   OR

2. The member has a first-degree relative with sudden unexplained cardiac death (SUDS) and autopsy revealed an ARVC phenotype.

Genetic testing for arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy (ARVC) via a multigene panel is considered experimental/investigational for all other indications.

B. Dilated Cardiomyopathy (DCM) Panels

Genetic testing for dilated cardiomyopathy (DCM) via a multigene panel is considered medically necessary when the member meets both of the following (1 and 2):

1. The member has a diagnosis of DCM by left ventricular enlargement and systolic dysfunction (e.g., ejection fraction less than 50%) based on echocardiogram, cardiac MRI, and/or left ventricular angiogram;

   AND

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

2. a) Non-genetic causes of DCM have been ruled out, such as prior myocardial infarction from coronary artery disease, valvular and congenital heart disease, toxins (most commonly, anthracyclines or other chemotherapeutic agents; various drugs with idiosyncratic reactions), thyroid disease, inflammatory or infectious conditions, severe long-standing hypertension, and radiation; (post-partum cardiomyopathy would not exclude someone from testing)

   OR

   b) The member has a first-degree relative with sudden unexplained cardiac death (SUDS) and autopsy revealed a DCM phenotype.

   Genetic testing for DCM via a multigene panel is considered experimental/investigational for all other indications.

C. Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy (HCM) Panels

Genetic testing for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy via a multigene panel is considered medically necessary when:

1. The member has unexplained left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH);

   AND

2. Myocardial wall thickness of 15mm or greater (in adults), or a z-score greater than or equal to 2 (in children) based on echocardiogram or cardiac MRI;

   AND

3. a) Non-genetic causes of HCM have been ruled out, such as chronic hypertension, aortic stenosis, extreme physiologic hypertrophy (aka "athlete's heart"),

   OR

   b) The member has a first-degree relative with sudden unexplained cardiac death (SUDS) and autopsy revealed an HCM phenotype.

   Genetic testing for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy via a multigene panel is considered investigational for all other indications.

D. Restrictive Cardiomyopathy (RCM) Panels

Genetic testing for RCM via a multigene is considered medically necessary when:

1. The member has a diagnosis of RCM based on echocardiogram; AND
2. Non-genetic causes of cardiomyopathy have been ruled out.

E. Peripartum Cardiomyopathy

Genetic testing for peripartum cardiomyopathy via a multigene panel is considered medically necessary when:

1. The member has a diagnosis of peripartum cardiomyopathy in the last month of pregnancy or within 3 months following delivery by left ventricular enlargement and systolic dysfunction (e.g., ejection fraction less than 45); AND
2. Non-genetic and non-pregnancy causes of cardiomyopathy have been ruled out.

F. Left Ventricular Noncompaction (LVNC) Cardiomyopathy

Genetic testing for LVNC cardiomyopathy via a multigene panel is considered medically necessary when:

1. The member has a diagnosis of LVNC cardiomyopathy by echocardiogram; AND
2. Non-genetic causes of cardiomyopathy have been ruled out.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0237U Cardiac ion channelopathies (e.g., Brugada syndrome, long QT syndrome, short QT syndrome, catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia), genomic sequence analysis panel including ANK2, CASQ2, CAV3, KCNE1, KCNE2, KCNH2, KCNJ2, KCNQ1, RYR2, and SCN5A, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions

81410 Aortic dysfunction or dilation (eg, Marfan syndrome, Loeys Dietz syndrome, Ehler Danlos syndrome type IV, arterial tortuosity syndrome); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 9 genes, including FBN1, TGFBR1, TGFBR2, COL3A1, MYH11, ACTA2, SLC2A10, SMAD3, and MYLK

81411 Aortic dysfunction or dilation (eg, Marfan syndrome, Loeys Dietz syndrome, Ehler Danlos syndrome type IV, arterial tortuosity syndrome); duplication/deletion analysis panel, must include analyses for TGFBR1, TGFBR2, MYH11, and COL3A1

81413 Cardiac ion channelopathies (eg, Brugada syndrome, long QT syndrome, short QT syndrome, catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 10 genes, including ANK2, CASQ2, CAV3, KCNE1, KCNE2, KCHN2, KCNJ2, KCNQ1, RYR2, and SCH5A

81414 Cardiac ion channelopathies (eg, Brugada syndrome, long QT syndrome, catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia); duplication/deletion gene analysis panel, must include analysis of at least 2 genes, including KCNH2 and KCNQ1

81439 Hereditary cardiomyopathy (eg, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, dilated cardiomyopathy, arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 5 cardiomyopathy-related genes (eg, DSG2, MYBPC3, MYH7, PKP2, TTN)

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

81493 Coronary artery disease, mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 23 genes, utilizing whole peripheral blood, algorithm reported as a risk score

Key References

1. Corrado, D., et al. Evolving Diagnostic Criteria for Arrhythmogenic Cardiomyopathy. *Journal of the American Heart Association*. September 2021; 10(18). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.121.021987

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: Cardiomyopathy, **continued**

2. Hershberger, R. E., et al. Genetic Evaluation of Cardiomyopathy—A Heart Failure Society of America Practice Guideline. Journal of Cardiac Failure. March 2018. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cardfail.2018.03.004
3. Landstrom, A. P., et al. Genetic Testing for Heritable Cardiovascular Diseases in Pedatric Patients: A Scientific Statement from the American Heart Association. Circulation: Genomic and Precision Medicine. October 2021; 14(5). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1161/HCG.0000000000000086
4. Musunuru, K., et al. Genetic Testing for Inherited Cardiovascular Diseases: A Scientific Statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation: Genomic and Precision Medicine*. August 2020; 13(4). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1161/HCG.0000000000000067
5. Sliwa, K., et al. Current state of knowledge on aetiology, diagnosis, management, and therapy of peripartum cardiomyopathy: a position statement from the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology Working Group on peripartum cardiomyopathy. *European Journal of Heart Failure*. June 2010; 12: 767−778. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/eurjhf/hfq120
6. Towbin, J.A., et al. 2019 HRS expert consensus statement on evaluation, risk stratification, and management of arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy: Executive summary. *Heart Rhythm Society*. November 2019; 16(11). Available at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrthm.2019.09.019
7. Wilde, A. A. M., et al. European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA)/Heart Rhythm Society (HRS)/Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS)/Latin American Heart Rhythm Society (LAHRS) Expert Consensus Statement on the state of genetic testing for cardiac diseases. Europace. 2022 Aug; 24(8): 1307–1367. Available at: doi: 10.1093/europace/euac030

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: CELIAC DISEASE (CELIAGENE)

Policy # 286

Implementation Date:	11/15/05
Review Dates:	10/19/06, 12/20/07, 12/18/08, 10/20/09, 10/21/10, 10/13/11, 10/24/13, 10/23/14, 10/15/15, 10/20/16, 10/19/17, 10/12/18, 10/20/19, 2/7/23
Revision Dates:	11/29/12, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Celiac disease also known as celiac sprue or gluten-sensitive enteropathy is an immune-mediated disorder of the small intestine characterized by mucosal inflammation, villous atrophy, and crypt hyperplasia, which occur upon exposure to gluten (a protein contained in wheat, rye, barley, and a multitude of prepared foods) and which demonstrate improvement with withdrawal of gluten from the diet. People with celiac disease have an abnormal immune system reaction against gluten, the consequences of which cause damage to the lining of the small intestine. Celiac disease occurs in people of any age and affects both genders.

The generally accepted diagnostic criteria are that there should be an abnormal small intestinal mucosa while individuals continue to take a gluten-containing diet. There should then be unequivocal improvement in villous architecture on a repeat small intestinal biopsy procedure after some months on a gluten-free diet with symptomatic improvement. A repeat biopsy should usually be taken four to six months after induction of treatment and if there has been no improvement in the small intestinal mucosal morphology, the original diagnosis should be questioned. Most clinicians do not undertake formal gluten challenge to show the resultant deterioration of the small intestinal villous architecture. However, gluten challenge should be performed if there is any doubt concerning the correct diagnosis.

When the diagnosis of celiac disease is uncertain because of indeterminate results, testing for certain genetic markers (HLA haplotypes) can stratify individuals to high or low risk for celiac disease. Even though celiac disease is a complex genetic disorder, HLA status appears to be the strongest genetic determinant of risk for celiac autoimmunity. There is a propensity for individuals with celiac disease to carry specific HLA class II alleles, which has been estimated to account for up to 40% of the genetic load. In affected individuals, 95% have either DQ2 (HLA-DQA1*05-DQB1*02) or DQ8 (HLADQA1*03-DQB1*0302), in comparison with the general population in which 39.5% have either DQ2 or DQ8.However, only 3% of individuals in the general population carrying DQ2 will develop evidence of celiac autoimmunity, suggesting that HLA typing could be used to identify increased genetic risk, but not for defining celiac disease, as is possible with many monogenic disorders. DQ2 homozygous individuals have an even higher risk for expressing transglutaminase autoantibodies and celiac disease, and among patients with type 1 diabetes almost one third of patients homozygous for DQ2 express transglutaminase autoantibodies. One half of these individuals have high levels of transglutaminase autoantibodies and celiac disease on intestinal biopsy examination. In a recent European report, only 0.5% of celiac patients lacked both DQ2 and DQ8. Greater than 97% of celiac disease individuals have the DQ2 and/or DQ8 marker, compared to about 40% of the general population. Therefore, an individual negative for DQ2 or DQ8 is extremely unlikely to have celiac disease (high negative predictive value).

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic testing for celiac disease in patients with symptoms suggestive of celiac disease who have failed to achieve an appropriate diagnosis through other standard testing.* This testing meets the plan guidelines for genetic testing as it has demonstrated statistical validity and clinical utility in appropriately selected individuals undergoing this testing.

*Standard testing for celiac disease includes IgA endomyosial, IgA transglutumine, and small bowel biopsy.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

The population estimate of a 0.5%−1.0% prevalence of celiac disease among persons of Northern European descent has been fairly well established by several large epidemiological studies. The association between celiac disease and other medical conditions and problems has also been well studied. Type 1 diabetes, autoimmune thyroiditis, Down syndrome, Turner syndrome, William's syndrome, Selective IgA deficiency, and having an affected first degree relative all portend risk for celiac disease that is much higher than the population risk.

Likewise, a large body of literature exists (most with fairly small sample sizes) to support the association between celiac disease and histocompatibility complex class II antigens (primarily DQ2 and DQ8). Some

literature suggests an association between homozygosity for DQ2 alleles and early onset celiac disease, though the relationship between particular HLA genotypes and the clinical presentation of the disorder is generally not well studied. Likewise, the prevalence of HLA genotypes in the aforementioned high-risk groups is only beginning to be investigated. In Sumnik et al., for example, the DQ2 molecule was more common in diabetic children with celiac disease (80%) than in diabetic children without the disorder (49%). The DQ2 molecule conferred a four-fold risk of celiac disease among diabetic children. In contrast, Doolan et al. found no significant difference for HLA genotypes (DQ2 and DR4) among Australian patients (age range 10−37 years) with diabetes mellitus Type 1 with or without celiac disease.

Many studies have reported generally high sensitivity and negative predictive values, but poor specificity and positive predictive values of HLA genotyping for celiac disease, though percentages do vary widely. Zubillaga found DQ2 or DQ8 alleles in 98% of celiac patients while Agardh et al. found DQ2 in 65% of celiac patients and 36% of those without celiac disease. Pena-Quintana reported that the sensitivity, specificity, and the positive and negative predictive values of HLA typing were 92.4%, 78.4%, 68.1%, and 95.4%, respectively.

The American College of Gastroenterology's clinical guidelines on diagnosis and management of celiac disease (CD) (Rubio-Tapia et al., 2013) include the use of HLA DQ2 and DQ8 genotyping in the clinical algorithm when other modalities are not able to reach a diagnosis. They also state that intestinal permeability tests, D-xylose, and small-bowel follow-through are not recommended for CD diagnosis (strong recommendation, moderate level of evidence) and that stool studies or salivary tests are neither validated nor recommended for use in the diagnosis of CD (strong recommendation, weak level of evidence).

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES

81220	CFTR (cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator) (eg, cystic fibrosis) gene analysis; common variants (eg, ACMG/ACOG guidelines)
81221	CFTR (cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator) (eg, cystic fibrosis) gene analysis; known familial variants
81222	CFTR (cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator) (eg, cystic fibrosis) gene analysis; duplication/deletion variants
81223	CFTR (cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator) (eg, cystic fibrosis) gene analysis; full gene sequence
81224	CFTR (cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator) (eg, cystic fibrosis) gene analysis; intron 8 poly-T analysis (eg, male infertility)
81376	HLA Class II typing, low resolution (e.g., antigen equivalents); one locus (e.g., HLA-DRB1, -DRB3/4/5, -DQB1, -DQA1, -DPB1, or -DPA1), each
81377	HLA Class II typing, low resolution (e.g., antigen equivalents); one antigen equivalent, each
81382	HLA Class II typing, high resolution (ie, alleles or allele groups); one locus (eg, HLA-DRB1, -DRB3/4/5, -DQB1, -DQA1, -DPB1, or -DPA1), each
81383	HLA Class II typing, high resolution (ie, alleles or allele groups); one allele or allele group (eg, HLA-DQB1*06:02P), each

HCPCS CODES

Genetic Testing: Celiac Disease (Celiagene), **continued**

G0452 Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Agardh, D., et al., Prediction of silent celiac disease at diagnosis of childhood type 1 diabetes by tissue transglutaminase autoantibodies and HLA. Pediatr Diabetes/01. 2(2): p. 58-65.
2. American Gastroenterological Association medical position statement: Celiac Sprue. Gastroenterology/01. 120(6): p. 1522-5.
3. Bao, F., et al., One third of HLA DQ2 homozygous patients with type 1 diabetes express celiac disease-associated transglutaminase autoantibodies. J Autoimmune/99. 13(1): p. 143-8.
4. Ciclitira, P.J., King, A.L., and Fraser, J.S. AGA technical review on Celiac Sprue. American Gastroenterological Association. Gastroenterology/01. 120(6): p. 1526-40.
5. Collin, P., et al., Celiac disease and HLA DQ in patients with IgA nephropathy. Am J Gastroenterol/02. 97(10): p. 2572-6.
6. Csizmadia, C.G., et al., Accuracy and cost-effectiveness of a new strategy to screen for celiac disease in children with Down syndrome. J Pediatr/00. 137(6): p. 756-61.
7. Dolinsek, J., et al., The prevalence of celiac disease among family members of celiac disease patients. Wien Klin Wochenschr/04. 116 Suppl 2: pp. 8-12.
8. Doolan, A., et al., Use of HLA typing in diagnosing celiac disease in patients with type 1 diabetes. Diabetes Care/05. 28(4): pp. 806-809.
9. Fasano, A., et al., Prevalence of celiac disease in at-risk and not-at-risk groups in the United States: a large multicenter study. Arch Intern Med/03. 163(3): p. 286-92.
10. Greco, L., et al., The first large population based twin study of coeliac disease. Gut/02. 50(5): p. 624-8.
11. Grodzinsky, E., Screening for coeliac disease in apparently healthy blood donors. Acta Pediatr Suppl/96. 412: p. 36-8.
12. Hill, I.D., et al., Guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of celiac disease in children: recommendations of the North American Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr/05. 40(1): p. 1-19.
13. Johnston, S.D., et al., Preliminary results from follow-up of a large-scale population survey of antibodies to gliadin, reticulin and endomysium. Acta Paediatr Suppl/96. 412: p. 61-4.
14. Johnson, T.C., et al., Relationship of HLA-DQ8 and severity of celiac disease: comparison of New York and Parisian cohorts. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol/04. 2(10): p. 888-94.
15. Karell, K., et al., HLA types in celiac disease patients not carrying the DQA1*05-DQB1*02 (DQ2) heterodimer: results from the European Genetics Cluster on Celiac Disease. Hum Immunol/03. 64(4): p. 469-77.
16. Kaukinen, K., et al., HLA-DQ typing in the diagnosis of celiac disease. Am J Gastroenterol/02. 97(3): p. 695-9.
17. Kelly, C., Patient information: Celiac disease. UpToDate/03. http://www.utdol.com/.
18. Kelly, C., Diagnosis of celiac disease. UpToDate/05. http://www.utdol.com.
19. Kimball Genetics, Celiac Disease DNA Test. 2004.
20. Lenhardt, A., et al., Role of human-tissue transglutaminase IgG and anti-gliadin IgG antibodies in the diagnosis of coeliac disease in patients with selective immunoglobulin A deficiency. Dig Liver Dis/04. 36(11): p. 730-4.
21. Liu, E., Rewers, M., and Eisenbarth, G.S., Genetic testing: who should do the testing and what is the role of genetic testing in the setting of celiac disease? Gastroenterology/05. 128(4 Suppl 1): p. S33-7.
22. Maki, M., et al., Prevalence of Celiac disease among children in Finland. N Engl J Med/03. 348(25): p. 2517-24.
23. National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference Statement on Celiac Disease, 6/28-30/04. Gastroenterology/05. 128(4 Suppl 1): p. S1-9.
24. Neuhausen, S.L., et al., HLA DQA1-DQB1 genotypes in Bedouin families with celiac disease. Hum Immunol/02. 63(6): p. 502-507.
25. Not, T., et al., Celiac disease risk in the USA: high prevalence of antiendomysium antibodies in healthy blood donors. Scand J Gastroenterol/98. 33(5): p. 494-8.
26. Pena-Quintana, L., et al., Assessment of the DQ heterodimer test in the diagnosis of celiac disease in the Canary Islands (Spain). J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr/03. 37(5): p. 604-8.
27. Polvi, A., et al., HLA-DQ2-negative celiac disease in Finland and Spain. Hum Immunol/98. 59(3): p. 169-75.
28. Rutherford, R.M., et al., Prevalence of coeliac disease in patients with sarcoidosis. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol/04. 16(9): p. 911-5.
29. Sumnik, Z., et al., HLA-DQA1*05-DQB1*0201 positivity predisposes to coeliac disease in Czech diabetic children. Acta Paediatr/00. 89(12): p. 1426-30.
30. Rubio-Tapia, A., et al. (2013). "ACG clinical guidelines: diagnosis and management of celiac disease." Am J Gastroenterol 108(5): 656-676; quiz 677.
31. Vidales, M.C., et al., Allele and haplotype frequencies for HLA class II (DQA1 and DQB1) loci in patients with celiac disease from Spain. Hum Immunol/04. 65(4): p. 352-8.
32. Zubillaga, P., et al., HLA-DQA1 and HLA-DQB1 genetic markers and clinical presentation in celiac disease. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr/02. 34(5): p. 548-54.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Genetic Testing: Celiac Disease (Celiagene), **continued**

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: CELL-FREE FETAL DNA TESTING

Policy # 679
Implementation Date: 3/25/24
Review Dates:
Revision Dates:

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Cell-free fetal DNA (cffDNA) testing [also called noninvasive prenatal testing (NIPT) or noninvasive prenatal screening (NIPS)] is a screen for fetal aneuploidies. This testing evaluates short segments of cell-free fetal DNA in the maternal plasma during pregnancy. The clinical utility of cffDNA has been established for detecting fetal trisomy 13, 18, and 21, at ≥ 8-10 weeks gestation with a viable singleton or twin pregnancy. This testing can identify fetuses at increased risk for aneuploidy but cannot definitively diagnose, confirm, or exclude. Screening tests that show increased risk should be confirmed by diagnostic testing prior to any intervention.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

Select Health covers cell-free fetal DNA testing for common aneuploidy (chromosomes 13, 18, 21, X, Y) once per singleton or twin pregnancy.

Select Health does not cover this testing solely for the purposes of fetal sex determination; this is considered NOT medically necessary.

Select Health does NOT cover cell-free fetal DNA testing for the evaluation of the following:

- Microdeletions/microduplications
- Expanded aneuploidies (chromosomes other than 13, 18, 21, X, Y)
- Twin zygosity
- Fetal RhD status
- Whole genome or whole exome screening
- Single gene disorders
- Non-viable pregnancies
- Fetal trophoblast cells (such as Luna Prenatal Test)
- Higher order multiple gestation (≥ 3 fetuses)

Use of this testing for these indications meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information
Covered for the indications listed above when criteria are met
CPT CODES

81420 Fetal chromosomal aneuploidy (eg, trisomy 21, monosomy X) genomic sequence analysis panel, circulating cell-free fetal DNA in maternal blood, must include analysis of chromosomes 13, 18, and 21

81507 Fetal aneuploidy (trisomy 21, 18, and 13) DNA sequence analysis of selected regions using maternal plasma, algorithm reported as a risk score for each trisomy

0327U Fetal aneuploidy (trisomy 13, 18, and 21), DNA sequence analysis of selected regions using maternal plasma, algorithm reported as a risk score for each trisomy, includes sex reporting, if performed

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

Not covered for the indications listed above

81422 Fetal chromosomal microdeletion(s) genomic sequence analysis (eg, digeorge syndrome, cri-du-chat syndrome), circulating cell-free fetal dna in maternal blood

Key References

1. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG). Screening for Fetal Chromosomal Abnormalities: ACOG Practice Bulletin, Number 226. Obstet Gynecol. 2020;136(4):e48-e69. Epub 2020/08/18. PMID: 32804883
2. Gregg AR, Skotko BG, Benkendorf JL, et al. Noninvasive prenatal screening for fetal aneuploidy, 2016 update: a position statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics. Genet Med. 2016;18(10):1056-65. Epub 2016/07/29. PMID: 27467454
3. Palomaki GE, Chiu RWK, Pertile MD, et al. International Society for Prenatal Diagnosis Position Statement: cell free (cf)DNA screening for Down syndrome in multiple pregnancies. Prenat Diagn. 2021;41(10):1222-32. Epub 2020/10/06. PMID: 33016373
4. Rose NC, Barrie ES, Malinowski J, et al. Systematic evidence-based review: The application of noninvasive prenatal screening using cell-free DNA in general-risk pregnancies. Genet Med. 2022;24(7):1379-91. Epub 2022/05/25. PMID: 35608568

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: Cell-free Fetal DNA Testing, **continued**

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: CELL-FREE TUMOR DNA/LIQUID BIOPSY

Policy # 581
Implementation Date: 7/8/16
Review Dates: 6/15/17, 9/18/18, 8/8/19, 10/21/20, 5/19/22, 1/17/23
Revision Dates: 8/21/17, 8/16/19, 9/23/20, 1/29/21, 5/9/22, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#570 Genetic Testing: Molecular Profiling for Determining Therapy of Malignant Tumors

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Detecting and monitoring cancer recurrence can sometimes be problematic. Additionally, for individuals who have a relapse while on therapy determining optimal approaches to therapy modification can also be problematic as tumor samples may not be accessible via biopsy, or the patient may not be able to well-tolerate an invasive procedure. New methods to identify and characterize the molecular characteristics of persistent or recurrent tumors are being developed which are intended to eliminate invasive biopsies but retain similar sensitivities and specificities. One such technology is the "liquid biopsy." This technology uses next-generation sequencing to characterize tumors based on the capture and analysis of cell-free tumor DNA (ctDNA). This technology involves a blood test that provides detailed information on the genomic make up of any tumor present with the ability to identify the percentage of each mutation found in an individual's blood. Though it has long been known that tumor cells release DNA into the blood, what is unknown is whether the DNA that is released will accurately represent the same genetic mutations as the primary cancer tumor, as well as other sites of metastasis. The concentration of tumor DNA in the blood stream has been speculated to also indicate how advanced the cancer may be and if current therapies are impacting.

Laboratories pursing this technology include Pathway Genomics, the CancerIntercept test (designed for early cancer detection and monitoring), and also Circulogene's (Theranostics) liquid biopsy uses a finger stick volume of blood and NGS to monitor known tumor mutations (≈3000) in 50 cancer-associated genes for targeted therapy and others. This test uses a proprietary method to recover necrotic and apoptotic cell-death-associated cell-free DNA. Pathway Genomics Cancer Intercept is a 96-gene mutation panel designed to detect mutations in 9 driver genes involved primarily in breast, ovarian, lung, and colorectal cancers, as well as melanoma. Guardant Health and their Guardant360 test assess 70 actionable mutations on various solid tumors. Many other tests are in various stages of development.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

A. **SelectHealth covers either the Guardant360Cdx liquid biopsy assay or FoundationOne LiquidCdx if one of the following is present:**

1. Tissue-based CGP (comprehensive genomic profiling) is infeasible (i.e., quantity not sufficient for tissue-based CGP or invasive biopsy is medically contraindicated) specifically in non-small cell lung cancer (NSLC)

   OR

2. Tissue-based CGP (comprehensive genomic profiling) is infeasible (i.e., quantity not sufficient for tissue-based CGP or invasive biopsy is medically contraindicated), and an FDA-approved indication or NCCN recommendation requires information about the presence or absence of a genetic biomarker

   OR

3. Member is considering participating in a clinical trial* intended to assess the effectiveness of targeted therapies based on tumor marker, and tissue-based CGP is infeasible (i.e., quantity not sufficient for tissue-based CGP or invasive biopsy is medically contraindicated).

*Clinical trial must meet one (i–iii) of the following clinical conditions:

i. Any advanced stage III or IV solid tumors, or
ii. All lymphomas, or
iii. Multiple myeloma

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are no available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

For individuals who have cancer who receive molecular characterization of tumor using cell-free tumor DNA (ctDNA), the evidence includes case series and systematic reviews of these case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, morbid events, and medication use. Ultrasensitive methods to detect mutations from ctDNA have been developed, but there is limited evidence on the analytic validity of these methods. There is a need for further optimization and standardization of testing methods. Clinical validity consists of case series that report correlations between mutations detected in ctDNA with mutations detected in tumor tissue. Results have shown variable results for clinical sensitivity. Although some reports have suggested that clinical sensitivity may be high, this finding has not been consistent. Published studies have consistently reported high clinical specificity; however, most study population have consisted of small and heterogeneous, and it is not known to what degree mutations detected by ctDNA are representative of the primary tumor. Published studies reporting clinical outcomes and/or clinical utility are lacking. The uncertainties concerning clinical validity and clinical utility preclude conclusions about whether mutation analysis by ctDNA can replace mutation analysis in tissue. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

Covered for the Indications Listed Above

0152U	Infectious disease (bacteria, fungi, parasites, and DNA viruses), microbial cell-free DNA, plasma, untargeted next-generation sequencing, report for significant positive pathogens
0091U	Oncology (colorectal) screening, cell enumeration of circulating tumor cells, utilizing whole blood, algorithm, for the presence of adenoma or cancer, reported as a positive or negative result
0179U	Oncology (non-small cell lung cancer), cell-free DNA, targeted sequence analysis of 23 genes (single nucleotide variations, insertions and deletions, fusions without prior knowledge of partner/breakpoint, copy number variations), with report of significant mutation(s)
0229U	BCAT1 (Branched chain amino acid transaminase 1) and IKZF1 (IKAROS family zinc finger 1) (eg, colorectal cancer) promoter methylation analysis
0239U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, cell-free DNA, analysis of 311 or more genes, interrogation for sequence variants, including substitutions, insertions, deletions, select rearrangements, and copy number variations
0242U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, cell-free circulating DNA analysis of 55-74 genes, interrogation for sequence variants, gene copy number amplifications, and gene rearrangements
0285U	Oncology, response to radiation, cell-free DNA, quantitative branched chain DNA amplification, plasma, reported as a radiation toxicity score
0306U	Oncology (minimal residual disease [MRD]), next-generation targeted sequencing analysis, cell-free DNA, initial (baseline) assessment to determine a patient specific panel for future comparisons to evaluate for MRD
0307U	Oncology (minimal residual disease [MRD]), next-generation targeted sequencing analysis of a patient-specific panel, cell-free DNA, subsequent assessment with comparison to previously analyzed patient specimens to evaluate for MRD
0317U	Oncology (lung cancer), four-probe FISH (3q29, 3p22.1, 10q22.3, 10cen) assay, whole blood, predictive algorithm generated evaluation reported as decreased or increased risk for lung cancer
0333U	Oncology (liver), surveillance for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) in highrisk patients, analysis of methylation patterns on circulating cell-free DNA (cfDNA) plus measurement

Genetic Testing: Cell-free Tumor DNA/Liquid Biopsy, **continued**

	of serum of AFP/AFP-L3 and oncoprotein desgammacarboxy-prothrombin (DCP), algorithm reported as normal or abnormal result
0334U	Oncology (solid organ), targeted genomic sequence analysis, formalin-fixed paraffin embedded (FFPE) tumor tissue, DNA analysis, 84 or more genes, interrogation for sequence variants, gene copy number amplifications, gene rearrangements, microsatellite instability and tumor mutational burden
0338U	Oncology (solid tumor), circulating tumor cell selection, identification, morphological characterization, detection and enumeration based on differential EpCAM, cytokeratins 8, 18, and 19, and CD45 protein biomarkers, and quantification of HER2 protein biomarker–expressing cells, peripheral blood
0340U	Oncology (pan-cancer), analysis of minimal residual disease (MRD) from plasma, with assays personalized to each patient based on prior nextgeneration sequencing of the patient's tumor and germline DNA, reported as absence or presence of MRD, with disease-burden correlation, if appropriate
0356U	Oncology (oropharyngeal), evaluation of 17 DNA biomarkers using droplet digital PCR (ddPCR), cell-free DNA, algorithm reported as a prognostic risk score for cancer recurrence
81445	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, DNA analysis, and RNA analysis when performed, 5-50 genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, NRAS, MET, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed
81449	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, 5-50 genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, MET, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed; RNA analysis
81450	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, DNA analysis, and RNA analysis when performed, 5-50 genes (eg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KRAS, KIT, MLL, NRAS, NPM1, NOTCH1), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed
81451	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 5-50 genes (eg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis
81455	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm, DNA analysis, and RNA analysis when performed, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NPM1, NRAS, MET, NOTCH1, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, 3 RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed
81456	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

Not Covered for the Indications Listed Above

0326U Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, cell-free circulating DNA analysis of 83 or more genes, interrogation for sequence variants, gene copy number amplifications, gene rearrangements, microsatellite instability and tumor mutational burden

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. Alix-Panabieres, C. and Pantel, K. (2013). Circulating tumor cells: liquid biopsy of cancer. Clin Chem. 59(1): 110-8; PMID:23014601.
2. Alix-Panabieres, C. and Pantel, K. (2016). Clinical Applications of Circulating Tumor Cells and Circulating Tumor DNA as Liquid Biopsy. Cancer Discov. 6(5): 479-91; PMID:26969689.
3. Braig, F., Voigtlaender, M., et al. (2016). Liquid biopsy monitoring uncovers acquired RAS-mediated resistance to cetuximab in a substantial proportion of patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. Oncotarget. PMID:27119512.
4. Biggs, C. N., Siddiqui, K. M., et al. (2016). Prostate extracellular vesicles in patient plasma as a liquid biopsy platform for prostate cancer using nanoscale flow cytometry. Oncotarget. 7(8): 8839-49; PMID:26814433.
5. Cortesi, E., Palleschi, M., et al. (2015). The promise of liquid biopsy in cancer: a clinical perspective. Chin J Cancer Res. 27(5): 488-90; PMID:26543335
6. De Mattos-Arruda, L. and Caldas, C. (2016). Cell-free circulating tumour DNA as a liquid biopsy in breast cancer. Mol Oncol. 10(3): 464-74; PMID:26776681.
7. Huang, S. K. and Hoon, D. S. (2016). Liquid biopsy utility for the surveillance of cutaneous malignant melanoma patients. Mol Oncol. 10(3): 450-63; PMID:26778792.
8. Karachaliou, N., Mayo-de-Las-Casas, C., et al. (2015). Real-time liquid biopsies become a reality in cancer treatment. Ann Transl Med. 3(3): 36; PMID:25815297.
9. Marchetti, A., Del Grammastro, M., et al. (2014). Assessment of EGFR mutations in circulating tumor cell preparations from NSCLC patients by next generation sequencing: toward a real-time liquid biopsy for treatment. PLoS One. 9(8): e103883; PMID:25137181.
10. Willms, A., Muller, C., et al. (2016). Tumour-associated circulating microparticles: A novel liquid biopsy tool for screening and therapy monitoring of colorectal carcinoma and other epithelial neoplasia. Oncotarget. PMID:27127176.
11. Zhou, J., Huang, A., et al. (2016). Liquid Biopsy and its Potential for Management of Hepatocellular Carcinoma. J Gastrointest Cancer. 47(2): 157-67; PMID:26969471.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: CHARCOT-MARIE-TOOTH SYNDROME (HEREDITARY MOTOR SENSORY NEUROPATHY)

Policy # 134

Implementation Date: 3/6/10
Review Dates: 7/18/13, 6/19/14, 6/11/15, 6/16/16, 6/15/17, 9/13/18, 8/7/19, 1/24/23
Revision Dates: 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Charcot-Marie-Tooth is a spectrum of disorders and is one of the most common inherited neurological disorders, affecting approximately 1 in 2,500 people in the US. It is a polyneuropathic process that can be demyelinating or axonal and affects patients typically in the first or early second decade, but infants may be symptomatic. The neuropathy of CMT affects both motor and sensory nerves.

Hereditary motor sensory neuropathy (Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease) has been classified as types 1−7 and consists of at least 30 different disorders. The major division comprises type 1 and type 2, which together are the most common hereditary peripheral neuropathies, with an estimated prevalence of 40 per 100,000. Common features include both motor and sensory nerve manifestations with distal leg weakness, foot deformities (pes cavus, hammer toes), and sensory deficits.

Early symptoms may include frequent sprained ankles caused by distal muscle weakness or difficulty running and keeping up with peers. The only obvious physical findings may be loss of reflexes, pes cavus foot deformity, and hammer toes. Calf muscle atrophy often occurs, causing the classic "stork leg deformity." Walking is clumsy because of both muscle weakness and sensory loss. Sensory loss is gradual and mainly involves proprioception and vibration. Later changes include atrophy of the intrinsic hand and foot muscles. Palpable enlargement of the peripheral nerves may occur secondary to nerve hypertrophy. In addition, kyphosis or scoliosis often develops.

Treatment is symptomatic. Affected individuals are often evaluated and managed by a multidisciplinary team that includes neurologists, physiatrists, orthopedic surgeons, and physical and occupational therapists. Quality of life has been measured and compared among various groups of individuals with Charcot-Marie-Tooth. Special shoes, including those with good ankle support, may be needed. Affected individuals often require ankle/foot orthoses (AFOs) to correct foot drop and aid walking. Orthopedic surgery may be required to correct severe pes cavus deformity. Some individuals require forearm crutches or canes for gait stability, but fewer than 5% of individuals need wheelchairs. Exercise is encouraged within the individual's capability and many individuals remain physically active. The cause of any pain should be identified as accurately as possible.

HMSN type 1, also known as Charcot-Marie-Tooth type 1 (CMT1) disease, is a demyelinating disorder of peripheral nerves. It has been subdivided based on genetic markers into types 1A, 1B, and 1C, (with type 1A being most common), although the clinical manifestations are similar. Affected patients typically present in the first or early second decade, but infants may be symptomatic. Type 1 disease is caused by mutations in genes that are expressed in Schwann cells, the myelinating cells of the peripheral nervous system. The types that typically exhibit autosomal dominance have been subdivided into types 1A, 1B, and 1C. However, autosomal recessive and X-linked forms also occur.

Genetic Testing: Charcot Marie-Tooth Syndrome (Hereditary Motor Sensory Neuropathy, continued

CMT hereditary neuropathy needs to be distinguished from acquired non-genetic causes of peripheral neuropathy and other genetic neuropathies. The CMT phenotype consists of motor and sensory neuropathy without an established acquired cause. Individuals with CMT who experience blindness, seizures, dementia, and intellectual disability are not part of the CMT hereditary neuropathy syndrome and should be suggestive of some other diagnosis. The probability of any given group possessing a mutation for CMT is not established. Furthermore, among those with identifiable mutations, the penetrance and expressivity of mutations is also unknown.

Currently, there are no established, effective treatments to either slow or reverse the natural disease process for the various CMT variants, though, multiple treatment regimens are being explored.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

SelectHealth does not cover genetic testing for Charcot-Marie-Tooth Syndrome, including inheritable motor/sensory neuropathy. This testing has not been established as medically necessary in the management of patients with peripheral neuropathy.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Extensive literature has been published on Charcot-Marie-Tooth; this evidence demonstrates the reliability of this testing (statistical validity). From this evidence, it is clear that genetic mutation is responsible, at least in part, for a wide variety of otherwise undiagnosed motor-sensory peripheral neuropathies.

GeneReviews lists 4 major types of CMT with about 30 subtypes. This will likely expand as further research on this group of disorders becomes better understood. However, it is not yet clear from the evidence what the accuracy of available genetic tests is, the penetrance or expressivity of mutations, or the necessity/importance of performing genetic testing vs. clinical testing.

The American Academy of Neurology's guideline from 2009 on genetic testing for neuropathy and subsequently reaffirmed in 2013 (England et al.), noted: "Genetic testing should be conducted for the accurate diagnosis and classification of hereditary neuropathies (Level A)". Despite this recommendation, there is insufficient evidence to support performing testing in this situation, as it alters patient management in a substantive manner nor presents significant clinical utility. The guideline goes on to state, genetic testing may be considered in patients with cryptogenic polyneuropathy who exhibit a hereditary neuropathy phenotype (Level C). Initial genetic testing should be guided by the clinical phenotype, inheritance pattern, and electrodiagnostic features, and should focus on the most common abnormalities which are CMT1A duplication/HNPP deletion, Cx32 (GJB1), and MFN2 mutation screening. There is insufficient evidence to determine the usefulness of routine genetic testing in patients with cryptogenic polyneuropathy who do not exhibit a hereditary neuropathy phenotype (Level U).

Genetic Testing: Charcot Marie-Tooth Syndrome (Hereditary Motor Sensory Neuropathy, continued

Currently, there remains a lack of information demonstrating the clinical utility of this testing.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

81324 PMP22 (peripheral myelin protein 22) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth, hereditary neuropathy with liability to pressure palsies) gene analysis; duplication/deletion analysis

81325 PMP22 (peripheral myelin protein 22) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth, hereditary neuropathy with liability to pressure palsies) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

81326 PMP22 (peripheral myelin protein 22) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth, hereditary neuropathy with liability to pressure palsies) gene analysis; known familial variant

81403 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 4

81404 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 5

81405 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 5

81406 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 7

81448 Hereditary peripheral neuropathies (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth, spastic paraplegia), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 5 peripheral neuropathy-related genes (eg, BSCL2, GJB1, MFN2, MPZ, REEP1, SPAST, SPG11, SPTLC1)

HCPCS CODES

G0452 Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Arnold, W. D. and K. M. Flanigan (2012). "A practical approach to molecular diagnostic testing in neuromuscular diseases." Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am 23(3): 589-608.
2. Bassam, B. A. (2014). "Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease variants-classification, clinical, and genetic features and rational diagnostic evaluation." J Clin Neuromuscul Dis 15(3): 117-128.
3. Bertorini T, Narayanaswami P, Rashed H. Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease (hereditary motor sensory neuropathies) and hereditary sensory and autonomic neuropathies. Neurologist. 2004 Nov;10(6):327-37.
4. Bird TD. Charcot-Marie-Tooth Hereditary Neuropathy Overview. GeneReviews.org. Last Revision: April 16, 2009. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bookshelf/br.fcgi?book=gene&part=cmt. Date Accessed: February 2, 2010
5. Carter GT, England JD, Chance PF. Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease: electrophysiology, molecular genetics and clinical management. IDrugs. 2004 Feb;7(2):151-9.
6. Cruse RP, Hereditary primary motor sensory neuropathies, including Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease. UpToDate. Last Update: October 3, 2009. Available at: http://www.utdol.com/online/content/topic.do?topicKey=ped_neur/5537&selectedTitle=1%7E150&source=search_result. Date Accessed: February 2, 2010
7. Di Auer-Grumbach M. Hereditary sensory neuropathies. Drugs Today (Barc). 2004 May;40(5):385-94.
8. DiVincenzo, C., C. D. Elzinga, A. C. Medeiros, I. Karbassi, J. R. Jones, M. C. Evans, C. D. Braastad, C. M. Bishop, M. Jaremko, Z. Wang, K. Liaquat, C. A. Hoffman, M. D. York, S. D. Batish, J. R. Lupski and J. J. Higgins (2014). "The allelic spectrum of Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease in over 17,000 individuals with neuropathy." Mol Genet Genomic Med 2(6): 522-529.
9. England, J. D. (2014). "The shifting landscape of genetic testing for Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease." Muscle Nerve 49(4): 467-468.
10. England, J. D., G. S. Gronseth, G. Franklin, G. T. Carter, L. J. Kinsella, J. A. Cohen, A. K. Asbury, K. Szigeti, J. R. Lupski, N. Latov, R. A. Lewis, P. A. Low, M. A. Fisher, D. N. Herrmann, J. F. Howard, Jr., G. Lauria, R. G. Miller, M. Polydefkis, A. J. Sumner and N. American Academy of (2009). "Practice Parameter: evaluation of distal symmetric polyneuropathy: role of laboratory and genetic testing (an evidence-based review). Report of the American Academy of Neurology, American Association of Neuromuscular and Electrodiagnostic Medicine, and American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation." Neurology 72(2): 185-192.
11. Gemignani F, Marbini A. Disease course of Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease type 2 and comorbidity. Arch Neurol. 2004 Sep;61(9):1470; author reply 1470.
12. Grandis M, Shy ME. Current Therapy for Charcot-Marie-Tooth Disease. Curr Treat Options Neurol. 2005 Jan;7(1):23-31.
13. Irobi J, De Jonghe P, Timmerman V. Molecular genetics of distal hereditary motor neuropathies. Hum Mol Genet. 2004 Oct 1;13 Spec No 2: R195-202.
14. Ostern, R., et al. (2013). "Diagnostic laboratory testing for Charcot Marie Tooth disease (CMT): the spectrum of gene defects in Norwegian patients with CMT and its implications for future genetic test strategies." BMC Med Genet 14: 94.
15. Pareyson D. Guidelines for the diagnosis of Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease and related neuropathies. Ad hoc Working Group of the Peripheral Nervous System Study Group, Italian Neurological Society. Ital J Neurol Sci. 1999 Aug;20(4):207-16.
16. Pareyson D. Differential diagnosis of Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease and related neuropathies. Neurol Sci. 2004 Jun;25(2):72-82.

Genetic Testing: Charcot Marie-Tooth Syndrome (Hereditary Motor Sensory Neuropathy, continued

17. Pouget J. [Molecular diagnosis of hereditary neuropathies such as Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease] Rev Neurol (Paris). 2004 Feb;160(2):181-7.
18. Rossor, A. M., et al. (2013). "Clinical implications of genetic advances in Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease." Nat Rev Neurol 9(10): 562-571.
19. Saifi GM, Szigeti K, Snipes GJ, et al. Molecular mechanisms, diagnosis, and rational approaches to management of and therapy for Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease and related peripheral neuropathies. J Investig Med. 2003 Sep;51(5):261-83. Review. Erratum in: J Investig Med. 2004 Jan;52(1):50.
20. Shy ME. Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease: an update. Curr Opin Neurol. 2004 Oct;17(5):579-85.
21. Vallat JM, Grid D, Magdelaine C, Sturtz F, Tazir M. Autosomal recessive forms of Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease. Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep. 2004 Sep;4(5):413-9.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: COMPARATIVE GENOMIC HYBRIDIZATION (CGH)/CHROMOSOMAL MICROARRAY (CMA)

Policy # 297	
Implementation Date:	2/15/06
Review Dates:	5/17/07, 4/24/08, 2/18/10, 5/19/11, 6/21/12, 6/20/13, 4/17/14, 5/7/15, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 6/16/18, 4/17/19, 2/14/23
Revision Dates:	4/23/09, 5/26/16, 8/7/18, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling
#476 Genetic Testing: CYP2C19 Testing in the Assessment of Clopidogrel Therapy
#514 Whole Genomic Sequencing (WGS)/Whole Exome Sequencing (WES)

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Developmental disabilities are a family of chronic disorders of early onset, affecting between 5%–10% of children. Global developmental delay (DD), a heterogeneous subset of developmental disabilities, is defined as significant delay in 2 or more developmental areas and is associated with deficits in adaptation and learning skills. Those deficits are evident in comparison with the skills-attainment of chronological peers. "Significant" delay is defined as performance 2 standard deviations or more below the mean on age-appropriate, standardized norm referenced testing. The term global developmental delay is usually reserved for younger children (i.e., typically less than 5 years of age), whereas the term intellectual disability (previously referred to as mental retardation) is usually applied to older children when IQ testing is more valid and reliable.

In 2003, the American Academy of Neurology (AAN) outlined a stepwise approach to evaluating the child with DD. Although there is insufficient evidence to recommend the optimal sequence of tests to determine the etiology of DD, taking into account diagnostic yield and potential treatability, they proposed an evidence-based approach to the testing schedule. In these guidelines, any test with a 6% yield was thought to be meaningful. These recommendations relate to the order and timing of testing but not to the relative diagnostic yield of the specific tests themselves. The absence of any clinical features that suggest a specific diagnosis is less likely to be associated with a definable disease and thus a stepwise approach is recommended. This may include initial neuroimaging (MRI preferred), cytogenetic, and Fragile X screening. If these tests are negative, consideration may be given to metabolic evaluation, testing for subtelomeric rearrangements, and genetic consultation.

The comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) or chromosomal microarray (CMA) is a technique that permits the detection of chromosomal copy number changes without the need for cell culturing. It gives a global overview of chromosomal gains and losses throughout the whole genome. In CGH/CMA, DNA is extracted directly from the test sample and a normal reference sample (pooled DNA from 10,000 samples). The 2 DNA samples are differentially labeled, for example, with the test labeled in green and the reference in red. The combined probes are then applied to target metaphase chromosomes attached to a medium and compete for complementary hybridization sites. Therefore, if a region is amplified in the test sample, the corresponding region on the metaphase chromosome becomes predominantly green. Conversely, if a region is deleted in the test sample, the corresponding region becomes red. The ratios of test-to-reference fluorescence along the chromosomes are quantified using digital image analysis. Gains

Genetic Testing: Comparative Genomic Hybridization (CGH)/Chromosomal Microarray (CMA), continued

and amplifications in the test DNA are identified as chromosomal regions with increased fluorescence ratios, whereas losses and deletions result in a reduced ratio. One of the main advantages of CGH/CMA is its use as a discovery tool, as it requires no prior knowledge of the chromosome imbalance that is involved. In the hands of the preferred referral laboratory, the current U-array has an average resolution of approximately 500 kb.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a genetic counselor, a medical geneticist, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and
2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic testing for clinical conditions presenting as developmental delay using the comparative genomic hybridization (CGH)/chromosomal microarray (CMA) technique in *limited circumstances* as outlined below. Use of this technology has been shown to have statistical validity and clinical utility when applied to appropriately selected patients.

Criteria for coverage:

A. Diagnostic Testing for Symptomatic Individuals:

1) Testing performed on living child or adult; and

2) Diagnosis cannot be made on clinical evaluation alone; and

3) Common aneuploidy (trisomy 13, 18, 21, or sex chromosome) is not a suspected diagnosis; and

4) One of the following presentations:

i. Isolated developmental delay (DD)/intellectual disability (ID)

ii. DD/ID associated with other findings that are not consistent with an easily recognizable syndrome

iii. Autism spectrum disorder

iv. Multiple congenital anomalies[a] not specific to a well-delineated genetic syndrome.

B. Diagnostic Testing for Intrauterine Fetal Demise or Stillbirth:[b]

1) Common aneuploidy (trisomy 13, 18, 21, or sex chromosome) is not a suspected diagnosis; and

2) Multiple congenital anomalies[a] not specific to a well-delineated genetic syndrome.

OR

3) Fetal demise or stillbirth occurred at 20 weeks of gestation or later

C. SelectHealth covers use of chromosomal microarray analysis (CMA) in pregnancy, when the following criteria are met.

1) Any one of the following:

i. Patients with a fetus with one or more major structural abnormalities identified on ultrasonographic examination and who are undergoing invasive prenatal diagnosis
ii. Patients with a structurally normal fetus undergoing invasive prenatal diagnostic testing

iii. CMA covered for fetal demise

[a]Multiple congenital anomalies defined as 1) two or more major anomalies affecting different organ systems or 2) one major and two or more minor anomalies affecting different organ systems. [Major structural abnormalities are generally serious enough as to require medical treatment on their own (such as surgery) and are not minor developmental variations that may or may not suggest an underlying disorder.]

[b]The member has sufficient risk of fetal choroidal neovascularization (CNV) to justify invasive prenatal diagnosis. [It is important to note that invasive diagnostic procedures such as chorionic villus sampling and amniocentesis are associated with risks; the provider and member must have determined that the associated benefits outweigh the risks.

D. Exclusions and other considerations

1) CMA is not considered medically necessary in cases of family history of chromosome rearrangement in phenotypically normal individuals

2) CMA is not considered medically necessary in individuals experiencing infertility, structurally normal pregnancy losses that occur at less than 20 weeks, or recurrent pregnancy loss.

3) If routine karyotype and CMA are ordered simultaneously, only the most appropriate test based on clinical history will be considered for coverage.

4) If CMA has been performed, the following tests are often excessive and are not considered medically necessary. Each test may require medical necessity review:

5) Routine karyotype: Full karyotype in addition to CMA is typically considered excessive. However, a limited 5 cell analysis may be approved in addition to CMA if criteria for CMA are met. This approval may be subject to claims review to ensure that the appropriate procedure code for a limited 5 cell analysis is billed (CPT 88261 x1).

6) FISH analysis

7) Telomere/subtelomere analysis

8) More than one type of microarray analysis (i.e., if 81228 performed, 81229 is not medically necessary)

9) When a multigene deletion/duplication panel is being requested and billed using a microarray procedure code (typically 81228 or 81229), the panel will be redirected to the more specific code.

10) CMA for delineation of translocation breakpoints will be reviewed on a case-

by-case basis

.

11) CMA for determination of whether a translocation is balanced or unbalanced with be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

12) The patient presents with a clinical diagnosis of developmental delay.

13) Thorough history and physical has failed to establish a definitive diagnosis other than developmental delay.

14) Chromosome Analysis has failed to provide a definitive diagnosis in patients presenting with dysmorphic features suggestive of a specific chromosome abnormality (e.g., Down syndrome, Prader Willi syndrome).

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Cytogenetic technology is growing rapidly and experts in this area are rapidly incorporating and applying new techniques and approaches to chromosome analysis. However, the same rapid change has limited the study of this technology in randomized, controlled, prospective studies. To some extent, this has resulted in a limited ability to interpret the final role of array CGH.

Significant literature exists demonstrating the statistical validity of CGH using microarray. This literature has demonstrated that array CGH is more accurate and sensitive in discovering deletions/duplications in the genome than any other techniques, although this technique will not identify balanced translocations (which are irrelevant for the most part in this indication). Literature specific to the application of this technology related to specific health/disease states, however, is lacking, although between 5 and 10 new microdeletion/duplication syndromes have been characterized through use of this technology that has yielded insights into specific medical care for these syndromes. A movement to standardize testing platforms as well as aggregating clinical and variant data in a centralized database may help to address some of these issues. The position statements from the American College of Medical Genetics and the American Academy of Neurology imply that this technology has a place and will probably become an integral part of solving the diagnostic dilemma of developmental delay. Most experts believe that a test which may provide a 1% or more yield has clinical utility. Best estimates across many case series estimates the yield of CGH for this clinical indication at 20%—the highest yield of any generally applied testing technology. This utility would be measured by “making a diagnosis” which can, in some cases, promote allowing families the ability to make reasonable choices with regards to their reproductive status. Most authors also make the assumption that some testing may be eliminated, specifically subtelomeric FISH, by performing array CGH, but no prospective analysis has been done. Unpublished information from the preferred referral laboratory has confirmed a dramatic reduction in utilization of standard karyotype and subtelomeric FISH; diagnostic yield is comparable to that reported in the literature.

Genetic Testing: Comparative Genomic Hybridization (CGH)/Chromosomal Microarray (CMA), continued

However, this technique may also reveal a number of polymorphisms that are unrelated to the patient's phenotype, but which must be considered, nonetheless. The relative value of the test will depend on the clinical experience of the geneticist to guide the patient/family through the plethora of genetic tests available to evaluate developmental delay. From the current medical literature, it appears array CGH and CMA have the ability to enhance diagnostic accuracy and expedite the testing process.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the indications outlined above

CPT CODES

0156U	Copy number (eg, intellectual disability, dysmorphology), sequence analysis
0209U	Cytogenomic constitutional (genome-wide) analysis, interrogation of genomic regions for copy number, structural changes and areas of homozygosity for chromosomal abnormalities
0318U	Pediatrics (congenital epigenetic disorders), whole genome methylation analysis by microarray for 50 or more genes, blood EpiSign Complete, Greenwood Genetic Center
81228	Cytogenomic constitutional (genome-wide) microarray analysis; interrogation of genomic regions for copy number variants (eg, bacterial artificial chromosome [BAC] or oligo-based comparative genomic hybridization [CGH] microarray analysis)
81229	Cytogenomic constitutional (genome-wide) microarray analysis; interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) variants for chromosomal abnormalities
81349	Cytogenomic (genome-wide) analysis for constitutional chromosomal abnormalities
81405	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 6 (eg, analysis of 6-10 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 11-25 exons, regionally targeted cytogenomic array analysis) [when specified as the following]:
	Cytogenomic constitutional targeted microarray analysis of chromosome 22q13 by interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) variants for chromosomal abnormalities
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

HCPCS CODES

G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report
S3870	Comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) microarray testing for developmental delay, autism spectrum disorder and/or mental retardation

Key References

1. Battaglia A, Carey JC. Diagnostic evaluation of developmental delay/mental retardation: An overview. Am J Med Genet C Semin Med Genet. 2003; 117(1):3-14.
2. Bejjani BA, Saleki R, Ballif BC, et al. Use of targeted array-based CGH for the clinical diagnosis of chromosomal imbalance: is less more? Am J Med Genet A. 2005; 134(3):259-67.
3. Brownstein, C. A., et al. (2016). "Overlapping 16p13.11 deletion and gain of copies variations associated with childhood onset psychosis include genes with mechanistic implications for autism associated pathways: Two case reports." Am J Med Genet A 170(5): 1165-1173.
4. Cheung SW, Shaw CA, Yu W, et al. Development and validation of a CGH microarray for clinical cytogenetic diagnosis. Genet Med. 2005; 7(6):422-32.
5. Ciccone R, Giorda R, Gregato G, et al. Reciprocal translocations: a trap for cytogenetists? Hum Genet. 2005; 117(6):571-82.
6. de Vries BB, Pfundt R, Leisink M, et al. Diagnostic genome profiling in mental retardation. Am J Hum Genet. 2005; 77(4):606-16.
7. Cooper, G. M., et al. (2011). "A copy number variation morbidity map of developmental delay." Nat Genet 43(9): 838-846.

Genetic Testing: Comparative Genomic Hybridization (CGH)/Chromosomal Microarray (CMA), continued

8. Dynagene. Basic Cytogenetics. http://www.dynagene.com/print/geninfo.html. 2005.
9. http://www.zeiss.com. Date accessed: 1/18/06.
10. http://stemcells.nih.gov/StaticResources/images/WA01-p64.jpg. Date accessed: 1/18/06.
11. http://www.dartmouth.edu/~cbbc/courses/bio4/bio4-lectures/theCell.html. Date accessed: 1/18/06.
12. http://www.chem.agilent.com/Scripts/Generic.ASP?lPage=36617&indcol=N&prodcol=Y. Date accessed: 1/18/06.
13. http://www.klinikum.uni-heidelberg.de/fileadmin/inst_humangenetik/abt_humangenetik/M-Telpicturegross.jpg. Date accessed: 1/18/06.
14. Laboratory Corporation of America. CGH Chip Array, Constitutional. (http://www.labcorp.com/datasets/labcorp/html/chapter/mono/nf10005580.htm). 2005.
15. Mao R, Pevsner J. The use of genomic microarrays to study chromosomal abnormalities in mental retardation. Ment Retard Dev Disabil Res Rev. 2005; 11(4):279-85.
16. Miller, D. T., et al. (2010). "Consensus statement: chromosomal microarray is a first-tier clinical diagnostic test for individuals with developmental disabilities or congenital anomalies." Am J Hum Genet 86(5): 749-764.
17. Ness GO, Lybaek H, Houge G. Usefulness of high-resolution comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) for detecting and characterizing constitutional chromosome abnormalities. Am J Med Genet. 2002; 113(2):125-36.
18. Rickman L, Fiegler H, Shaw-Smith C, et al. Prenatal detection of unbalanced chromosomal rearrangements by array-CGH. J Med Genet. 2005.
19. Roa BB, Pulliam J, Eng CM, Cheung SW. Evolution of prenatal genetics: from point mutation testing to chromosomal microarray analysis. Expert Rev Mol Diagn. 2005; 5(6):883-92.
20. Rosenberg C, Knijnenburg J, Bakker E, et al. Array-CGH detection of micro rearrangements in mentally retarded individuals: Clinical significance of imbalances present both in affected children and normal parents. J Med Genet. 2005.
21. Sahoo T, Peters SU, Madduri NS, et al. Microarray-based comparative genomic hybridization testing in deletion-bearing Angelman Syndrome patients: Genotype-phenotype correlations. J Med Genet. 2005.
22. Schoumans J, Ruivenkamp C, Holmberg E, Kyllerman M, Anderlid BM, Nordenskjold M. Detection of chromosomal imbalances in children with idiopathic mental retardation by array based comparative genomic hybridisation (array-CGH). J Med Genet. 2005; 42(9):699-705.
23. Shaffer LG. American College of Medical Genetics guideline on the cytogenetic evaluation of the individual with developmental delay or mental retardation. Genet Med. 2005; 7(9):650-4.
24. Shaw-Smith C, Redon R, Rickman L, et al. Microarray based comparative genomic hybridisation (array-CGH) detects submicroscopic chromosomal deletions and duplications in patients with learning disability/mental retardation and dysmorphic features. J Med Genet. 2004; 41(4):241-8.
25. Shevell M, Ashwal S, Donley D, et al. Practice parameter: evaluation of the child with global developmental delay: report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology and The Practice Committee of the Child Neurology Society. Neurology. 2003; 60(3):367-80.
26. South, S. T., et al. (2013). "ACMG Standards and Guidelines for constitutional cytogenomic microarray analysis, including postnatal and prenatal applications: revision 2013." Genet Med 15(11): 901-909.
27. Speicher MR, Carter NP. The new cytogenetics: blurring the boundaries with molecular biology. Nat Rev Genet. 2005; 6(10):782-92.
28. Tammimies, K., et al. (2015). "Molecular Diagnostic Yield of Chromosomal Microarray Analysis and Whole-Exome Sequencing in Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder." JAMA 314(9): 895-903.
29. Tyson C, Harvard C, Locker R, et al. Submicroscopic deletions and duplications in individuals with intellectual disability detected by array-CGH. Am J Med Genet A. 2005; 139(3):173-85.
30. Weiss MM, Hermsen MA, Meijer GA, et al. Comparative genomic hybridisation. Mol Pathol. 1999; 52(5):243-51.
31. Wong A, Lese Martin C, Heretis K, et al. Detection and calibration of microdeletions and microduplications by array-based comparative genomic hybridization and its applicability to clinical genetic testing. Genet Med. 2005; 7(4):264-71.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: CYSTIC FIBROSIS (CF)

Policy # 289	
Implementation Date:	12/15/05
Review Dates:	2/21/08, 2/26/09, 2/18/10, 2/17/11, 2/16/12, 4/25/13, 2/11/16, 2/16/17, 2/15/18, 2/18/19, 2/7/23
Revision Dates:	2/15/07, 2/20/14, 2/11/15, 2/25/19, 7/1/23, 8/7/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Cystic fibrosis (CF) is a multisystem genetic disease in which defective chloride transport across membranes causes dehydrated secretions. This leads to tenacious mucus in the lungs, to mucous plugs in the pancreas, and to the characteristically high sweat chloride levels. Intelligence and cognitive function are typically normal. More than 25,000 Americans have CF, with approximately 850 individuals newly diagnosed each year. Cystic fibrosis is inherited as an autosomal recessive disorder; the responsible gene, the CF transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR), was mapped to chromosome 7 and identified in 1989.

Cystic fibrosis has a highly variable presentation and course. Median age at diagnosis is 6–8 months; nearly 2/3 of individuals are diagnosed before 1 year of age. Some individuals have severe pulmonary and/or gastrointestinal disease while others have relatively mild disease with presentation during adolescence and young adulthood. There is a range of outcomes, from early death from pulmonary complications to mild atypical disease in second and third decades, but rarely a normal length of life. Even though median survival has increased from 18 years in 1976 to 30.1 years in 1995, there has been little life-span extension between 1990 and 1995. Survival has improved thus far, through aggressive management of pulmonary, pancreatic, and intestinal complications.

Even though there have been advances in treatment, there is no cure for CF. Severity of lung disease is the key to the quality and length of life. Ninety percent of persons who have CF die from pulmonary complications. Pulmonary function tests, especially forced expiratory volume (FEV1), are predictive of mortality: when the FEV1 is 30%, mortality is 50% in 2 years. Poor prognosis is related to respiratory complications before 1 year of age, malnutrition, and denial of the condition. Better prognosis is indicated from mild symptoms at diagnosis, pancreatic sufficiency, and atypical presentation. A survey in 1995 reported that 35% of young adults with CF worked full-time, and almost 90% had completed at least a high school education.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

1. **Select Health covers genetic testing of cystic fibrosis for members** in any of the following groups:

   a) Couples seeking prenatal care; *or*

   b) Couples who are planning a pregnancy; *or*

   c) Persons with a family history of cystic fibrosis; *or*

   d) Persons with a first-degree relative identified as a cystic fibrosis carrier; *or*

   e) Reproductive partners of persons with cystic fibrosis.

2. Diagnostic Testing for Symptomatic Individuals:

a) Individuals with an intermediate range/equivocal sweat chloride test (30-59mmol/L), or

b) Individuals with a negative sweat chloride test when symptoms of CF are present, or

c) Infants with meconium ileus or other symptoms indicative of CF and are too young to produce adequate volumes of sweat for sweat chloride test, or

d) Infants with an elevated IRT value on newborn screening, or

e) Males with oligospermia/azoospermia/congenital absence of vas deferens (CAVD), OR

f) Mutation Identification to Guide Pharmacologic Therapy Selection (individuals who meet diagnostic criteria for CF and are eligible for FDA-approved CFTR mutation-specific therapies), OR

3. Prenatal Testing:

a) Either biological parent has a diagnosis of CF, or

b) Family history of CF in a first degree relative, or

c) Both parents are carriers of CF mutations included in the panel, or

d) Echogenic bowel has been identified on ultrasound in a fetus.

4. CFTR Intron 8 Poly T Analysis:

Diagnostic Testing:

a) CFTR mutation analysis performed and R117H mutation detected, or

b) Diagnosis of male infertility (e.g., congenital absence of vas deferens [CAVD], obstructive azoospermia), or

c) Diagnosis of non-classic CF.

Select Health does not cover genetic carrier testing for cystic fibrosis for all other indications as the effectiveness of testing for other indications other than the ones listed above have not been established. Use of this testing in these circumstances is considered experimental/investigational.

Select Health considers a core panel of 40 mutations recommended by the American College of Medical Genetics (ACMG) medically necessary for cystic fibrosis genetic testing. Preauthorization will be required for full sequencing review. The standard CF transmembrane regulator (CFTR) mutation panel is as follows (Available at: http://www.acmg.net):

ΔF508	ΔI507	G542X	G551D	W1282X	N1303K
R553X	621+1G→ T	R117H	1717-1G→ A	A455E	R560T
R1162X	G85E	R334W	R347P	711+1G→ T	1898+1G→ A
2184delA	1078delT	3849+10kbC→ T	2789+5G→ A	3659delC	I148T
3120+1G→ A					

Select Health considers screening for cystic fibrosis mutations that extend beyond the standard mutation panel recommended by the ACMG to be experimental/ investigational.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Cystic fibrosis is one of the most common genetic diseases in Caucasians, with an incidence of about one in 3,300. The disease also has a fairly high incidence among Hispanics: 1 in 9,500. Cystic fibrosis is a rare disorder in native African and native Asians, estimated to occur in less than 1 in 50,000, but higher incidences are observed in American populations of these ethnic groups (1 in 15,300 and 1 in 32,100, respectively), suggesting Caucasian admixture. Recent surveys of some Native American populations also indicate high incidences: 1 in 3,970 in the Pueblo people, and 1 in 1,580 among the Zuni.

Genetic Testing: Cystic Fibrosis (CF), **continued**

Since the identification of the gene and the major mutation responsible for CF, more than 600 mutations and DNA sequence variations have been identified in the CFTR gene. The Delta F508 mutation is represented in almost all populations, although its relative frequency varies among different geographic locations. The highest frequency is observed in Caucasian populations, where it accounts for approximately 70% of the CF alleles. Delta F508 mutation accounts for large portions of the alleles in other racial/ethnic groups: 48% in African Americans, 46% in Hispanics, and 30% in Asian Americans and Ashkenazi Jews. Some 15–20 other "common" mutations account for 2%–15% of CF alleles, depending on the ethnic composition of the patient group studied. Most of the remaining mutations are rare. The proportion of detectable mutations is an important indicator of the utility of a population-screening program. Combining detection of the Delta F508 with other mutations common to specific ethnic groups, it appears that there are several examples of populations for which 90% to 95% sensitivity can now be achieved with the current technology: the Ashkenazi Jews, Celtic Bretons, French Canadians from Quebec, and some Native Americans. In Caucasians in the United States, it is feasible to approach 90% sensitivity at the current time. Because the remaining mutations are rare, expanding the panel of screened mutations is expected to achieve only marginal gains in the sensitivity. The detection rate in African Americans is about 75%. Despite the relatively high incidence in Hispanics, the detectable alleles account for only 57% of the CF mutations in this group. The promise appears to be weak in Asian Americans at 30% sensitivity.

Studies have shown that interest in CF genetic screening is limited in the general population and that agreement to participate in genetic education and testing procedures occurs primarily among pregnant women and persons with positive family histories. Uptake of prenatal genetic testing for CF varies widely, with acceptance ranging from about 50% to a high of 78% in one HMO population. Participation has been affected by factors relating to convenience, education, cost, views regarding abortion, concerns about the low sensitivity of the test, and the manner of presentation of the testing opportunity. Concerns about confidentiality and insurability and simply "not wanting to know," are often mentioned as reasons to forgo testing.

Guidelines published by the American College of Medical Genetics (ACMG) in 2001 and affirmed by the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology (ACOG) in their policy statement published in 2001 recommend that genetic testing be offered to individuals with a family history of CF and partners of those with CF. As a group, individuals with a family history have relatively high frequencies of mutations in the CFTR gene. Members of this group have increased awareness of their risk of being carriers, as well as increased familiarity with the disease and its impact on the family. Testing may assist in making informed reproductive choices and decisions regarding family health. To date, over 900 mutations in the CF gene have been identified. As it is impractical to test for every known mutation, the ACMG Accreditation of Genetic Services Committee has compiled a standard screening panel of 25 CF mutations, which represents the standard panel that ACMG recommends for screening in the U.S. population. This 25-mutation panel incorporates all CF-causing mutations with an allele frequency of greater than or equal to 0.1 % in the general U.S. population, including mutation subsets shown to be sufficiently predominant in certain ethnic groups, such as Ashkenazi Jews and African Americans. This standard panel of mutations is intended to provide the greatest pan-ethnic detectability that can practically be performed.

The ACOG's update on carrier screening for CF (2011) added the recommendations stating that a patient previously screened should not be re-screened and the results should be documented and complete analysis of the CFTR gene by DNA sequencing is not appropriate for routine carrier screening.

The NIH, ACOG, and the ACMG also recommend that CF genetic testing be offered prenatally and to couples planning a pregnancy. Data indicates that a significant level of interest in CF testing exists in this group. This is a vulnerable population and because of the inherent time constraints, it is particularly important that they receive adequate and balanced information. This information includes, but is not limited to, the implications of genetic testing, its limitations and strengths, and the risks of ensuing potential therapies and interventions, sensitivity of the test, a description of the range of severity of the disease. Care should be given to ensure decisions of couples considering testing or subsequent reproductive options are completely voluntary and made without coercion from care providers. The NIH Consensus Statement on Genetic Testing for CF and the ACMG has not recommended CF testing for the general population. Given the low incidence and prevalence of CF and the demonstrable lack of interest in the general population, there is little justification for testing. Genetic testing for CF should begin with education concerning CF. It should be clear that the patient has received the material and has had an opportunity for questions to be answered before testing is undertaken—all persons undergoing genetic testing should give written informed consent for the test.

Genetic Testing: Cystic Fibrosis (CF), **continued**

As with any genetic testing, provision of accurate genetic counseling, particularly when the results are provided to the patient or when the intervention strategies are discussed, is essential. The implications of genetic testing, its limitations and strengths, and the risks of ensuing potential therapies and interventions mandate that individuals knowledgeable in genetics provide these services. The counseling skills required must combine respect for a patient's right to make an autonomous decision with an appropriate level of support to facilitate the decision-making process. Any strategy attempting to provide these services to the public carries with it a responsibility to enhance the educational process for physicians and other healthcare providers.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES

81220	CFTR (cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator) (e.g., cystic fibrosis) gene analysis; common variants (e.g., ACMG/ACOG guidelines)
81221	; known familial variants
81222	; duplication/deletion variants
81223	; full gene sequence
81224	; intron 8 poly-T analysis
81412	Ashkenazi Jewish associated disorders (eg, Bloom syndrome, Canavan disease, cystic fibrosis, familial dysautonomia, Fanconi anemia group C, Gaucher disease, Tay-Sachs disease), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 9 genes, including ASPA, BLM, CFTR, FANCC, GBA, HEXA, IKBKAP, MCOLN1, and SMPD1
81443	Genetic testing for severe inherited conditions (eg, cystic fibrosis, Ashkenazi Jewish-associated disorders [eg, Bloom syndrome, Canavan disease, Fanconi anemia type C, mucolipidosis type VI, Gaucher disease, Tay-Sachs disease], beta hemoglobinopathies, phenylketonuria, galactosemia), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 15 genes (eg, ACADM, ARSA, ASPA, ATP7B, BCKDHA, BCKDHB, BLM, CFTR, DHCR7, FANCC, G6PC, GAA, GALT, GBA, GBE1, HBB, HEXA, IKBKAP, MCOLN1, PAH)

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) and the American College of Medical Genetics (ACMG). Preconception and Prenatal Carrier Screening for Cystic Fibrosis: Clinical and Laboratory Provider Guidelines. ACOG/ACMG Position Statement. Washington, DC: ACOG; 2001.
2. American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology. Policy statement on prenatal Cystic Fibrosis Testing, 12/12/01.
3. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG). Update on carrier screening for cystic fibrosis. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 325. Washington, DC: ACOG; December 2005
4. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Update on carrier screening for cystic fibrosis. Committee Opinion No. 486. Obstet Gynecol, 2011;117(4):1028-1031.
5. Cystic Fibrosis Diagnosed After 2 Months of Age Leads to Worse Outcomes and Requires More Therapy. Pediatrics. http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/cgi/content/full/119/1/19. 2/14/07.
6. Genetic Testing for Cystic Fibrosis. NIH Consensus Statement Available on-line at http://text.nlm.nih.gov/ or at NIH Consensus Program Information Center, P.O. Box 2577, Kensington, MD 20891, Telephone: 1-888-NIH-CONSENSUS (888-644-2667) Fax: (301) 816-2494.
7. Guidelines for Population-Based Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Screening. Adapted from the American College of Medical Genetics; Genetics in Medicine/01, Vol. 3 No. 2:149-154; on-line at http://www.acmg.net/Pages/ACMG_Activities/Poilicies Statements.htm. American College of Medical Genetics, 9650 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, MD 20814-3998, Phone: 301-530-7127, Fax: 301-571-1895
8. Watson, M. S., et al. (2004). "Cystic fibrosis population carrier screening: 2004 revision of American College of Medical Genetics mutation panel." Genet Med, 6(5): 387-391.

Genetic Testing: Cystic Fibrosis (CF), **continued**

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: DONOR-DERIVED CELL-FREE DNA FOR MONITORING OF REJECTION IN HEART AND KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION

Policy # 671

Implementation Date: 7/1/23
Review Dates:
Revision Dates: 1/22/24

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Heart Transplant

Donor-derived cell-free deoxyribonucleic acid (dd-CF DNA) is released from damaged donor heart cells and can be quantified relative to the amount of background circulating recipient cell-free DNA. An increase in the percentage of dd-CF DNA in the blood indicates injury to the transplanted (i.e., donor) heart that may be caused by acute cellular rejection (ACR) or antibody-mediated rejection (AMR), as well as other forms of injury, such as cardiac allograft vasculopathy.

The accuracy of dd-CF DNA for the detection of ACR and AMR was reported in a large prospective study of 171 patients who had undergone transplantation at least seven days prior. The study assessed the ability of dd-CF DNA to detect grade 2 ACR or grade 1 AMR. The study reported the following:

- For the detection of ACR in patients who were at least 14 days post-transplantation, the sensitivity and specificity of dd-CF DNA were 83 and 82 percent, respectively, for the cutoff value of 0.25 percent dd-CF DNA.
- For the detection of AMR in similar patients, the sensitivity and specificity of dd-CF DNA were 88 and 82 percent, respectively, for the cutoff value of 0.25 percent dd-CF DNA. For either AMR or ACR and at the 0.25 percent cutoff, the sensitivity and specificity were 88 and 82 percent, respectively.

- Given the limitations of endomyocardial biopsy to detect ACR and AMR, the study also evaluated dd-CF DNA as the reference standard to assess the accuracy of endomyocardial biopsy. When dd-CF DNA ≥ 0.25 percent was used as the reference standard, the study found that endomyocardial biopsy had a sensitivity of 20 percent and specificity of 99 percent.

After obtaining serologic tests for rejection, confirmatory biopsies are performed based on the test results as follows:

- Simultaneous gene expression and cell free DNA test results: If a GEP test and dd-CF DNA are obtained simultaneously, the result of each test must be considered. If the dd-CF DNA result is positive, a biopsy is obtained regardless of the GEP result. If the dd-CF DNA result is negative

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: Donor-Derived Cell-Free DNA for Monitoring Rejection of Heart and Kidney Transplantation, continued

and the GEP result is positive, the approach to performance of a biopsy is individualized and may be influenced by such factors as the severity and frequency of past episodes of rejection. If both tests are negative, we do not perform a biopsy. This approach is based on the diagnostic characteristics of these tests.

- Isolated gene expression profiling: If an isolated GEP test is negative, an endomyocardial biopsy is not performed. If an isolated GEP test is positive, a biopsy is typically obtained. In patients who have two negative biopsies following elevated GEP test results, further biopsies are not obtained based on GEP results and cease GEP testing. This approach is motivated by the high negative predictive value and low positive predictive value of GEP testing.

- Isolated donor-derived cell-free DNA: In the presence of an isolated positive dd-CF DNA test, a endomyocardial biopsy is obtained, while a negative dd-CF DNA result does not require a follow-up biopsy. This approach is motived by the high diagnostic accuracy of the dd-CF DNA test.

Kidney Transplant

The use of routine monitoring of donor-derived cell-free DNA (dd-cfDNA) after kidney transplant may allow clinicians to identify subclinical allograft injury and intervene prior to development of clinically evident graft injury. To evaluate this, data from 1092 kidney transplant recipients monitored for dd-cfDNA over a three-year period was analyzed to assess the association of dd-cfDNA with histologic evidence of allograft rejection. Elevation of dd-cfDNA (0.5% or more) was significantly correlated with clinical and subclinical allograft rejection. dd-cfDNA values of 0.5% or more were associated with a nearly three-fold increase in risk development of de novo donor-specific antibodies (hazard ratio 2.71) and were determined to be elevated a median of 91 days (interquartile range of 30-125 days) ahead of donor specific antibody identification.

Persistently elevated dd-cfDNA (more than one result above the 0.5% threshold) predicted over a 25% decline in the estimated glomerular filtration rate over three years (hazard ratio 1.97). Therefore, routine monitoring of dd-cfDNA allowed early identification of clinically important graft injury. Biomarker monitoring complemented histology and traditional laboratory surveillance strategies as a prognostic marker and risk-stratification tool post-transplant. Thus, persistently low dd-cfDNA levels may accurately identify allograft quiescence or absence of injury, paving the way for personalization of immunosuppression trials.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

Donor-derived cell-free DNA (dd-cfDNA) for monitoring of rejection in heart or kidney transplantation is covered if ordered by an Intermountain Health Transplant Provider, or when the following criteria are met:

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when recommended by a genetic counselor, medical geneticist, or other provider with recognized expertise in this area; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested; and

3. dd-cfdna for heart or kidney transplant is covered to assess the probability of allograft rejection in kidney and cardiac transplant recipients with clinical suspicion of rejection and to

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: Donor-Derived Cell-Free DNA for Monitoring Rejection of Heart and Kidney Transplantation, continued

inform clinical decision-making about the necessity of cardiac or renal biopsy. Frequency of genetic testing to be determined by the transplant provider.

I. Frequency of Testing Recommendations for Heart

A. Year 1:
Starting day 30 post-transplantation; and then, once every 2 weeks x 2; and then, once every 3 weeks x 3; and then, monthly up to 6 months post-transplantation; and then, every 6 weeks till the end of the first-year post-transplantation.

B. Year 2:
Every 3 months.

C. Year 3:
Every 6 months.

D. Year 4:
Once yearly.

E. Year 5 and Beyond:
As needed.

II. Frequency of Testing Recommendations for Kidney

A. These are the recommended frequencies for post-kidney transplant: 2,4,7,10, and 13 months post-transplant.

B. After the 13th month, determinations will be made on a case-by-case basis, or if more frequent testing will be allowed, based on further concern of renal rejection.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: Donor-Derived Cell-Free DNA for Monitoring Rejection of Heart and Kidney Transplantation, **continued**

Key References

1. Bu, L., Gupta, G., Pai, A., Anand, S., Stites, E., Moinuddin, I., … Alhamad, T. Clinical outcomes from the Assessing Donor-derived cell-free DNA Monitoring Insights of kidney Allografts with Longitudinal surveillance (ADMIRAL) study. *Kidney Int*. 2022;101(4):793. Epub 2021 Dec 22.
2. Eisen, H. J. Heart transplantation in adults: Diagnosis of allograft rejection. UpToDate. Last updated: Jan. 10, 2023. Retrieved from: https://www.uptodate.com/contents/heart-transplantation-in-adults-diagnosis-of-allograft-rejection
3. Halloran, P. F., Reeve, J., Madill-Thomsen, K.S., Demko, Z., Prewett, A., Billings, P., & The Trifecta Investigators. The Trifecta Study: Comparing Plasma Levels of Donor-derived Cell-Free DNA with the Molecular Phenotype of Kidney Transplant Biopsies. *JASN*. 2022; 33: 387–400. doi: https://doi.org/10.1681/ASN.2021091191
4. Kim, P. J., et al. A novel donor-derived cell-free DNA assay for the detection of acute rejection in heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2022; 41: 919−927.
5. Kobashigawa J, Hall S, Shah P, Fine B, Halloran P, Jackson AM, Khush KK, Margulies KB, Sani MM, Patel JK, Patel N, Peyster E. The Evolving Use of Biomarkers in Heart Transplantation: Consensus of an Expert Panel. *American Journal of Transplantation*. 27 Feb 2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajt.2023.02.025
6. Martuszewski, A., et al. Donor-Derived Cell-Free DNA in Kidney Transplantation as a Potential Rejection Biomarker: A Systematic Literature Review. *J. Clin. Med*. 2021; 10: 193.
7. Qazi, Y., Patel, A., Fajardo, M., McCormick, S., Fehringer, G., Ahmed, E., ... Gauthier, P. Incorporation of Donor-derived Cell-free DNA Into Clinical Practice for Renal Allograft Management. *Transplantation Proceedings*. 2021;000: 1−7.
8. Sidgel, T. K., Archila, F. A., Constantin, T., Prins, S. A., Liberto, J., Damm, I., ... Sarwal, M. M. Optimizing Detection of Kidney Transplant Injury by Assessment of Donor-Derived Cell-Free DNA via Massively Multiplex PCR. *J. Clin. Med*. 2019, 8, 19; doi:10.3390/jcm8010019

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: EPILEPSY

Policy # 602
Implementation Date: 5/19/17
Review Dates: 7/18/18, 4/12/19, 8/7/19, 4/5/23
Revision Dates: 7/1/23, 7/21/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Epilepsy is a disorder characterized by unprovoked seizures. It is a heterogeneous condition that encompasses many different types of seizures and that varies in age of onset and severity. The common epilepsies, also called idiopathic epilepsy, are thought to have a complex, multifactorial genetic basis. There are also numerous rare epileptic syndromes that occur in infancy or early childhood and that may be caused by a single gene mutation. Genetic testing is commercially available for many genetic mutations that may be related to epilepsy.

More recently, the concept of genetic epilepsies has emerged as a way of classifying epilepsy. Many experts now refer to "genetic generalized epilepsy" as an alternative classification for seizures that were previously called "idiopathic generalized epilepsies." Genetic epilepsies are conditions in which the seizures are a direct result of a known or presumed genetic defect(s). Genetic epilepsies are characterized by recurrent unprovoked seizures in patients who do not have demonstrable brain lesions or metabolic abnormalities. In addition, seizures are the core symptom of the disorder and other symptomatology is not present, except as a direct result of seizures. This is differentiated from genetically determined conditions in which seizures are part of a larger syndrome, such as tuberous sclerosis, fragile X syndrome, or Rett syndrome.

The common genetic epilepsies are primarily believed to involve multifactorial inheritance patterns. This follows the concept of a threshold effect, in which any particular genetic defect may increase the risk of epilepsy but is not by itself causative. A combination of risk-associated genes, together with environmental factors, determines whether the clinical phenotype of epilepsy occurs. In this model, individual genes that increase the susceptibility to epilepsy have a relatively weak impact. Multiple genetic defects, and/or particular combination of genes, probably increase the risk by a greater amount. However, it is not well understood how many abnormal genes are required to exceed the threshold to cause clinical epilepsy, nor is it understood which combination of genes may increase the risk more than others.

The rare epilepsy syndromes may be single-gene disorders. This hypothesis arises from the discovery of pathologic mutations in small numbers of patients with the disorders. Because of the small amount of research available, the evidence base for these rare syndromes is incomplete, and new mutations are currently being discovered frequently (Helbig et al.).

Commercial testing is available from numerous companies. Because of the large number of potential genes, panel testing is available from several genetic companies. These panels typically include large numbers of genes that have been implicated in diverse disorders.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

A. Select Health covers genetic testing for epilepsy by genome sequencing, exome sequencing, or multi-gene panel, when all the following criteria are met:

1. The patient has epilepsy of unexplained etiology with onset at any age; and
2. Alternate etiologies have been considered and ruled out when possible (e.g., head trauma, toxic exposures, stroke, infections, autoimmune conditions, metabolic conditions, tumors, prenatal injury), and
3. Clinical presentation does not fit a well-described syndrome for which more targeted testing is available.

Exclusions
- Genetic testing for epilepsy is considered not medically necessary in individuals who do not meet the above criteria.
- Comprehensive genetic testing for epilepsy is not medically necessary for individuals with a known familial variant unless targeted genetic testing has been performed and is negative.
- Genetic testing is considered experimental/investigational for screening for genetic epilepsy in asymptomatic individuals.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Regulatory Status

No U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-cleared genotyping tests were identified. The available commercial genetic tests for epilepsy are offered as laboratory-developed tests. Clinical laboratories may develop and validate tests in-house (“home-brew”) and market them as a laboratory service; such tests must meet the general regulatory standards of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act (CLIA).

The evaluation of a genetic test focuses on 3 main principles: (1) analytic validity (the technical accuracy of the test in detecting a mutation that is present or in excluding a mutation that is absent); (2) clinical validity (the diagnostic performance of the test [sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values] in detecting clinical disease); and (3) clinical utility (how the results of the diagnostic test will be used to change management of the patient and whether these changes in management lead to clinically important improvements in health outcomes).

Genetic epilepsies can be divided into the rare epileptic syndromes that may be caused by a single-gene mutation and the common epilepsy syndromes that are thought to have a multifactorial genetic basis.

Rare Epilepsy Syndromes Associated with Single-Gene Mutations:

There are numerous rare syndromes that have seizures as their primary symptom, some of these include Dravet syndrome, early infantile epileptic encephalopathy, generalized epilepsy with febrile seizures plus (GEFS+), epilepsy and intellectual disability limited to females (EFMR), and Nocturnal frontal lobe epilepsy. These generally present in infancy or early childhood. Many of them are thought to be caused by single-gene mutations. The published literature on these syndromes generally consists of small cohorts of patients treated in tertiary care centers, with descriptions of genetic mutations that are detected in affected individuals.

These syndromes can be evaluated by single-gene analysis, which is generally performed by direct sequencing. Direct sequencing is the gold standard for identifying specific mutations. This testing method has an analytic validity of greater than 99%. They can also be evaluated by genetic panel testing, which is generally done by next-generation sequencing. This method has a lower analytic validity compared to direct sequencing, but is still considered to be very accurate, in the range of 95% to 99%.

The literature on the clinical validity of these rare syndromes is limited, and for most syndromes, the clinical sensitivity and specificity is not defined. Dravet syndrome (Hirose and Mulley et al) is probably the most well-studied, and some evidence on the clinical validity of SCN1A mutations is available. The clinical sensitivity has been reported to be in the 70% to 80% range. In 1 series of 64 patients, 51 (79%) were found to have SCN1A mutations. The false-positive rate and the frequency of variants of uncertain significance, is not well characterized.

For the other syndromes, the associations of the genetic mutations with the syndromes have been reported in case reports or very small numbers of patients. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the clinical validity of the putative causative genetic mutations.

One potential area of clinical utility for genetic testing may be in making a definitive diagnosis and avoiding further testing. For most of these syndromes, the diagnosis is made by clinical criteria, and it is not known how often genetic testing leads to a definitive diagnosis when the diagnosis cannot be made by clinical criteria.

Another potential area of clinical utility may be in directing pharmacologic treatment. For Dravet syndrome, the seizures are often refractory to common medications. Some experts (Mulley and Ottman et al.) have suggested that diagnosis of Dravet syndrome may therefore prompt more aggressive treatment, and/or avoidance of certain medications that are known to be less effective, such as carbamazepine. However, there are no studies that examine the frequency with which genetic testing leads to changes in medication management, and there are no studies that report on whether the efficacy of treatment directed by genetic testing is superior to efficacy of treatment without genetic testing.

Therefore, there are numerous rare epileptic syndromes which may be caused by single-gene mutations, but the evidence on genetic testing for these syndromes is insufficient to form conclusions on the clinical validity and clinical utility of genetic testing. The syndrome with the greatest amount of evidence is Dravet syndrome. The clinical sensitivity of testing patients with clinically defined Dravet syndrome is relatively high in small cohorts of patients. There may be clinical utility in avoiding further testing and directing treatment, but there is only a small amount of evidence to suggest this and no evidence demonstrating that outcomes are improved.

Common Epilepsies

The common epilepsy syndromes, also known as idiopathic epilepsy, generally present in childhood, adolescence, or early adulthood. They may be generalized or focal in nature, and may be convulsant (grand mal) or absence type. They are generally thought to have a multifactorial genetic component.

The common epilepsies are generally evaluated by genetic panel testing. The larger, commercially available panels that include many mutations are generally performed by next-generation sequencing. This method has a lower analytic validity compared to direct sequencing, but is still considered to be very accurate, in the range of 95% to 99%. Less commonly, deletion/duplication analysis may be performed; this method is also considered to have an analytic validity of greater than 95%.

The literature on clinical validity includes many studies that report the association of various genetic variants with the common epilepsies. There are a large number of case-control studies that compare the frequency of genetic variants in patients with epilepsy to the frequency in patients without epilepsy. There is a smaller number of genome-wide association studies (GWAS) that evaluate the presence of single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) associated with epilepsy across the entire genome. No studies were identified that reported the clinical sensitivity and specificity of genetic mutations in various clinically defined groups of patients with epilepsy. In addition to these studies on the association of genetic variants with the diagnosis of epilepsy, there are numerous other studies that evaluate the association of genetic variants with pharmacogenomics of anti-epileptic medications.

Diagnosis of Epilepsy

The Epilepsy Genetic Association Database (epiGAD) (Tan et al.) published an overview of genetic association studies in 2010. This review identified 165 case-control studies published between 1985 and 2008. There were 133 studies that examined the association of 77 different genetic variants with the diagnosis of epilepsy. Approximately half of these studies (65/133) focused on patients with genetic generalized epilepsy. Most of these studies had relatively small sample sizes, with a median of 104 cases (range, 8–1361) and 126 controls (range, 22–1390). There were less than 200 case patients in 80% of the studies. The majority of the studies did not show a statistically significant association. Using a cutoff of $p < 0.01$ as the threshold for significance, there were 35 studies (21.2%) that reported a statistically significant association. According to standard definitions for genetic association, all of the associations were in the weak-to-moderate range, with no associations reported that were considered strong.

The EPICURE Consortium published one of the larger GWAS of genetic generalized epilepsy in 2012 (12). This study included 3,020 patients with genetic generalized epilepsy (GGE) and 3,954 control patients, all of European ancestry. A 2-stage approach was used, with a discovery phase and a replication phase, to evaluate a total of 4.56 million single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). In the discovery phase, 40 candidate SNPs were identified that exceeded the significance for the screening threshold (1×10^{-5}), although none of these reached the threshold defined as statistically significant for genome-wide association (1×10^{-8}). After stage 2 analysis, there were 4 SNPs identified that had suggestive associations with GGE on genes *SCN1A*, *CHRM3*, *ZEB2*, and *NLE2F1*.

A second GWAS (Guo et al.), with a relatively large sample size of Chinese patients, was also published in 2012. Using a similar 2-stage methodology, this study evaluated 1,087 patients with epilepsy and 3,444 matched controls. Two variants were determined to have the strongest association with epilepsy. One of these was on the *CAMSAP1L1* gene and the second was on the *GRIK2* gene. There were several other loci on genes that were suggestive of an association on genes that coded for neurotransmitters or other neuron function.

In contrast to the 2 studies, a GWAS published from the UK (Kasperaviciute et al.) failed to show any robust associations of SNPs with partial epilepsy. This study included 3,445 patients with partial epilepsies and 6,935 controls of European ancestry. Using a threshold of an odds ratio greater than 1.3, the authors reported that no SNPs were identified that had a statistically significant association at that level.

In 2012, Heinzen et al. used whole exome sequencing to evaluate the association of genetic variants with genetic generalized epilepsy in 118 individuals with the disorder and 242 control patients of European origin. No variants were found that reached the statistical threshold for a statistical association. From this initial data, the researchers selected 3,897 candidate genetic variants. These variants were tested in a

replication sample of 878 individuals with GGE and 1,830 controls. None of the tested variants showed a statistically significant association.

In addition to the individual studies, there are a number of meta-analyses that evaluate the association of particular genetic variants with different types of epilepsy. Most of these have not shown a significant association. For example, Cordoba et al. evaluated the association of *SLC6A4* gene variants with temporal lobe epilepsy in a total of 991 case patients and 1,202 controls and failed to demonstrate a significant association on combined analysis. Nurmohamed et al. performed a meta-analysis of 9 case-control studies that evaluated the association of the *ABC1* gene polymorphisms with epilepsy. There was a total of 2,454 patients with epilepsy and 1,542 control patients. No significant associations were found. One meta-analysis that did report a significant association was published by Kauffman et al. in 2008. This study evaluated the association of variants in the *IL1B* gene with temporal lobe epilepsy and febrile seizures, using data from 13 studies of 1,866 patients with epilepsy and 1,930 controls. Combined analysis showed a significant relationship between one SNP (511T) and temporal lobe epilepsy, with a strength of association that was considered modest (odds ratio [OR]=1.48; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.1 to 2.0; p=0.01).

The evidence on genetic testing for the common epilepsies is characterized by a large number of studies that evaluate associations of many different genetic variants with the various categories of epilepsy. The evidence on clinical validity is not consistent in showing an association of any specific genetic mutation with any specific type of epilepsy. Where associations have been reported, they are not of strong magnitude, and in most cases, have not been replicated independently or through the available meta-analyses. Because of the lack of established clinical validity, the clinical utility of genetic testing for the common epilepsies is also lacking.

In conclusion, genetic testing for epilepsy covers a wide range of clinical syndromes and possible genetic defects. For rare epilepsy syndromes, which may be caused by single-gene mutations, there is only a small body of research, which is insufficient to determine the clinical validity and clinical utility of genetic testing. There may be a potential role in differentiating these syndromes from the common epilepsies and from each other, and in improving the efficiency of the diagnostic work-up. There also may be a potential role for genetic testing in identifying syndromes that are resistant to particular medications, and thereby directing treatment. However, now the evidence is limited and the specific way in which genetic testing leads to improved outcomes is ill-defined.

For the common epilepsies, which are thought to have a complex, multifactorial basis, the role of specific genetic mutations remains uncertain. Despite a large body of literature of associations between genetic variants and common epilepsies, the clinical validity of genetic testing is poorly understood. Published literature is characterized by weak and inconsistent associations, which have not been replicated independently or by meta-analyses. This literature does not permit conclusions on the clinical validity of genetic testing. Because of the lack of conclusions on clinical validity, conclusions on clinical utility are also lacking.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0232U	CSTB (cystatin B) (eg, progressive myoclonic epilepsy type 1A, UnverrichtLundborg disease), full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat (STR) expansions, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions
81401	Molecular pathology procedure level 2
81403	Molecular pathology procedure level 4
81404	Molecular pathology procedure level 5
81405	Molecular pathology procedure level 6
81406	Molecular pathology procedure level 7
81407	Molecular pathology procedure level 8

81419	Epilepsy genomic sequence analysis panel, must include analyses for ALDH7A1, CACNA1A, CDKL5, CHD2, GABRG2, GRIN2A, KCNQ2, MECP2, GT.80 | 32 Codes Number Description PCDH19, POLG, PRRT2, SCN1A, SCN1B, SCN2A, SCN8A, SLC2A1, SLC9A6, STXBP1, SYNGAP1, TCF4, TPP1, TSC1, TSC2, and ZEB2
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

HCPCS CODES

G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report
81188	CSTB (cystatin B) (eg, Unverricht-Lundborg disease) gene analysis; evaluation to detect abnormal (eg, expanded) alleles
81189	;full gene sequence
81190	;known familial variant(s)

Key References

1. Berg AT, Berkovic SF, Brodie MJ et al. Revised terminology and concepts for organization of seizures and epilepsies: report of the ILAE Commission on Classification and Terminology, 2005-2009. Epilepsia 2010; 51(4):676-85.
2. Cavalleri GL, McCormack M, Alhusaini S et al. Pharmacogenomics and epilepsy: the road ahead. Pharmacogenomics 2011; 12(10):1429-47.
3. Cordoba M, Consalvo D, Moron DG et al. SLC6A4 gene variants and temporal lobe epilepsy susceptibility: a meta-analysis. Mol Biol Rep 2012; 39(12):10615-9.
4. Epicure Consortium, Consortium EM, Steffens M et al. Genome-wide association analysis of genetic generalized epilepsies implicates susceptibility loci at 1q43, 2p16.1, 2q22.3 and 17q21.32. Hum Mol Genet 2012; 21(24):5359-72.
5. Guo Y, Baum LW, Sham PC et al. Two-stage genome-wide association study identifies variants in CAMSAP1L1 as susceptibility loci for epilepsy in Chinese. Hum Mol Genet 2012; 21(5):1184-9.
6. Haerian BS, Roslan H, Raymond AA et al. ABCB1 C3435T polymorphism and the risk of resistance to antiepileptic drugs in epilepsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Seizure 2010; 19(6):339-46.
7. Heinzen EL, Depondt C, Cavalleri GL et al. Exome sequencing followed by large-scale genotyping fails to identify single rare variants of large effect in idiopathic generalized epilepsy. Am J Hum Genet 2012; 91(2):293-302.
8. Helbig I, Lowenstein DH. Genetics of the epilepsies: where are we and where are we going? Curr Opin Neurol 2013; 26(2):179-85.
9. Hirose S, Scheffer IE, Marini C et al. SCN1A testing for epilepsy: application in clinical practice. Epilepsia 2013; 54(5):946-52.
10. Jang SY, Kim MK, Lee KR et al. Gene-to-gene interaction between sodium channel-related genes in determining the risk of antiepileptic drug resistance. J Korean Med Sci 2009; 24(1):62-8.
11. Kasperaviciute D, Catarino CB, Heinzen EL et al. Common genetic variation and susceptibility to partial epilepsies: a genome-wide association study. Brain 2010; 133(Pt 7):2136-47.
12. Kauffman MA, Moron DG, Consalvo D et al. Association study between interleukin 1 beta gene and epileptic disorders: a HuGe review and meta-analysis. Genet Med 2008; 10(2):83-8.
13. Kwan P, Poon WS, Ng HK et al. Multidrug resistance in epilepsy and polymorphisms in the voltage-gated sodium channel genes SCN1A, SCN2A, and SCN3A: correlation among phenotype, genotype, and mRNA expression. Pharmacogenet Genomics 2008; 18(11):989-98.
14. Kwan P, Brodie MJ. Early identification of refractory epilepsy. N Engl J Med 2000; 342(5):314-9.
15. Merwick A, O'Brien M, Delanty N. Complex single gene disorders and epilepsy. Epilepsia 2012; 53 Suppl 4:81-91.
16. Mulley JC, Nelson P, Guerrero S et al. A new molecular mechanism for severe myoclonic epilepsy of infancy: exonic deletions in SCN1A. Neurology 2006; 67(6):1094-5.
17. Nurmohamed L, Garcia-Bournissen F, Buono RJ et al. Predisposition to epilepsy--does the ABCB1 gene play a role? Epilepsia 2010; 51(9):1882-5.
18. Ottman R, Hirose S, Jain S et al. Genetic testing in the epilepsies--report of the ILAE Genetics Commission. Epilepsia 2010; 51(4):655-70.
19. Petrovski S, Kwan P. Unraveling the genetics of common epilepsies: approaches, platforms, and caveats. Epilepsy Behav 2013; 26(3):229-33.
20. Patient-Centered Laboratory Utilization Guidance Services (PLUGS). Epilepsy Genetic Testing Policy. February 2023.
21. Smith, L., et al. Genetic testing and counseling for the unexplained epilepsies: An evidence-based practice guideline of the National Society of Genetic Counselors. *J Genet Couns*. 2023; 32:266–280.
22. Tan NC, Berkovic SF. The Epilepsy Genetic Association Database (epiGAD): analysis of 165 genetic association studies, 1996-2008. Epilepsia 2010; 51(4):686-9.
23. Williams CA, Battaglia A. Molecular biology of epilepsy genes. Exp Neurol 2013; 244:51-8.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

Genetic Testing: Epilepsy, **continued**

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

”Intermountain Healthcare” and its accompanying logo, the marks of “Select Health” and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: ESOGUARD

Policy # 678
Implementation Date: 2/19/24
Review Dates:
Revision Dates:

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

The EsoGuard test and the EsoCheck device (Lucid Diagnostics, Inc., New York, NY) have been proposed as a screening kit for the detection of Barrett's Esophagus (BE). The EsoCheck is a specimen collection device in the form of a vitamin-sized, encapsulated balloon. The device is swallowed and surface textures on the balloon collect a gentle brushing of the esophageal mucosa. The balloon is collapsed to protect the collected specimen and drawn back out through the upper esophagus and mouth. The specimen is submitted to a laboratory for EsoGuard testing. The EsoGuard uses next generation sequencing bisulfate converted DNA to detect the presence of Vimentin and CyclinA1 methylation signatures at 31 sites within those genes to identify the presence of BE. The EsoCheck device has received a 510(k) clearance from the FDA while the EsoGuard was granted a breakthrough device designation. Use of the EsoGuard test for detection of BE is not considered in accordance with generally accepted standards of medical practice.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Select Health does NOT cover genetic testing to screen for the likelihood of Barrett's esophagus, esophageal cancer, or esophagogastric junction cancer (e.g., methylation analysis, EsoGuard). The effectiveness of this testing has not been established; therefore, this meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: EsoGuard, **continued**

Billing/Coding Information

Not covered: Experimental/Investigational for the indications listed above

CPT CODES

0114U Gastroenterology (Barrett's esophagus), VIM and CCNA1 methylation analysis, esophageal cells, algorithm reported as likelihood for Barrett's esophagus EsoGuard™, Lucid Diagnostics, Lucid Diagnostics

Key References

1. Anthem. Clinical UM Guideline. Testing for Oral and Esophageal Cancer. Last Review Date: 05/11/2023.
2. Poppers, D. M., et al. Novel Screening and DNA Testing for the Detection of Esophageal Precancerous Disease. *Gastroenterology & Hepatology*. Volume 18, Issue 5. May 2022.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: EXPANDED CARRIER SCREENING

Policy # 452
Implementation Date: 8/9/10
Review Dates: 9/15/11, 7/18/13, 8/28/14, 5/7/15, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 2/18/19, 8/16/23
Revision Dates: 12/5/11, 6/1/17, 1/26/18, 8/17/23, 4/27/24

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the “Policy” section for more information.

Description

Genetic diseases inherited through Mendelian genetics impose a significant public health burden on society, with single-gene disorders accounting for at least 10% of pediatric admissions and 20% of infant mortality. Over 6,000 genetic disorders are inherited through Mendelian genetics, each of which affect less than 200,000 Americans, but combine to afflict 25–30 million people worldwide. Because of this heterogeneity, diagnosis and treatment are difficult for most individuals with a genetic disease.

Couples who test positive as carriers have several options to conceive a child without a lethal disease, such as a pre-implantation genetic diagnosis (PGD) or donor gametes with in vitro fertilization. With forewarning of a positive test result, couples might choose to adopt, to conceive naturally and engage in watchful waiting, have an amniocentesis-based genetic test performed for the suspected disease, or decide not to conceive. Finally, those carrier couples who choose to conceive without any intervention at all, will at minimum, benefit from knowing the diagnosis of an affected child; for some diseases ameliorative options are available, involving special drugs or rigorous diets from birth.

New technologies such as next-generation sequencing have made it possible to screen for mutations in many genes more efficiently than testing mutations in a single gene or a small number of population-specific mutations in several genes. Commercial laboratories offer these expanded carrier screening panels. There is no standardization to the makeup of these genetic panels, the composition of the panels varies among labs, and different commercial products for the same condition may test a different set of genes. Although ECS panels may include conditions that are routinely assessed in carrier testing, they also include many conditions that are not routinely evaluated.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN’S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual’s benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

Select Health covers expanded carrier screening, only once per lifetime*.

***Select Health will cover CPT 81443 once per lifetime;** and if appropriate, will also cover CPT 81412 once per lifetime (see code descriptions below).

Select Health does not cover the UNITY Fetal Risk Screen as it does not align with the minimum gene panel recommendations for testing by ACOG.

SELECT HEALTH ADVANTAGE (MEDICARE/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SELECT HEALTH COMMUNITY CARE (MEDICAID)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

There is consensus on core conditions that should be offered universally. Some of these conditions are included in one or both of societal guidelines, the American College of Medical Genetics (ACMG) and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG), including cystic fibrosis, fragile X, and spinal muscular atrophy. Recently, these groups co-published a statement (Edwards et al., 2015), which demonstrates an approach for how healthcare providers and laboratories that wish to or that are currently offering expanded carrier screening to their patients. It was not put forward as a replacement to existing guidelines and does not advance the use of large carrier screening panels (beyond those conditions already recommended).

In a recent literature search it was found that the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecologists (ACOG, 2017) now recommends information and counseling about carrier screening should be provided to every pregnant woman, ideally before pregnancy. If the individual or reproductive partner choose to be tested, it should only happen once in a lifetime, and if either are found to be a carrier for a genetic condition, then counseling about potential reproductive outcomes should be offered. The cost to the patient and the healthcare system should be considered when an individual requests a test for a specific condition because the use of expanded carrier screening testing may be cheaper.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

81412	Ashkenazi Jewish associated disorders (eg, Bloom syndrome, Canavan disease, cystic fibrosis, familial dysautonomia, Fanconi anemia group C, Gaucher disease, Tay-Sachs disease), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 9 genes, including ASPA, BLM, CFTR, FANCC, GBA, HEXA, IKBKAP, MCOLN1, and SMPD1
81443	Genetic testing for severe inherited conditions (eg, cystic fibrosis, Ashkenazi Jewish-associated disorders [eg, Bloom syndrome, Canavan disease, Fanconi anemia type C, mucolipidosis type VI, Gaucher disease, Tay-Sachs disease], beta hemoglobinopathies, phenylketonuria, galactosemia), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 15 genes (eg, ACADM, ARSA, ASPA, ATP7B, BCKDHA, BCKDHB, BLM, CFTR, DHCR7, FANCC, G6PC, GAA, GALT, GBA, GBE1, HBB, HEXA, IKBKAP, MCOLN1, PAH)

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

Genetic Testing: Expanded Carrier Screening, **continued**

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

Not covered for the indications listed above

0449U Carrier screening for severe inherited conditions (eg, cystic fibrosis, spinal muscular atrophy, beta hemoglobinopathies [including sickle cell disease], alpha thalassemia), regardless of race or self-identified ancestry, genomic sequence analysis panel, must include analysis of 5 genes (CFTR, SMN1, HBB, HBA1, HBA2)

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology. (2017) ACOG committee opinion No. 691: Carrier screening for genetic conditions. Obstet Gynecol 129: e41-55.
2. Gregg, A.R, et al. Screening for autosomal recessive and X-linked conditions during pregnancy and preconception: a practice resource of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). Genet Med. 2021 Oct;23(10):1793-1806.
3. Franasiak, J. M., et al. (2016). "Expanded carrier screening in an infertile population: how often is clinical decision making affected?" Genet Med.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

”Intermountain Healthcare” and its accompanying logo, the marks of “Select Health” and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: FLT3 MUTATION ANALYSIS AND WT1 RQ-PCR FOR ACUTE MYELOGENOUS LEUKEMIA

Policy # 314

Implementation Date:	9/19/06
Review Dates:	10/18/07, 10/23/08, 10/22/09, 5/19/11, 6/21/12, 6/20/13, 4/17/14, 5/7/15, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 9/18/18, 4/17/19, 2/14/23
Revision Dates:	7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Acute myelocytic leukemia (AML) is the most common type of leukemia among adults, although it affects people of all ages. The 2006 incidence of AML in the U.S. is 3.7 per 100,000. Acute myelocytic leukemia develops as the consequence of a series of genetic changes in a hematopoietic precursor cell. These changes alter normal hematopoietic growth and differentiation, resulting in an accumulation of large numbers of abnormal, immature myeloid cells in the bone marrow, peripheral blood, and other tissues.

Approximately 50%–70% of adults with AML attain complete remission (CR) following treatment. Unfortunately, 75% of these patients with first remission will ultimately relapse. Patients with relapsed AML have a particularly poor prognosis (approximately 5%–10% long-term disease-free survival). A number of adverse prognostic features have been described for AML, including advanced age, performance status, karyotype and other molecular changes, the presence of a prior hematologic disorder, and biologic behavior of the tumor cells. Several studies indicate that AML patients with normal karyotypes molecularly represent a heterogeneous group and that molecular differences are likely to correlate with prognosis. The identification of new molecular markers has become an important area of research. Two such markers are FMS-like tyrosine kinase 3 (FLT3) mutations and Wilms Tumor 1 (WT1) gene mutations.

FMS-like tyrosine kinase 3 (FLT3) is a member of the class 3 receptor tyrosine kinase family and is preferentially expressed on hematopoietic progenitor cells and mediates stem cell differentiation and proliferation. Activating mutations of FLT3 occur in 20%–30% of de novo AML cases and represent the most frequent molecular abnormality in this disease. The most common type of mutation (23%) is an internal tandem duplication mutation (FLT3/ITD) localized to the juxtamembrane region of the receptor, while point mutations in the kinase domain (D835) are less common (7%). Both types of mutations inhibit growth and induce apoptosis in factor-dependent leukemia cell lines. Common clinical features of patients with FLT3/ITD AML include normal cytogenetics, leukocytosis, and monocytic differentiation. Patients with FLT3/ITD mutations, and possibly those with FLT3 point mutations, are consistently reported to have an increased relapse rate and reduced overall survival.

The WT1 gene encodes for a protein with the characteristics of a zinc finger transcription factor originally identified as a tumor suppressor gene in children with hereditary syndromes predisposing to Wilms tumor. Few genes have been found to be physiologically regulated by WT1, among them the epidermal growth factor receptor, syndecan 1, bcl-2, amphiregulin, and E-cadherin. WT1 is also expressed in hematopoietic stem/progenitor cells, and there is strong evidence that WT1 plays both developmental and antiapoptotic roles in the myeloid lineage, though the role of WT1 in human hematopoiesis remains to be clarified. WT1 over-expression has been reported in up to 90% of persons with AML. WT1 expression is correlated with poor survival, probably due to chemotherapy resistance.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic testing for FLT3 and WT1 mutations in patients with acute myelogenous leukemia (AML) as this testing has proven statistical validity and substantial potential to impact health outcomes for patients with AML.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Systematic reviews of these tests have not been published. The primary literature concerning FLT3 emphasized that only 30% of AML patients have expressions of 1 of 2 different mutations that would allow uncontrolled growth in AML. FLT3 mutations were found to have a negative prognostic effect in a large (200 patients) prospective study by Fröhling. Both mutations, an IDT (internal tandem duplication) or a point mutation (ASP 835), were associated with a worse prognosis and the authors speculated that a more aggressive chemotherapy approach could be offered to those patients.

Other articles summarized clinical responses to tyrosine kinase inhibitors in those patients who have mutations in the tyrosine kinase receptor. Since the enzyme is constitutive, therapy directed against the enzyme would inhibit its activity. Similar treatments in CML have produced dramatic response in patients with tyrosine kinase mutations, and there is expectation that future therapies against AML will proceed in the same direction.

With regards to WT1 expression, the review article by Cilloni et al. summarizes the relative lack of biological markers predicting early relapse in AML. The WT1 gene, though not perfect, is present in 70% of AML patients. Furthermore, increased WT1 expression above the range found in normal bone marrow and/or in normal peripheral blood samples during follow-up of AML patients was always found to be predictive of an impending hematological relapse even in AML patients lacking additional molecular markers. Scientific data concerning the change in clinical outcomes in patients with an elevated WT1 in AML, and the identification of early relapse, are unknown. Clinical judgment would assume that earlier awareness of a relapse would prompt therapy and decrease mortality.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES

0023U	Oncology (acute myelogenous leukemia), DNA, genotyping of internal tandem duplication, p.D835, p.I836, using mononuclear cells, reported as detection or non-detection of FLT3 mutation and indication for or against the use of midostaurin
0046U	FLT3 (fms-related tyrosine kinase 3) (eg, acute myeloid leukemia) internal tandem duplication (ITD) variants, quantitative
0049U	NPM1 (nucleophosmin) (eg, acute myeloid leukemia) gene analysis, quantitative NPM1 MRD by NGS; LabPMM LLC, an Invivoscribe Technologies, Inc. Company
0050U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, acute myelogenous leukemia, DNA analysis, 194 genes, interrogation for sequence variants, copy number variants or rearrangements
81245	FLT3 (FMS-related tyrosine kinase 3) (e.g., acute myeloid leukemia), gene analysis, internal tandem duplication (ITD) variants (i.e., exons 14, 15)
81246	FLT3 (fms-related tyrosine kinase 3) (eg, acute myeloid leukemia), gene analysis; tyrosine kinase domain (TKD) variants (eg, D835, I836)
81450	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 5-50 genes (eg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis
81451	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 5-50 genes (eg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis
81455	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis
81456	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis

HCPCS CODES

G0452 Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Anuchapreeda S, Limtrakul P, Thanarattanakorn P, Sittipreechacharn S, Chanarat P. Inhibitory effect of curcumin on WT1 gene expression in patient leukemic cells. Arch Pharm Res. 29.1 (2006): 80-7.
2. Boublikova L, Kalinova M, Ryan J, et al. Wilms' tumor gene 1 (WT1) expression in childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia: a wide range of WT1 expression levels, its impact on prognosis and minimal residual disease monitoring. Leukemia. 20.2 (2006): 254-63.
3. Brown P, Meshinchi S, Levis M, et al. Pediatric AML primary samples with FLT3/ITD mutations are preferentially killed by FLT3 inhibition. Blood. 104.6 (2004): 1841-9.
4. Cilloni D, Gottardi E, De Micheli D, et al. Quantitative assessment of WT1 expression by real time quantitative PCR may be a useful tool for monitoring minimal residual disease in acute leukemia patients. Leukemia. 16.10 (2002): 2115-21.
5. Cilloni D, Saglio G. WT1 as a universal marker for minimal residual disease detection and quantification in myeloid leukemias and in myelodysplastic syndrome. Acta Haematol. 112.1-2 (2004): 79-84.
6. Cloos J, Goemans BF, Hess CJ, et al. Stability and prognostic influence of FLT3 mutations in paired initial and relapsed AML samples. Leukemia. 20.7 (2006): 1217-20.
7. Frohling S, Schlenk RF, Breitruck J, et al. Prognostic significance of activating FLT3 mutations in younger adults (16 to 60 years) with acute myeloid leukemia and normal cytogenetics: a study of the AML Study Group Ulm. Blood. 100.13 (2002): 4372-80.
8. Gaiger A, Schmid D, Heinze G, et al. Detection of the WT1 transcript by RT-PCR in complete remission has no prognostic relevance in de novo acute myeloid leukemia. Leukemia. 12.12 (1998): 1886-94.
9. Genzyme Corporation. WT1 RQ-PCR Analysis for Monitoring Early Relapse in Acute Myeloid Leukemia (AML). 2006. Available: http://www.genzymegenetics.com/testmenu/tests/cancer/geneptestmenucantestWT1asp?tests=%2Fcancer%2Fgeneptestmenucantest WT1asp. Date Accessed: July 25, 2006.
10. Kletzel M. Why target the WT1 gene? Blood. 7.12 (2006): 4578-4579.
11. Krause DS, Etten RAV. Tyrosine kinases and tyrosine kinase inhibitors in malignancy. UpToDate http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=genl_onc/18022 (2006).
12. Kiyoi H, Naoe T, Nakano Y, et al. Prognostic implication of FLT3 and N-RAS gene mutations in acute myeloid leukemia. Blood. 93.9 (1999): 3074-80.
13. Komeno Y, Kurokawa M, Imai Y, et al. Identification of Ki23819, a highly potent inhibitor of kinase activity of mutant FLT3 receptor tyrosine kinase. Leukemia. 19.6 (2005): 930-5.
14. Kottaridis PD, Gale RE, Frew ME, et al. The presence of a FLT3 internal tandem duplication in patients with acute myeloid leukemia (AML) adds important prognostic information to cytogenetic risk group and response to the first cycle of chemotherapy: analysis of 854 patients from the United Kingdom Medical Research Council AML 10 and 12 trials. Blood. 98.6 (2001): 1752-9.
15. Laboratory Corporation of America. FLT 3 Mutation Detection. 2006. Available: http://www.labcorp.com/datasets/labcorp/html/chapter/mono/nf10004670.htm. Date Accessed: July 25, 2006.
16. Lapillonne H, Renneville A, Auvrignon A, et al. High WT1 expression after induction therapy predicts high risk of relapse and death in pediatric acute myeloid leukemia. J Clin Oncol. 24.10 (2006): 1507-15.
17. Levis M, Tse KF, Smith BD, Garrett E, Small D. A FLT3 tyrosine kinase inhibitor is selectively cytotoxic to acute myeloid leukemia blasts harboring FLT3 internal tandem duplication mutations. Blood. 98.3 (2001): 885-7.
18. Levis M, Allebach J, Tse KF, et al. A FLT3-targeted tyrosine kinase inhibitor is cytotoxic to leukemia cells in vitro and in vivo. Blood. 99.11 (2002): 3885-91.
19. Nakao M, Yokota S, Iwai T, et al. Internal tandem duplication of the flt3 gene found in acute myeloid leukemia. Leukemia. 10.12 (1996): 1911-8.
20. National Cancer Institute. Adult Acute Myeloid Leukemia (PDQ®): Treatment. 2006. Available: http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/pdq/treatment/adultAML/HealthProfessional/page2#Section_275. Date Accessed: July 25, 2006.
21. National Cancer Institute. Age-adjusted seer incidence and U.S. death rates and 5-year relative survival rates. (2006).
22. O'Farrell AM, Yuen HA, Smolich B, et al. Effects of SU5416, a small molecule tyrosine kinase receptor inhibitor, on FLT3 expression and phosphorylation in patients with refractory acute myeloid leukemia. Leuk Res. 28.7 (2004): 679-89.
23. Oncologic Drugs Advisory Committee (ODAC) Meeting. Briefing document--Mylotarg® (gemtuzumab ozogamicin for Injection). 2003. Food and Drug Administration. Available: http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/03/briefing/3936B2_01_WyethAyerst-Mylotarg.pdf. Date Accessed: July 25, 2006.
24.
25. Osborne D, Frost L, Tobal K, Liu Yin JA. Elevated levels of WT1 transcripts in bone marrow harvests are associated with a high relapse risk in patients autografted for acute myeloid leukaemia. Bone Marrow Transplant. 36.1 (2005): 67-70.
26. Ostergaard M, Olesen LH, Hasle H, Kjeldsen E, Hokland P. WT1 gene expression: an excellent tool for monitoring minimal residual disease in 70% of acute myeloid leukaemia patients - results from a single-centre study. Br J Haematol. 125.5 (2004): 590-600.
27. Schmid D, Heinze G, Linnerth B, et al. Prognostic significance of WT1 gene expression at diagnosis in adult de novo acute myeloid leukemia. Leukemia. 11.5 (1997): 639-43.
28. Schmidt-Arras D, Schwable J, Bohmer FD, Serve H. Flt3 receptor tyrosine kinase as a drug target in leukemia. Curr Pharm Des. 10.16 (2004): 1867-83.
29. Schiffer CA. Clinical features, diagnosis, and prognosis of acute myeloid leukemia. UpToDate http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=leukemia/15783&type=A&selectedTitle=1~78 (2006).
30. Schumacher V, Schneider S, Figge A, et al. Correlation of germ-line mutations and two-hit inactivation of the WT1 gene with Wilms tumors of stromal-predominant histology. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 94.8 (1997): 3972-7.
31. Seiter K. Acute Myelogenous Leukemia. 2006. E-Medicine Website. Available: http://www.emedicine.com/med/topic34.htm. Date Accessed: July 25, 2006.

32. Simpson LA, Burwell EA, Thompson KA, Shahnaz S, Chen AR, Loeb DM. The antiapoptotic gene A1/BFL1 is a WT1 target gene that mediates granulocytic differentiation and resistance to chemotherapy. Blood. 107.12 (2006): 4695-702.
33. Spiekermann K, Dirschinger RJ, Schwab R, et al. The protein tyrosine kinase inhibitor SU5614 inhibits FLT3 and induces growth arrest and apoptosis in AML-derived cell lines expressing a constitutively activated FLT3. Blood. 101.4 (2003): 1494-504.
34. Stirewalt DL, Kopecky KJ, Meshinchi S, et al. Size of FLT3 internal tandem duplication has prognostic significance in patients with acute myeloid leukemia. Blood. 107.9 (2006): 3724-6.
35. Stock W, Thirman MJ. Pathobiology of acute myeloid leukemia. UpToDate http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=leukemia/14277 (2006).
36. Stone RM, DeAngelo DJ, Klimek V, et al. Patients with acute myeloid leukemia and an activating mutation in FLT3 respond to a small-molecule FLT3 tyrosine kinase inhibitor, PKC412. Blood. 105.1 (2005): 54-60.
37. Tamaki H, Ogawa H, Ohyashiki K, et al. The Wilms' tumor gene WT1 is a good marker for diagnosis of disease progression of myelodysplastic syndromes. Leukemia. 13.3 (1999): 393-9.
38. Tse KF, Allebach J, Levis M, Smith BD, Bohmer FD, Small D. Inhibition of the transforming activity of FLT3 internal tandem duplication mutants from AML patients by a tyrosine kinase inhibitor. Leukemia. 16.10 (2002): 2027-36.
39. Whitman SP, Archer KJ, Feng L, et al. Absence of the wild-type allele predicts poor prognosis in adult de novo acute myeloid leukemia with normal cytogenetics and the internal tandem duplication of FLT3: a cancer and leukemia group B study. Cancer Res. 61.19 (2001): 7233-9.
40. Yamamoto Y, Kiyoi H, Nakano Y, et al. Activating mutation of D835 within the activation loop of FLT3 in human hematologic malignancies. Blood. 97.8 (2001): 2434-9.

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: GENE EXPRESSION PROFILING IN THE MANAGEMENT OF BREAST CANCER

Policy # 281
Implementation Date: 8/30/05
Review Dates: 8/17/06, 8/21/08, 8/13/09, 8/19/10, 6/21/12, 6/20/13, 4/17/14, 5/7/15, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 5/25/18, 4/17/19, 9/29/20, 9/15/22, 2/7/23
Revision Dates: 9/17/07, 5/3/11, 8/22/14, 11/13/14, 1/1/15, 9/8/15, 5/25/18, 9/17/18, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#196 Genetic Testing: BP1 for Breast Cancer
#321 Genetic Testing: CHEK2 Test to Assess Breast Cancer Risk
#387 Genetic Testing: FGFR1 for Lobular Carcinoma
#474 Genetic Testing: BRCA1 and BRCA2 for Breast and Ovarian Cancer

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Excluding cancers of the skin, breast cancer is the most common cancer among women, accounting for nearly 1 in 4 cancers diagnosed in US women. Although initial treatment decisions (e.g., mastectomy versus breast conserving therapy, preoperative chemotherapy) may be made based on the size and appearance of the primary tumor, and the presence of palpable axillary nodes (i.e., the clinical stage), the surgical findings are used to determine the pathologic disease stage, which dictates the prognosis and need for adjuvant systemic therapy. Physical examination is unreliable. Up to one-third of women with non-palpable axillary lymph nodes will be found to harbor metastases, while one-third of those with palpable nodes will be pathologically free of nodal involvement.

Treatment for early-stage breast cancer continues to evolve rapidly. Surgical resection is required in all patients with invasive breast cancer. Oncologic outcomes are similar with mastectomy and breast-conserving therapy (lumpectomy plus breast radiation therapy) in appropriately selected patients. Adjuvant systemic therapy (chemotherapy) can be recommended for those individuals at high risk for distant recurrence.

Gene expression profiling attempts to identify markers that will predict the likelihood of recurrence in women with early-stage breast cancer. The results of these tests may be used to determine whether adjuvant chemotherapy would be a benefit. Currently, there are multiple commercially available gene expression profile assays.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers the following gene expression tests for patients with *invasive breast cancer* in *limited circumstances.* (Only one gene expression test will be covered for a new breast cancer.)

A. **Coverage criteria for *Oncotype* DX:**
   1. Patient is newly diagnosed with Stage I or II breast cancer with a primary tumor that is over 5mm, node-negative, estrogen receptor positive (ER+), and human epidermal receptor negative (HER2-).

   OR

   2. Patient is newly diagnosed with ER + and HER2- breast cancer involving 1–3 lymph nodes and no distant metastasis.

   AND

   3. Patient is a candidate for adjuvant chemotherapy (i.e., chemotherapy is not disallowed due to other factors, such as advanced age or comorbidities) and willing to consider adjuvant chemotherapy.

B. **Coverage criteria for Prosigna:** (when all the following criteria are met):
   1. Patient is newly diagnosed with Stage I or II breast cancer with a primary tumor that is over 5mm, node-negative, estrogen receptor positive (ER+), and human epidermal receptor negative (HER2-).

   AND

   2. Patient is a candidate for adjuvant chemotherapy (i.e., chemotherapy is not disallowed due to other factors, such as advanced age or comorbidities) and willing to consider adjuvant chemotherapy.

C. **Coverage criteria for MammaPrint:** (when all the following criteria are met):
   1. Newly diagnosed breast cancer; and
   2. High clinical risk of distant recurrence defined by the modified Adjuvant!Online tool (see below)
   3. Estrogen-receptor (ER+) positive; and
   4. Node negative or 1–3 positive lymph nodes; and
   5. Patient is a candidate for adjuvant chemotherapy (i.e., chemotherapy is not disallowed due to other factors, such as advanced age or comorbidities) and willing to consider adjuvant chemotherapy.

D. **Coverage criteria for EndoPredict (also known as 12-gene score):** (when all the following criteria are met):

1. Breast cancer is nonmetastatic (node negative) or with 1-3 involved ipsilateral axillary lymph nodes; and
2. Breast tumor is estrogen receptor positive; and
3. Breast tumor is HER2 receptor negative; and
4. Adjuvant chemotherapy is not precluded due to any other factor (e.g., advanced age and/or significant co-morbidities); and
5. Member and physician (prior to testing) have discussed the potential results of the test and agree to use the results to guide therapy.

E. **Coverage criteria for Breast Cancer Index to assess necessity of adjuvant chemotherapy or adjuvant endocrine therapy in females or males with recently diagnosed breast tumors** (when all the following criteria are met):

1. Breast cancer is nonmetastatic (node negative) or with 1-3 involved ipsilateral axillary lymph nodes; and
2. Breast tumor is estrogen receptor and/or progesterone receptor positive; and
3. Breast tumor is HER2 receptor negative; and
4. Adjuvant therapy is not precluded due to any other factor (e.g., advanced age and/or significant co-morbidities); and
5. Member and physician (prior to testing) have discussed the potential results of the test and agree to use the results to guide therapy.

SelectHealth does NOT cover gene expression testing to assist in decision-making regarding continuation of endocrine therapy after 5 years.

SelectHealth does NOT cover use of a subset of genes from the 21-gene RT-PCR assay for predicting recurrence risk in patients with non-invasive ductal carcinoma in situ (i.e., Oncotype DX DCIS) to inform treatment planning following excisional surgery; this is considered experimental/investigational.

SelectHealth does NOT cover the use of other gene expression assays (e.g., Mammostrat Breast Cancer Test, the Breast Cancer Index 5-Year Test, the BreastOncPx, NexCourse Breast IHC4, TheraPrint, BluePrint, or TargetPrint for any indication, as they are considered experimental/investigational.

13 Clinical risk assessment according to modified Adjuvant!Online

Table S 13: Classification of patients according to clinical risk assessment by the modified version of Adjuvant!Online

ER status	HER2 status	Grade	Nodal status	Tumor Size	Clinical Risk in Mindact
ER positive	HER2 negative	well differentiated	N-	≤ 3 cm	**C-low**
				3.1-5 cm	**C-high**
			1-3 positive nodes	≤ 2 cm	**C-low**
				2.1-5 cm	**C-high**
		moderately differentiated	N-	≤ 2 cm	**C-low**
				2.1-5 cm	**C-high**
			1-3 positive nodes	Any size	**C-high**
		poorly differentiated or undifferentiated	N-	≤ 1 cm	**C-low**
				1.1-5 cm	**C-high**
			1-3 positive nodes	Any size	**C-high**
	HER2 positive	well differentiated OR moderately differentiated	N-	≤ 2 cm	**C-low**
				2.1-5 cm	**C-high**
			1-3 positive nodes	Any size	**C-high**
		poorly differentiated or undifferentiated	N-	≤ 1 cm	**C-low**
				1.1-5 cm	**C-high**
			1-3 positive nodes	Any size	**C-high**
ER negative	HER2 negative	well differentiated	N-	≤ 2 cm	**C-low**
				2.1-5 cm	**C-high**
			1-3 positive nodes	Any size	**C-high**
		moderately differentiated OR poorly differentiated or undifferentiated	N-	≤ 1 cm	**C-low**
				1.1-5 cm	**C-high**
			1-3 positive nodes	Any size	**C-high**
	HER2 positive	well differentiated OR moderately differentiated	N-	≤ 1 cm	**C-low**
				1.1-5 cm	**C-high**
			1-3 positive nodes	Any size	**C-high**
		poorly differentiated or undifferentiated	Any	Any size	**C-high**

20

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Since OncoType Dx first became available, other gene expression profile tests touting to perform similar functions have come to market. Several of these tests have been reviewed multiple times and the information below is intended to provide of summary of multiple previous reviews and technology assessments.

Oncotype DX Breast Cancer Assay

The initial indications for the 21-gene expression profile (Oncotype DX) were newly diagnosed invasive breast cancer patients with stage I or II disease that is node-negative and estrogen-receptor (ER)-positive, who would be treated with tamoxifen. Primary validation studies enrolled node-negative patients; this indication is reviewed first. More recently, Genomic Health has expanded their indication to include all stage II disease (tumor < 2 cm with spread to axillary lymph nodes or 2–5 cm without lymph node involvement); this indication for lymph node-positive disease will be reviewed separate from lymph node-negative disease.

Results from the Oncotype DX 21-gene expression profile are combined into a recurrence score (RS). Based on a study of analytic validity, tissue sampling, rather than technical performance of the assay is likely to be the greatest source of variability in results. The 21-gene expression profile was validated in studies using archived tumor samples from subsets of patients enrolled in already completed randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of early breast cancer treatment. Patients enrolled in the trial arms from which specimens were obtained had primary, unilateral breast cancer with no history of prior cancer and were treated with tamoxifen; tumors were ER-positive, most were human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2)-negative, and in the case of at least 1 trial, multifocal tumors were excluded.

Lymph Node-Negative Patients

Studies delineating the association between the 21-gene RS and recurrence risk are shown in Table 1. Results indicate strong, independent associations between the RS and distant disease recurrence or death from breast cancer. In secondary reclassification analyses of the Paik et al. data, patient risk levels were individually classified by conventional risk classifiers, then re-classified by Oncotype DX. Oncotype DX adds additional risk information to the conventional clinical classification of individual high-risk patients and identifies a subset of patients who would otherwise be recommended for chemotherapy but who are actually at lower risk of recurrence (average 7–9% risk at 10 years; upper 95% confidence interval [CI] limits: 11–15%). The analysis does not indicate significant erroneous reclassification, given known outcomes. Thus, a woman who prefers to avoid the toxicity and inconvenience of chemotherapy and whose Oncotype DX RS value shows that she is at very low risk of recurrence might reasonably decline chemotherapy. The lower the RS value, the greater the confidence the woman can have that chemotherapy will not provide net benefit; outcomes are improved by avoiding chemotherapy toxicity.

Table 1. Summary of Oncotype DX RS and recurrence risk studies

Study	Total N	Study Objective	Results			
Paik et al. 2004a (7) TAM arm of NSABP B-14 RCT	668	Predict recurrence	RS risk	% of patients	K-M distant recurrence at 10 yr, % (95% CI)	
			Low (<18)	51	6.8	(4.0–9.6)
			Intermed (18–30)	22	14.3	(8.3–20.3)
			High (>31)	27	30.5	(23.6–37.4)
			All	100	15	(12.5–17.9)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="7">Paik et al. 2004b (8)

Additional analysis of Paik et al 2004a data</td><td rowspan="7">668</td><td rowspan="7">Reclassification study; determine incremental risk compared to conventional classifier</td><td>Risk classification by NCCN [1]</td><td>Risk reclassification by Oncotype DX</td><td>N</td><td colspan="3">% DRF at 10 yr (95% CI[2])</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Low (8%)</td><td>Low</td><td>38</td><td colspan="3">100 (NR)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Intermed</td><td>12</td><td colspan="3">80 (59–100)</td></tr>
<tr><td>High</td><td>3</td><td colspan="3">56 (13–100)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">High (92%)</td><td>Low</td><td>301</td><td colspan="3">93 (89–96)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Intermed</td><td>137</td><td colspan="3">86 (80–92)</td></tr>
<tr><td>High</td><td>178</td><td colspan="3">70 (62–77)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">Bryant 2005 (9)

Additional analysis of Paik et al. 2004a data</td><td rowspan="5">668</td><td rowspan="5">N % recurrence at reclassification</td><td rowspan="5">Risk 10-yr classification By Adjuvant! Online[1]</td><td colspan="5">Risk (95%CI[2]) by Oncotype DX</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Low (53%)</td><td>Low</td><td>214</td><td>5.6</td><td>(2.5-9)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Int-High</td><td>140</td><td>2.9</td><td>(7-19)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Int-High (47%)</td><td>Low</td><td>120</td><td>8.9</td><td>(4-14)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Int-High</td><td>194</td><td>30.7</td><td>(24-38)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">Habel et al. 2006 (10)

Case control</td><td rowspan="5">255 ER+ TAM+;

361 ER+ TAM-</td><td rowspan="5">Predict mortality</td><td rowspan="2">RS risk</td><td colspan="5">10-yr absolute risk of death, % (95% CI)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">ER+, TAM-treated</td><td colspan="3">ER+, No TAM</td></tr>
<tr><td>Low (<18)</td><td>2.8</td><td>(1.7–3.9)</td><td>6.2</td><td colspan="2">(4.5–7.9)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Int (18–30)</td><td>10.7</td><td>(6.3–14.9)</td><td>17.8</td><td colspan="2">(11.8–23.3)</td></tr>
<tr><td>High (>31)</td><td>15.5</td><td>(7.6–22.8)</td><td>19.9</td><td colspan="2">(14.2–25.2)</td></tr>
</table>

Abbreviations: DRF, distant recurrence-free; ER, estrogen receptor; N, total number of patients; NR, not reported; RS, Oncotype DX recurrence score; K-M, Kaplan Meier; NSABP, National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project; RCT, randomized controlled trial; TAM, tamoxifen; NCCN, National Comprehensive Cancer Network (2004); Int/Intermed, Intermediate.

[1]Percentages are percent of total N.

[2]Estimated from graphs. Note that different outcomes were reported between Paik et al. 2004b and Bryant 2005 and could not be converted to similar outcomes with confidence intervals

An additional study, in which samples from a RCT of ER-positive, node-negative breast cancer patients treated with tamoxifen versus tamoxifen plus chemotherapy were tested by Oncotype DX, provides supportive evidence. RS high-risk patients derived clear benefit from chemotherapy, whereas the average benefit for other patients was statistically not significant, although the confidence intervals were wide and included the possibility of a small benefit.

Lymph Node-Positive Patients

Albain et al. evaluated samples from the Southwest Oncology Group Trial 8814, in which randomized node-positive, ER-positive patients treated with tamoxifen for 5 years were compared to those treated with cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, fluorouracil (CAF) chemotherapy, followed by tamoxifen (CAF-T) for 5 years. Samples were available for determination of RS for 41% (n=148) and 39% (n=219) of the trial arms, respectively.

In this study, 10-year disease-free survival (DFS) and overall survival (OS) outcomes in the tamoxifen study arm differed by RS risk category (p=0.017 and 0.003, respectively), indicating that the RS is prognostic. When the 2 treatment arms were compared within RS risk categories, only patients in the high RS category significantly benefited from the addition of CAF to tamoxifen (for DFS, 42% [tamoxifen] vs. 55% [CAF-T], p=0.033; for OS, 51% [tamoxifen] vs. 68% [CAF-T], p=0.027), suggesting that RS is also predictive of response to chemotherapy.

A multivariable analysis of RS interaction with DFS, adjusted for number of positive nodes, was significant for the first 5 years of follow-up at p=0.029 and remained significant after adjusting for age, race, tumor size, progesterone receptor status, grade, p53, and HER2. However, the interaction was not significant

(p=0.15) after adjusting for ER level (ER gene expression is a component of the 21-gene profile). Interaction results were similar for OS.

Dowsett et al. included a separate evaluation of node-positive patients in their examination of the ATAC trial samples. Of 306 node-positive patients, 243 had 1–3 involved nodes, and 63 patients, 4 or more; these were not evaluated separately. Rates of distant recurrence at 9 years were 17% (95% CI: 12–24%), 28% (20–39%), and 49% (35–64%), respectively. It is not clear that the risk of distant recurrence in low-risk RS patients would be sufficiently low to forgo the choice of chemotherapy. The authors note that their study "… did not directly evaluate the value of RS in predicting the benefit of chemotherapy."

Goldstein et al. evaluated samples from the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group E2197 trial, which included patients with 0–3 positive lymph nodes and operable tumors greater than 1 cm in size. Patients were randomly assigned to doxorubicin plus cyclophosphamide or docetaxel plus 5 years of endocrine therapy; outcomes were not significantly different for the study arms. A case-control study of samples from this trial found that low-risk RS patients with 0–1 positive node had a recurrence risk of 3.3% (95% CI: 2.2-5%), and low-risk patients with 2–3 positive nodes had a recurrence risk of 7.9% (4.3–14.1%). RS was also a significant predictive of risk regardless of nodal status.

A previous study by Chang et al. reported that in women with locally advanced breast cancer treated with neoadjuvant docetaxel (n=97), a complete response was more likely in those with a high RS (p=0.008). Gianni et al. studied 93 patients with locally advanced breast cancer who received neoadjuvant taxane chemotherapy, then post-surgery CMF treatment and tamoxifen (if ER-positive). The authors reported that pathological complete response was more likely in patients with high RS results than with low RS results (p < 0.01).

One study surveyed oncologists ordering the 21-gene profile for lymph node-positive patients to determine the effect of the assay results on treatment recommendations and reported that approximately half changed their recommendations after receiving RS results, with 33% recommending endocrine therapy alone instead of endocrine plus chemotherapy. However, only medical oncologists who were already using the assay (16% response rate) were surveyed, thus biasing the results. Finally, no outcomes were reported, providing no firm evidence of clinical utility.

Additional studies are necessary before it is possible to confidently withhold currently recommended chemotherapy from lymph node-positive invasive breast cancer patients with low/intermediate RS results. The RxPONDER (Rx for Positive Node, Endocrine Responsive Breast Cancer) trial, led by the Southwest Oncology Group, will enroll 4,000 women with RS < 25 who have early-stage, hormone receptor-positive, HER2-negative breast cancer involving 1 to 3 lymph nodes. Patients will be randomized to receive either chemotherapy with endocrine therapy or endocrine therapy alone. The primary trial outcomes are expected to be completed in December 2016 (available online at: http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01272037).

Patients with DCIS
Ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) is breast cancer located in the lining of the milk ducts that has not yet invaded nearby tissues. It may progress to invasive cancer if untreated. The frequency of DCIS diagnosis in the U.S. has increased in tandem with the widespread use of screening mammography, accounting for about 20% of all newly diagnosed invasive plus noninvasive breast tumors. Recommended treatment is lumpectomy (mastectomy is also an option) with or without radiation treatment; post-surgical tamoxifen treatment is recommended for ER-positive DCIS, especially if excision alone is used. Because the overall rate of ipsilateral tumor recurrence (DCIS or invasive carcinoma) is about 25% at 10 years, it is believed many women are over treated with radiation therapy. Thus, accurate prediction of recurrence risk may identify those women who may safely avoid radiation.

The Oncotype DX DCIS test uses information from 12 of the 21 genes assayed in the standard Oncotype DX test for early breast cancer. According to the Oncotype website, analyses from the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project (NSABP) B-14 study and the Habel et al. case-control study (10) were used to select genes that predict the risk of recurrence independent of tamoxifen treatment and ER status. Scaling and category cut-points were based on an analysis of DCIS Score results from a separate cohort of patients with DCIS; this study has not yet been published and is available only as a meeting abstract. In a retrospective analysis of data and samples from patients in the prospective Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group E5194 study, the Oncotype DX Score for DCIS was compared with the 10-year recurrence risk in a subset of DCIS patients treated only with surgery and some with tamoxifen (n=327). DCIS Score was significantly associated with recurrence outcomes (HR: 2.34 per 50 units; 95% CI: 1.15, 4.59; p=0.02) whether or not patients were treated with tamoxifen. The standard Oncotype DX Score for early breast cancer was not associated with DCIS recurrence outcomes. This study is available

as a meeting abstract but has not yet been published. These studies address the development of the Oncotype DX DCIS Score and the clinical validity (association of the test result with recurrence outcomes). Whether women are better categorized as to their recurrence risk by the Oncotype DX DCIS Score compared with standard clinical indicators of risk has not yet been addressed. Full evaluation awaits publication of studies.

MammaPrint
In the most recent review completed in April 2014, two systematic reviews and thirteen primary literature articles met inclusion criteria for this report. MammaPrint was reviewed May 2011, which concluded, "Of note, to date, no studies have been performed which assess the comparative effectiveness of MammaPrint to any other gene expression profile test such as Oncotype DX to assess whether a seventy gene signature or a twenty-one gene signature or any other gene signature has greater sensitivity or specificity especially given the fact they do not all assess similar genes. Since mid-2011, there have been a number of studies which have compared MammaPrint to other gene expression tests.

One of the two systematic reviews published by Paik et al. speaks to the fact that Oncotype Dx is the only breast cancer prognostic that has reached level IB evidence and that tests such as MammaPrint and MapQuantDx are further behind in their publication of clinically relevant data. However, the group acknowledges that other gene expression tests such as MammaPrint are expected to provide similar information to already marketed adjuvant chemotherapy prognostic tests. Notably, the recently published recommendation by NICE does not advise using MammaPrint in general practice, as there are still unanswered questions regarding its clinical utility and cost-effectiveness.

The primary literature, dating back to the last review, is generally favorable regarding the MammaPrint test. For example, in a prospective comparative trial with MammaPrint and Adjuvant! Online, MammaPrint was able to decrease the number of patients considered to be at high risk, and therefore, in need of adjuvant chemotherapy. Similarly, Drukker et al. showed that fewer patients would continue adjuvant chemotherapy with the use of MammaPrint in a 427-patient prospective study. Though some evidence demonstrates potential clinical utility, no published guidelines, systematic reviews, or society statements illustrate how the test should be used and interpreted within the clinical setting.

Since the last review, new evidence demonstrates Mammaprint offers the potential for use in clinical practice for prognostic stratification and treatment selection for patients with breast cancer, particularly if they are hormone receptor-positive. However, questions remain as to how the test will be employed in the clinical setting.

TargetPrint
TargetPrint is a microarray-based gene expression test that offers a quantitative assessment of ER, PR, and HER2 overexpression in breast cancer. TargetPrint is offered in conjunction with MammaPrint gene expression profiling to provide the physician an even more complete basis for treatment decisions. The manufacturer states that, as compared to Immunohistochemistry (IHC), TargetPrint provides additional information. Whereas IHC provides a semi-quantitative positive or negative result, the gene expression result produced by TargetPrint, provides data on the absolute level of ER, PR, and HER2 gene expression. Published information on the TargetPrint is limited to studies examining its correlation with measurements of ER, PR, and HER2 receptors (Gunven et al, 2011; Gevensleben et al, 2010; Roepman et al, 2009). There is a lack of evidence from published prospective clinical studies that demonstrates that quantification of ER, PR, and HER2 gene expression by TargetPrint alters management such that clinical outcomes are improved.

BluePrint
BluePrint is an 80-gene expression assay that classifies breast cancer into basal type, luminal type, or HER2-type. The test is marketed as an additional stratifier into a molecular subtype after risk assessment with MammaPrint®. Krijgsman et al. (2012) noted that classification of breast cancer into molecular subtypes may be important for the proper selection of therapy, as tumors with seemingly similar histopathological features can have strikingly different clinical outcomes. Herein, these researchers reported the development of a molecular subtyping profile (BluePrint), which enables rationalization in patient selection for either chemotherapy or endocrine therapy prescription. An 80-Gene Molecular Subtyping Profile (BluePrint) was developed using 200 breast cancer patient specimens and confirmed on 4 independent validation cohorts (n = 784). Additionally, the profile was tested as a predictor of chemotherapy response in 133 breast cancer patients, treated with T/FAC neoadjuvant chemotherapy. BluePrint classification of a patient cohort treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy (n = 133) showed improved distribution of pathological Complete Response (pCR), among molecular subgroups compared with local pathology: 56% of the patients had a pCR in the Basal-type subgroup, 3% in the MammaPrint

low-risk, luminal-type subgroup, 11% in the MammaPrint high-risk, luminal-type subgroup, and 50% in the HER2-type subgroup. The group of genes identifying luminal-type breast cancer is highly enriched for genes having an Estrogen Receptor binding site proximal to the promoter-region, suggesting that these genes are direct targets of the Estrogen Receptor. Implementation of this profile may improve the clinical management of breast cancer patients, by enabling the selection of patients who are most likely to benefit from either chemotherapy or from endocrine therapy, but current studies are inadequate to prove the clinical utility of this testing in clinical practice. Furthermore, there is no information regarding BluePrint/molecular subtyping from NCCN's clinical practice guideline on "Breast cancer" (Version 2.2013).

The aim of this study was to analyze the correlation between the pathologic complete response (pCR) rate after neoadjuvant chemotherapy and long-term outcome (distant metastases-free survival [DMFS]) in patients with early-stage breast cancer using BluePrint and MammaPrint molecular subtyping versus clinical subtyping using immunohistochemistry/fluorescence in situ hybridization (IHC/FISH) for the determination of estrogen receptor, progesterone receptor, and human epidermal growth factor receptor-2 (HER2). Data were analyzed from 437 patients in four neoadjuvant chemotherapy trials. BluePrint and MammaPrint outcomes were determined from 44K Agilent arrays, the I-SPY 1 data portal, or Affymetrix U133A arrays. The pCR rate differed substantially among BluePrint molecular subgroups: 6% in Luminal A-type, 10% in Luminal B-type, 47% in HER2-type, and 37% in Basal-type patients. In the Luminal A-type group (n = 90; including seven HER2-positive patients and eight triple-negative patients by IHC/FISH), the 5-year DMFS rate was 93%. The pCR rate provided no prognostic information, suggesting these patients may not benefit from chemotherapy. Forty-three of 107 (40%) HER2-positive patients were classified as Luminal-type by BluePrint and may have lower response rates to targeted therapy. Molecular subtyping identified 90 of 435 (21%) patients as Luminal A-type (BluePrint Luminal-type/MammaPrint Low Risk) with excellent survival. The pCR rate provided no prognostic information. Molecular subtyping can improve the stratification of patients in the neoadjuvant setting: Luminal A-type (MammaPrint Low Risk) patients have a good prognosis with excellent survival and do not seem to benefit from chemotherapy. We observed marked benefit in response and DMFS to neoadjuvant treatment in patients subtyped as HER2-type and Basal-type. BluePrint with MammaPrint molecular subtyping helps to improve prognostic estimation and the choice of therapy versus IHC/FISH.

Marked differences are observed between BluePrint and MammaPrint (microarray-based) breast cancer subtypes and centrally re-assessed pathological surrogates (based on ER, PR, HER2 & Ki67). The greatest discordance is seen in the substratification of Luminal patients, and in the HR+/HER2+ patients. The observed subtype discrepancies may have an important impact on treatment decision-making. Concordances are in line with recent observation that the four main breast cancer subtypes have common etiology and similar therapeutic opportunities [TCGA, 2012].

TheraPrint
TheraPrint is a microarray-based gene assay of 55 biomarkers and variant analysis results for 4 genes that have been identified as potential markers for predicting prognosis and therapeutic response to a variety of therapies. It is still in experimental stages and is used in conjunction with MammaPrint. TheraPrint for breast cancer patients provides an individualized genomic fingerprint of the patient's tumor and correlates gene expression and variant analysis results with a likely response or resistance to a variety of hormonal, chemical, and biological therapies. These include important therapies using SERMs, aromatase inhibitors, anti-androgen, alkylating agents, anti-metabolites, anthracyclines, mitotic inhibitors, platinum-based chemotherapy, topoisomerase inhibitors, angiogenesis inhibitors, HER2/EGFR and HER2/PI3K pathway inhibitors, and others.

Breast Cancer Index SM
The Breast Cancer Index is a simultaneous assessment of HOXB13:IL17BR (H/I) Index and the MGISM (Molecular Grade Index). The 2008 TEC Assessment (3) reviewed available studies for the original component assays. There was insufficient evidence to determine whether the H/I Ratio is better than conventional risk assessment tools in predicting recurrence. Ten-year recurrence rates of patients classified as low risk in available studies were 17–25%, likely too high for most patients and physicians to consider forgoing chemotherapy. The Molecular Grade Index is intended to measure tumor grade using the expression of 5 cell-cycle genes and to provide prognostic information in ER-positive patients regardless of nodal status.

Ma et al. evaluated MGI along with H/I in 93 patients with lymph node–negative tumors who received adjuvant hormone therapy and found that each index modified the other's predictive performance. High MGI was associated with significantly worse outcome only in patients with high H/I and vice versa. When the H/I Ratio and MGI were categorically combined into a single predictor, the estimates of 10-year

distant metastasis-free survival were 98% (95% CI: 96–100%), 87% (77–99%), and 60% (47–78%) for the low, intermediate, and high-risk groups, respectively.

Jerevall et al. combined the H/I Ratio and MGI into a continuous risk model using 314 ER-positive, node-negative postmenopausal patients from the tamoxifen-only arm of an RCT. The continuous model was also categorized, resulting in proportions of low-, intermediate-, and high-risk patients similar to those reported in the Ma et al. study. This continuous predictor was tested in patients from the no adjuvant treatment arm (n=274) of the same clinical trial, with estimates of rates of distant metastasis at 10 years in the low-, intermediate-, and high-risk groups of 8.3% (95% CI: 4.7–14.4), 22.9% (14.5–35.2), and 28.5% (17.9–43.6), respectively. The estimates of breast cancer-specific death were 5.1% (95% CI: 1.3–8.7), 19.8% (10.0–28.6), and 28.8% (15.3–40.2). An independent population of otherwise similar but tamoxifen-treated patients was not tested.

Jankowitz et al. evaluated tumor samples from 265 ER-positive, lymph node (LN)-negative, tamoxifen-treated patients from a single academic institution's cancer research registry. BCI categorized 55%, 21%, and 24% of patients as low-, intermediate- and high-risk, respectively, for distant recurrence. The 10-year rates of distant recurrence were 6.6% (95% CI: 2.3–10.9%), 12.1% (95% CI: 2.7–21.5%), and 31.9% (95% CI: 19.9–43.9) and of breast cancer-specific mortality were 3.8%, 3.6%, and 22.1% in low-, intermediate-, and high-risk groups, respectively. In a multivariate analysis, BCI was a significant predictor of distant recurrence and breast cancer-specific mortality. In a time-dependent (10-year) ROC curve analysis of recurrence risk, the addition of BCI to Adjuvant! Online risk prediction increased maximum predictive accuracy in all patients from 66% to 76% and in tamoxifen-only treated patients from 65% to 81%.

Mammostrat Breast Cancer Test
Mammostrat is an immunohistochemistry (IHC) test intended to evaluate risk of breast cancer recurrence in postmenopausal, node-negative, ER-positive invasive breast cancer patients who will receive endocrine therapy and are considering adjuvant chemotherapy. The test employs 5 monoclonal antibodies to detect gene expression of proteins biologically independent of each other and not involved in cell proliferation, hormone receptor status, or growth/differentiation, thus potentially allowing integration with clinically routine biomarkers. A proprietary diagnostic algorithm is used to calculate a risk score and to classify patients into high-, moderate-, or low-risk categories.

One published study described the development of the assay but provides no information on technical performance (analytic validity). In a validation study in an independent cohort, a multivariable model predicted 50%, 70%, and 87% 5-year DFS for patients classified as high, moderate, and low prognostic risk, respectively, by the test results (p=0.0008). An additional study of the same trial samples used for Oncotype DX validation (NSABP B-14 and B-20 trials) found that among patients with early, node-negative breast cancer treated only with tamoxifen, those stratified by Mammostrat into low-, moderate-, and high-risk groups had recurrence-free survival estimates of 85%, 85%, and 73%, respectively. Both low- and high-risk groups benefited significantly from chemotherapy treatment, but high-risk patients benefited to a greater degree. The moderate-risk group was not well-separated from the low-risk group and thus, moderate-risk results do not appear to provide clinically useful information. A test for an interaction between chemotherapy and the risk group stratification was not significant (p=0.13).

Bartlett et al. used Mammostrat on 1,540 of 1,812 patient samples from a consecutive cohort for which minimum 9-year outcomes were available. The tested samples were from tamoxifen-treated patients; 568 of these were from node-negative patients treated only with tamoxifen and whose tumors were ER-positive. In the latter group, the distant recurrence rates at 10 years for low-, moderate-, and high-risk patients were 7.6% (95% CI: 4.6–10.5%), 16.3% (10.0–22.6%), and 20.9% (12.3–29.5%), respectively. In multivariable analysis, Mammostrat was not a significant predictor of recurrence-free survival in node-negative, ER-positive patients treated only with tamoxifen. However, when all patients (24% node-positive, 20% tumors > 2.0 cm, 18% ER-negative, and 46% treated with chemotherapy) with complete Mammostrat data (n=1,300) were included in a multivariable analysis, Mammostrat scores were independent predictors of recurrence-free survival (p=0.0007). In exploratory analyses of various subpopulations (e.g. node-negative vs. node-positive, ER-negative), Mammostrat appeared to perform similarly in terms of identifying risk groups. However, numbers of subsets were small.

BreastOncPx
The BreastOncPx test is a reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) test performed on formalin-fixed, paraffin embedded tissue that measures the gene expression of 14 genes associated with key functions such as cell-cycle control, apoptosis, and DNA recombination and repair. The results are

combined into a metastasis score, which is reported to be associated with the risk of distant metastases in patients who are node-negative and estrogen-receptor positive.

Tutt et al. published information on the development and validation of the test; no information on analytic validity was provided. In order to develop a gene signature that was completely prognostic for distant recurrence and not confounded by treatment prediction, samples from untreated patients with early breast cancer were used. The training set (n=142) was derived from a cohort diagnosed with lymph node-negative stage T1 and T2 breast cancer from 1975 to 1986; ER-positive samples from patients who had had no systemic treatment were selected for analysis. Fourteen genes were eventually selected as most prognostic of time-to-distant metastasis and were given equal weighting in a summary metastasis score (MS). Using a single cutoff, patients are separated into high- and low-risk groups.

The 14-gene signature was validated on ER-positive samples (n=279) from a separate cohort of patients diagnosed with lymph node-negative primary breast cancer between 1975 and 2001. The estimated rates of distant metastasis-free survival were 72% (95% CI: 64–78%) for high-risk patients and 96% (95% CI: 90–99%) for low-risk patients at 10 years' follow-up. Overall, 10-year survival for high- and low-risk patients was 68% (95 CI: 61% to 75%) and 91% (95% CI: 84 to 95%), respectively. After adjusting for age, tumor size, and tumor grade in a Cox multivariate analysis, the HRs for distant metastasis-free survival for the high- versus low-risk group were 4.02 (95% CI: 1.91–8.44) and 1.97 (95% CI: 1.28 to 3.04) for distant metastasis-free survival and overall survival, respectively. However, this difference in risk between groups was not maintained when the analysis was restricted to patients with tumors larger than 2 cm (p value for interaction 0.012).

ROC analysis of the continuous MS for distant metastasis and for death at 10 years, compared to Adjuvant! resulted in slightly higher area under the curves (AUCs) for the MS in each case: 0.715 vs. 0.661 for distant metastases, and 0.693 vs. 0.655 for death. MS was not added to Adjuvant! and compared to Adjuvant! alone.

NexCourse Breast IHC4
NexCourse Breast IHC4 evaluates the protein expression of ER/PR, HER2, and Ki-67 to provide a combined recurrence risk score. The assay technology uses quantitative image analysis to measure immunofluorescent signals, with results that can be combined in an algorithm to generate the recurrence risk score. The use of quantitative immunofluorescence is said to increase sensitivity, be more reproducible, and allow specific measurement of tumor cells.

Cuzick et al. evaluated 1,125 ER-positive patients from the Arimidex, Tamoxifen, and Alone or in Combination (ATAC) trial, who did not receive adjuvant chemotherapy, already had the Oncotype DX Recurrence Score (RS) computed, and had adequate tissue for the IHC4 measurements. Of these, 793 were node-negative and 59 were HER2-positive (but were not treated with trastuzumab). A prognostic model that combined the 4 immunohistochemical markers was created (IHC4). In a model combining either IHC4 or Oncotype DX Rs with classical prognostic variables, the IHC4 score was found to be similar to the Oncotype DX RS, and little additional prognostic value was seen in the combined use of both scores. In a direct comparison, the IHC4 score was modestly correlated with the Oncotype DX RS (r=0.72); the correlation was similar for node-negative patients (r=0.68). As an example, for a 1–2 cm, node-negative poorly differentiated tumor treated with anastrozole, 9-year distant recurrence at the 25th versus 75th percentiles for IHC4 and Oncotype DX were 7.6% versus 13.9% and 9.2% versus 13.4%, respectively. The IHC4 score was validated in a separate cohort of 786 ER-positive women, about half of whom received no endocrine treatment. The IHC4 score was significant for recurrence outcomes (HR: 4.1; 95% CI: 2.5–6.8).

Barton et al. assessed the clinical utility of IHC4 plus clinicopathologic factors (IHC4 + C) by comparison with Adjuvant! Online and the Nottingham Prognostic Index (NPI). The study prospectively gathered clinicopathologic data for consecutively treated postmenopausal patients (n=101 evaluable) with hormone receptor-positive, HER2-negative, LN-negative or -positive with 1–2 nodes, resected early breast cancer. Of 59 patients classified as intermediate-risk group by the NPI, IHC4 reclassified 24 to low risk and 13 to high risk. IHC4 reclassified 13 of 32 Adjuvant! high-risk patients to intermediate risk, and 3 of 32 to low risk. In addition, 15 of 26 Adjuvant! intermediate-risk patients were reclassified to low-risk. No Adjuvant! low-risk patients were reclassified as high-risk.

Prosigna
The Prosigna ROR score is an algorithmic calculation that combines gene expression results and clinicopathological parameters/metrics that are specific to each individual patient. In some respects, the

Prosigna ROR represents an individual patient prediction tool, fortified with the PAM50 gene assay.

Genetic Testing: Gene Expression Profiling in the Management of Breast Cancer, continued

The NanoString nCounter Analysis System is one of several next-generation genomic tools that is being applied to clinical applications. The nCounter System is a standalone platform that was FDA 510(k) cleared for use with Prosigna in September 2013. In contrast to first-generation genomic tools such as DNA microarrays and quantitative PCR, the nCounter platform was designed to be an enzyme-free nucleic acid detection system that is easy to use and applicable to clinically-relevant biological samples such as FFPE tissue samples. The NanoString technology directly measures and counts single molecules of nucleic acids and therefore, similar to Next-Generation Sequencing technologies, is a digital technology. The digital data sets apart these next-generation technologies from their first-generation counterparts. The digital data is much more accurate and precise and is simpler to interpret than analog data that must be calibrated to facilitate data interpretation.

The NanoString nCounter system, consisting of a Prep Station and a Digital Analyzer, can be installed locally, hence FFPE samples do not need to be shipped to a centralized lab for analysis. The local pathology laboratory maintains ownership of the diagnostic work-up and remains the service provider. The advantages of this decentralized business model are a more rapid turn-around time and interface with the local care team. NanoString oversees the production and distribution of the consumable Prosigna Kits, consisting of the 50 gene-based CodeSet and 8 controls, other consumables require for the assay, and an associated RNA isolation kit.

In a recent review that was completed in September of 2015, two systematic reviews and 9 primary studies were identified which met inclusion criteria for this report. The literature primarily illustrates the analytical validity and clinical validity of the Prosigna PAM50 gene panel. Meaningful conclusions from the literature include the following:

- PAM50 was prognostic for disease-free survival and overall survival but immunohistochemistry was not.
- PAM50 was predictive of tamoxifen benefit but not statistically significantly.
- More patients were identified as high-risk and fewer as intermediate-risk with PAM50 than with Oncotype DX.
- PAM50 gene test has shown in one study to be clinically relevant for predicting distant recurrence.
- PAM50 results changed treatment recommendations in 20% of patients.

Though many studies have been published regarding the analytical validity and clinical validity of the Prosigna assay, little information regarding the clinical utility of the test has been published. Current evidence is insufficient to draw conclusions regarding the clinical relevance of the Prosigna test.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES

0008M	Oncology (breast), mRNA analysis of 58 genes using hybrid capture, on formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue, prognostic algorithm reported as a risk score
0045U	Oncology (breast ductal carcinoma in situ), mRNA, gene expression profiling by realtime RT-PCR of 12 genes (7 content and 5 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as recurrence score
0153U	Oncology (breast), mRNA, gene expression profiling by next-generation sequencing of 101 genes, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as a triple negative breast cancer clinical subtype(s) with information on immune cell involvement Insight TNBCtype™, Insight Molecular Labs
0262U	Oncology (solid tumor), gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 7 gene pathways (ER, AR, PI3K, MAPK, HH, TGFB, Notch), formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE), algorithm reported as gene pathway activity score
0295U	Oncology (breast ductal carcinoma in situ), protein expression profiling by immunohistochemistry of 7 proteins (COX2, FOXA1, HER2, Ki-67, p16, PR, SIAH2), with

4 clinicopathologic factors (size, age, margin status, palpability), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin- embedded (FFPE) tissue, algorithm reported as a recurrence risk score

0297U Oncology (pan tumor), whole genome sequencing of paired malignant and normal DNA specimens, fresh or formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue, blood or bone marrow, comparative sequence analyses and variant identification

0298U Oncology (pan tumor), whole transcriptome sequencing of paired malignant and normal RNA specimens, fresh or formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue, blood or bone marrow, comparative sequence analyses and expression level and chimeric transcript identification

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

81518 Oncology (breast), mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 11 genes (7 content and 4 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithms reported as percentage risk for metastatic recurrence and likelihood of benefit from extended endocrine therapy

81519 Oncology (breast), mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 21 genes, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin embedded tissue, algorithm reported as recurrence score.

81520 Oncology (breast), mRNA, gene expression profiling by hybrid capture of 58 genes (50 content and 8 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as a recurrence risk score

81521 Oncology (breast), mRNA, microarray gene expression profiling of 70 content genes and 465 housekeeping genes, utilizing fresh frozen or formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as index related to risk of distant metastasis

81522 Oncology (breast), mRNA, gene expression profiling by RT-PCR of 12 genes (8 content and 4 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as recurrence risk score

81523 Oncology, mRNA, next-generation sequencing gene expression profiling

81599 Unlisted multianalyte assay with algorithmic analysis

HCPCS CODES

Covered: For the conditions outlined above

S3854 Gene expression profiling panel for use in the management of breast cancer treatment

Key References

1. Abdullah-Sayani, A., J.M. Bueno-de-Mesquita, and M.J. van de Vijver. (2006). Technology Insight: tuning into the genetic orchestra using microarrays-limitations of DNA microarrays in clinical practice. Nat Clin Pract Oncol, 20. 3(9): p. 501-16.
2. Ademuyiwa FO, Miller A, O'Connor T et al. The effects of oncotype DX recurrence scores on chemotherapy utilization in a multi-institutional breast cancer cohort. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2011; 126(3):797-802.
3. Albain KS, Barlow WE, Shak S et al. Prognostic and predictive value of the 21-gene recurrence score assay in postmenopausal women with node-positive, oestrogen-receptor-positive breast cancer on chemotherapy: a retrospective analysis of a randomised trial. Lancet Oncol 2010; 11(1):55-65.
4. Albain, KS, Paik, S, van't Veer, L. (2009). Prediction of adjuvant chemotherapy benefit in endocrine responsive, early breast cancer using multigene assays. Breast 18 Suppl 3: S141-5.
5. Allred DC, Carlson RW, Berry DA et al. NCCN Task Force Report: Estrogen Receptor and Progesterone Receptor Testing in Breast Cancer by Immunohistochemistry. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2009; 7 Suppl 6:S1-S21; quiz S22-3.
6. Badve SS, Baehner FL, Gray RP et al. Estrogen- and progesterone-receptor status in ECOG 2197: comparison of immunohistochemistry by local and central laboratories and quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction by central laboratory. J Clin Oncol 2008; 26(15):2473-81.
7. Baehner FL, Achacoso N, Maddala T et al. Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 assessment in a case-control study: comparison of fluorescence in situ hybridization and quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction performed by central laboratories. J Clin Oncol 2010; 28(28):4300-6.

Genetic Testing: Gene Expression Profiling in the Management of Breast Cancer, **continued**

8. Baehner FL, Butler SM, Yoshizawa CN et al. The development of the DCIS score: Scaling and normalization in the Marin General Hospital cohort. J Clin Oncol 2012; 30(Suppl 27): Abstr 190.
9. Bartlett JM, Starczynski J. Quantitative reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction and the Oncotype DX test for assessment of human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 status: time to reflect again? J Clin Oncol 2011; 29(32):4219-21.
10. Bartlett JM, Thomas J, Ross DT et al. Mammostrat as a tool to stratify breast cancer patients at risk of recurrence during endocrine therapy. Breast Cancer Res 2010; 12(4): R47.
11. Barton S, Zabaglo L, A'Hern R et al. Assessment of the contribution of the IHC4+C score to decision making in clinical practice in early breast cancer. Br J Cancer 2012; 106(11):1760-5.
12. Bighin C, Del Mastro L, Canavese G et al. Use in current clinical practice of 70-gene signature in early breast cancer. Int J Cancer 2010; 127(11):2736-7.
13. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Gene expression profiling for managing breast cancer treatment. Technol Eval Cent Asses Program 2005; 20(Tab 3).
14. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Gene expression profiling of breast cancer to select women for adjuvant chemotherapy. Technol Eval Cent Asses Program 2008; 22(Tab 13).
15. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Gene Expression Profiling in Women with Lymph-Node-Positive Breast Cancer to Select Adjuvant Chemotherapy Treatment. Technol Eval Cent Asses Program 2010; 25(Tab 1).
16. Blue Cross Blue Shield TEC. (2005). Gene expression profiling for managing breast cancer treatment. Technol Eval Cent Asses Program Exec Summ 20.3: 1-5.
17. BlueCross BlueShield Association. Gene Expression Profiling in Women with Lymph Node-Negative Breast Cancer to Select Adjuvant Chemotherapy. 2014 October 2014 [cited 2015 June 16]; Available from: http://www.bcbs.com/blueresources/tec/vols/29/29_3.pdf.
18. Bryant J. Toward a more rational selection of tailored adjuvant therapy data from the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project. 2005 St. Gallen Breast Cancer Symposium. [Complete slide presentation via Genomic Health] 2005.
19. Bueno-de-Mesquita JM, Linn SC, Keijzer R et al. Validation of 70-gene prognosis signature in node-negative breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2009; 117(3):483-95.
20. Buyse M, Loi S, van't Veer L et al. Validation and clinical utility of a 70-gene prognostic signature for women with node-negative breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 2006; 98(17):1183-92.
21. Buyse, M., et al. (2006). Validation and clinical utility of a 70-gene prognostic signature for women with node-negative breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst. 98(17): p. 1183-92.
22. Caan, B.J., et al., Intrinsic subtypes from the PAM50 gene expression assay in a population-based breast cancer survivor cohort: prognostication of short- and long-term outcomes. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev, 2014. 23(5): p. 725-34.
23. Carlson, RW, Allred, DC, Anderson, BO, et al. (2011) NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Breast Cancer: National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN).
24. Cary, L.A. Prognostic molecular profiles of breast cancer. 2013 March 20, 2013 [cited 2013 July 25]; Available from: http://www.uptodate.com/contents/prognostic-molecular-profiles-of-breast-cancer?detectedLanguage=en&source=search_result&search=mammaprint&selectedTitle=1~2&provider=noProvider
25. Chang JC, Makris A, Gutierrez MC et al. Gene expression patterns in formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded core biopsies predict docetaxel chemosensitivity in breast cancer patients. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2008; 108(2):233-40.
26. Cheang MC, Voduc KD, Tu D et al. Responsiveness of Intrinsic Subtypes to Adjuvant Anthracycline Substitution in the NCIC.CTG MA.5 Randomized Trial. Clin Cancer Res 2012; 18(8):2402-12.
27. Chia, S.K., et al., A 50-gene intrinsic subtype classifier for prognosis and prediction of benefit from adjuvant tamoxifen. Clin Cancer Res, 2012. 18(16): p. 4465-72.
28. Coates, A.S., et al., Tailoring therapies-improving the management of early breast cancer: St Gallen International Expert Consensus on the Primary Therapy of Early Breast Cancer 2015. Ann Oncol, 2015. 26(8): p. 1533-46.
29. Cronin M, Sangli C, Liu ML et al. Analytical validation of the Oncotype DX genomic diagnostic test for recurrence prognosis and therapeutic response prediction in node-negative, estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. Clin Chem 2007; 53(6):1084-91.
30. Cuadros, M, Llanos, A. (2010). [Validation and clinical application of MammaPrint((R)) in patients with breast cancer.]. Med Clin (Barc).
31. Cusumano, P.G., et al., European inter-institutional impact study of MammaPrint. Breast, 2014.
32. Cuzick J, Dowsett M, Pineda S et al. Prognostic value of a combined estrogen receptor, progesterone receptor, Ki-67, and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 immunohistochemical score and comparison with the Genomic Health recurrence score in early breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2011; 29(32):4273-8.
33. Dabbs DJ, Klein ME, Mohsin SK et al. High false-negative rate of HER2 quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction of the Oncotype DX test: an independent quality assurance study. J Clin Oncol 2011; 29(32):4279-85.
34. Dowsett M, Cuzick J, Wale C et al. Prediction of risk of distant recurrence using the 21-gene recurrence score in node-negative and node-positive postmenopausal patients with breast cancer treated with anastrozole or tamoxifen: a TransATAC study. J Clin Oncol 2010; 28(11):1829-34.
35. Dowsett M, Houghton J, Iden C et al. Benefit from adjuvant tamoxifen therapy in primary breast cancer patients according oestrogen receptor, progesterone receptor, EGF receptor and HER2 status. Ann Oncol 2006; 17(5):818-26.
36. Dowsett M. on Behalf of the ATAC Trialists Group. Analysis of time to recurrence in the ATAC (arimidex, tamoxifen, alone or in combination) trial according to estrogen receptor and progesterone receptor status. Twenty-sixth Annual San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium 2003.
37. Dowsett, M., et al., Comparison of PAM50 risk of recurrence score with oncotype DX and IHC4 for predicting risk of distant recurrence after endocrine therapy. J Clin Oncol, 2013. 31(22): p. 2783-90.
38. Drukker, C.A., et al., A prospective evaluation of a breast cancer prognosis signature in the observational RASTER study. Int J Cancer, 2013. 133(4): p. 929-36.
39. Espinosa E, Vara JA, Redondo A et al. Breast cancer prognosis determined by gene expression profiling: a quantitative reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction study. J Clin Oncol 2005; 23(29):7278-85.
40. Esserman LJ, Berry DA, Cheang MC et al. Chemotherapy response and recurrence-free survival in neoadjuvant breast cancer depends on biomarker profiles: results from the I-SPY 1 TRIAL (CALGB 150007/150012; ACRIN 6657). Breast Cancer Res Treat 2012; 132(3):1049-62.
41. Esteva, et.al. (2005). Prognostic role of a multigene reverse transcriptase-PCR assay in patients with node-negative breast cancer not receiving adjuvant systemic therapy. Clin Cancer Res. 5/1;11(9):3315-9.

42. Evaluation of Genomic Applications in Practice and Prevention (EGAPP) Working Group. (2009). Recommendations from the EGAPP Working Group: can tumor gene expression profiling improve outcomes in patients with breast cancer? Genet Med 11.1: 66-73.
43. Fan C, Oh DS, Wessels L et al. Concordance among gene-expression-based predictors for breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2006; 355(6):560-9.
44. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2007) 510(k) Substantial equivalence determination decision summary. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. Available: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/reviews/K062694.pdf. Date Accessed: February 17, 2011.
45. Food and Drug Administration. ProsignaTM Breast Cancer Prognostic Gene Signature Assay. 2013 September 6, 2013 [cited 2015 July 9]; Available from: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf13/K130010.pdf.
46. Gennari A, Sormani MP, Pronzato P et al. HER2 status and efficacy of adjuvant anthracyclines in early breast cancer: a pooled analysis of randomized trials. J Natl Cancer Inst 2008; 100(1):14-20.
47. Gevensleben, H, Gohring, UJ, Buttner, R, et al. (2010). Comparison of MammaPrint and TargetPrint results with clinical parameters in German patients with early stage breast cancer. Int J Mol Med 26.6: 837-43.
48. Gianni L, Zambetti M, Clark K et al. Gene expression profiles in paraffin-embedded core biopsy tissue predict response to chemotherapy in women with locally advanced breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2005; 23(29):7265-77.
49. Glas AM, Floore A, Delahaye LJ et al. Converting a breast cancer microarray signature into a high-throughput diagnostic test. BMC Genomics 2006; 7:278.
50. Glinsky, G.V., T. Higashiyama, and A.B. Glinskii. (2004). Classification of human breast cancer using gene expression profiling as a component of the survival predictor algorithm. Clin Cancer Res. 10(7): p. 2272-83.
51. Gnant, M., et al., Predicting distant recurrence in receptor-positive breast cancer patients with limited clinicopathological risk: using the PAM50 Risk of Recurrence score in 1478 postmenopausal patients of the ABCSG-8 trial treated with adjuvant endocrine therapy alone. Ann Oncol, 2014. 25(2): p. 339-45.
52. Goetz MP, Suman VJ, Ingle JN et al. A two-gene expression ratio of homeobox 13 and interleukin-17B receptor for prediction of recurrence and survival in women receiving adjuvant tamoxifen. Clin Cancer Res 2006; 12(7 Pt 1):2080-7.
53. Goldhirsch A, Ingle JN, Gelber RD et al. Thresholds for therapies: highlights of the St Gallen International Expert Consensus on the primary therapy of early breast cancer 2009. Ann Oncol 2009; 20(8):1319-29.
54. Goldstein LJ, Gray R, Badve S et al. Prognostic utility of the 21-gene assay in hormone receptor-positive operable breast cancer compared with classical clinicopathologic features. J Clin Oncol 2008; 26(25):4063-71.
55. Grant, K.A., et al., MammaPrint Pre-screen Algorithm (MPA) reduces chemotherapy in patients with early-stage breast cancer. S Afr Med J, 2013. 103(8): p. 522-6.
56. Gunven P, Randén M, Elmberger G, et al. Gene expression profiling guiding diagnosis and therapy of rare mammary-like anogenital gland carcinomas. Med Oncol. 2012;29(1):127-132.
57. Habel LA, Shak S, Jacobs MK et al. A population-based study of tumor gene expression and risk of breast cancer death among lymph node-negative patients. Breast Cancer Res 2006; 8(3): R25.
58. Habel, et.al. Gene expression and breast cancer mortality in Northern California Kaiser Permanente Patients: A large population based case control study. Presented at: 41st Annual Meeting of the American Society of Clinical Oncology. 5/13-17/05, Orlando, FL. Abstract #603.
59. Harris L, Fritsche H, Mennel R et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology 2007 update of recommendations for the use of tumor markers in breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2007; 25(33):5287-312.
60. Hartmann, S., et al., The 70-Gene Signature as Prognostic Factor for Elderly Women with Hormone Receptor-Positive, HER2-Negative Breast Cancer. Breast Care (Basel), 2012. 7(1): p. 19-24.
61. Hassett MJ, Silver SM, Hughes ME et al. Adoption of gene expression profile testing and association with use of chemotherapy among women with breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2012; 30(18):2218-26.
62. Hayes, D.F. (2007). Adjuvant systemic therapy for early breast cancer: Rationale, assessing the need for and benefit from therapy, and treatment guidelines. 2007. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=breastcn/11453&type=A&selectedTitle=4~6.
63. Hayes, D.F. (2007). An overview of breast cancer and treatment for early stage disease. [cited 2007 June 11]; Available from: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=breastcn/10067.
64. Hayes, DF. (2010) An overview of breast cancer and treatment for early stage disease. 18.3. September 24, 2010. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=breastcn/10067. Date Accessed: February 17, 2011.
65. Henry LR, Stojadinovic A, Swain SM et al. The influence of a gene expression profile on breast cancer decisions. J Surg Oncol 2009; 99(6):319-23.
66. Hornberbger, et.al. (2005). Economic analysis of targeting chemotherapy using a 21-gene RT-PCR assay in lymph-node-negative, estrogen-receptor-positive, early-stage breast cancer. Am J Manag Care. May;11(5):313-24.
67. Ishitobi, M, Goranova, TE, Komoike, Y, et al. (2010). Clinical utility of the 70-gene MammaPrint profile in a Japanese population. Jpn J Clin Oncol 40.6: 508-12.
68. Jankowitz RC, Cooper K, Erlander MG et al. Prognostic utility of the breast cancer index and comparison to Adjuvant! Online in a clinical case series of early breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res 2011; 13(5): R98.
69. Jansen MP, Sieuwerts AM, Look MP et al. HOXB13-to-IL17BR expression ratio is related with tumor aggressiveness and response to tamoxifen of recurrent breast cancer: a retrospective study. J Clin Oncol 2007; 25(6):662-8.
70. Jerevall PL, Brommesson S, Strand C et al. Exploring the two-gene ratio in breast cancer--independent roles for HOXB13 and IL17BR in prediction of clinical outcome. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2008; 107(2):225-34.
71. Jerevall PL, Ma XJ, Li H et al. Prognostic utility of HOXB13: IL17BR and molecular grade index in early-stage breast cancer patients from the Stockholm trial. Br J Cancer 2011.
72. Joh JE, Esposito NN, Kiluk JV et al. The effect of Oncotype DX recurrence score on treatment recommendations for patients with estrogen receptor-positive early stage breast cancer and correlation with estimation of recurrence risk by breast cancer specialists. Oncologist 2011; 16(11):1520-6.
73. Jonsdottir, K., et al., Prognostic value of gene signatures and proliferation in lymph-node-negative breast cancer. PLoS One, 2014. 9(3): p. e90642.
74. Kelly CM, Bernard PS, Krishnamurthy S et al. Agreement in Risk Prediction Between the 21-Gene Recurrence Score Assay (Oncotype DX(R)) and the PAM50 Breast Cancer Intrinsic Classifier in Early-Stage Estrogen Receptor-Positive Breast Cancer. Oncologist 2012; 17(4):492-8.
75. Kelly CM, Krishnamurthy S, Bianchini G et al. Utility of oncotype DX risk estimates in clinically intermediate risk hormone receptor-positive, HER2-normal, grade II, lymph node-negative breast cancers. Cancer 2010; 116(22):5161-7.

76. Klang SH, Hammerman A, Liebermann N et al. Economic implications of 21-gene breast cancer risk assay from the perspective of an Israeli-managed health-care organization. Value Health 2010; 13(4):381-7.
77. Knauer, M, Mook, S, Rutgers, EJ, et al. (2010). The predictive value of the 70-gene signature for adjuvant chemotherapy in early breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 120.3: 655-61.
78. Krijgsman O, Roepman P, Zwart W, et al. A diagnostic gene profile for molecular subtyping of breast cancer associated with treatment response. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2012;133(1):37-47.
79. Kunz G. Use of a genomic test (MammaPrint) in daily clinical practice to assist in risk stratification of young breast cancer patients. Arch Gynecol Obstet 2011; 283(3):597-602.
80. Linn SC, Drukker CA, Retel VP et al. When to add chemotherapy to endocrine therapy and endocrine sensitivity. 8th European Breast Cancer Conference 2012: Abstract 207.
81. Lo SS, Mumby PB, Norton J et al. Prospective multicenter study of the impact of the 21-gene recurrence score assay on medical oncologist and patient adjuvant breast cancer treatment selection. J Clin Oncol 2010; 28(10):1671-6.
82. Lyman GH, Cosler L, Hornberger J. A 21-gene RT-PCR assay in lymph node negative (LN-). estrogen receptor positive (ER+) early-stage breast cancer (ESBC): an age-specific economic analysis. Presented at: 27th Annual San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium. 12/8-11/04. San Antonio, TX. Abstract #2081.
83. Lyman GH, Cosler L, Hornberger J. Gene Expression profiles of paraffin-embedded core biopsy tissue predict response to chemotherapy in patients with locally advanced breast cancer. Presented at: 40th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Clinical Oncology. 6/5-8/04 New Orleans, LA. Abstract #501.
84. Ma XJ, Hilsenbeck SG, Wang W et al. The HOXB13:IL17BR expression index is a prognostic factor in early-stage breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2006; 24(28):4611-9.
85. Ma XJ, Salunga R, Dahiya S et al. A five-gene molecular grade index and HOXB13:IL17BR are complementary prognostic factors in early stage breast cancer. Clin Cancer Res 2008; 14(9):2601-8.
86. Ma, P. Overview of gene expression profiling, proteomics, and microRNA profiling in clinical oncology. 2015 March 18, 2015 [cited 2015 July 10]; Available from: http://www.uptodate.com/contents/overview-of-gene-expression-profiling-proteomics-and-microrna-profiling-in-clinical-oncology?source=search_result&search=gene+expression+profiling&selectedTitle=1~150#H17.
87. Mamounas EP, Tang G, Fisher B et al. Association between the 21-gene recurrence score assay and risk of locoregional recurrence in node-negative, estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer: results from NSABP B-14 and NSABP B-20. J Clin Oncol 2010; 28(10):1677-83.
88. Marchionni, L, Wilson, RF, Wolff, AC, et al. (2008). Systematic review: gene expression profiling assays in early-stage breast cancer. Ann Intern Med 148.5: 358-69.
89. Martin, M., et al., Prospective study of the impact of the Prosigna assay on adjuvant clinical decision-making in unselected patients with estrogen receptor positive, human epidermal growth factor receptor negative, node negative early-stage breast cancer. Curr Med Res Opin, 2015. 31(6): p. 1129-37.
90. Mayo Clinic Staff. (2011) Breast Cancer Definition. February 11, 2011. Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research (MFMER). Available: http://www.mayoclinic.com/health/breast-cancer/ds00328. Date Accessed: February 12, 2011.
91. Mina L, Soule SE, Badve S et al. Predicting response to primary chemotherapy: gene expression profiling of paraffin-embedded core biopsy tissue. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2007; 103(2):197-208.
92. Mook S, Schmidt MK, Viale G et al. The 70-gene prognosis-signature predicts disease outcome in breast cancer patients with 1-3 positive lymph nodes in an independent validation study. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2009; 116(2):295-302.
93. Mook S, Schmidt MK, Weigelt B et al. The 70-gene prognosis signature predicts early metastasis in breast cancer patients between 55 and 70 years of age. Ann Oncol 2010; 21(4):717-22.
94. Mook, S, Bonnefoi, H, Pruneri, G, et al. (2009). Daily clinical practice of fresh tumour tissue freezing and gene expression profiling; logistics pilot study preceding the MINDACT trial. Eur J Cancer 45.7: 1201-8.
95. Mook, S, Knauer, M, Bueno-de-Mesquita, JM, et al. (2010). Metastatic potential of T1 breast cancer can be predicted by the 70-gene MammaPrint signature. Ann Surg Oncol 17.5: 1406-13.
96. Naderi, A., et al. (2007). A gene-expression signature to predict survival in breast cancer across independent data sets. Oncogene. 26(10): p. 1507-16.
97. National Cancer Institute (NCI). (2010) SEER Stat Fact Sheets: Breast. November 2009. U.S. National Institues of Health. Available: http://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/breast.html. Date Accessed: February 17, 2011.
98. National Cancer Institute (NCI). SEER Stat Fact Sheets: Breast. 2010 November 2009 [cited 2011 February 17]; Available from: http://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/breast.html
99. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Breast Cancer. V.3.2012. 2012; http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/breast.pdf. Accessed October 2012.
100. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. (2007) NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology™ Breast Cancer. Available: http://nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/PDF/breast.pdf. Date Accessed: June 11, 2007.
101. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. Breast Cancer. 2014 2014 [cited 2014 April 22].
102. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. Breast Cancer. 2015 2015 [cited 2015 August 10].
103. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Gene expression profiling and expanded immunolohistochemistry test for guiding adjuvant chemotherapy decisions in early breast cancer management: MammaPrint, Oncotype DX, IHC4 and Mammostrat. 2013 September 13, 2013 [cited 2014 March 4]; Available from: http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/live/14279/65265/65265.pdf.
104. Nguyen, B., et al., Comparison of molecular subtyping with BluePrint, MammaPrint, and TargetPrint to local clinical subtyping in breast cancer patients. Ann Surg Oncol, 2012. 19(10): p. 3257-63.
105. Nielsen, T., et al., Analytical validation of the PAM50-based Prosigna Breast Cancer Prognostic Gene Signature Assay and nCounter Analysis System using formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded breast tumor specimens. BMC Cancer, 2014. 14: p. 177.
106. Nielsen, T.O., et al., A comparison of PAM50 intrinsic subtyping with immunohistochemistry and clinical prognostic factors in tamoxifen-treated estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. Clin Cancer Res, 2010. 16(21): p. 5222-32.
107. NICE. The Prosigna gene expression profiling assay for assessing long-term risk of breast cancer recurrence. 25 March 2015 [cited 2015 June 16]; Available from: http://www.nice.org.uk/advice/mib27/resources/the-prosigna-gene-expression-profiling-assay-for-assessing-longterm-risk-of-breast-cancer-recurrence-63499050167749.
108. NICE. Tumour profiling tests to guide adjuvant chemotherapy decisions in early breast cancer. 19 December 2018. Available from https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/dg34
109. Nielsen TO, Parker JS, Leung S et al. A comparison of PAM50 intrinsic subtyping with immunohistochemistry and clinical prognostic factors in tamoxifen-treated estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. Clin Cancer Res 2010; 16(21):5222-32.

Genetic Testing: Gene Expression Profiling in the Management of Breast Cancer, **continued**

110. Nuyten, D.S., et al. (2006). Predicting a local recurrence after breast-conserving therapy by gene expression profiling. Breast Cancer Res, 8(5): p. R62.
111. Oncotype DX. Oncotype DX® Test for DCIS Overview. 2013 [cited 2013 August 23]; Available from: http://www.oncotypedx.com/en-US/Breast/PatientsCaregiversDCIS/OncotypeDX/Overview
112. Oratz R, Kim B, Chao C et al. Physician Survey of the Effect of the 21-Gene Recurrence Score Assay Results on Treatment Recommendations for Patients With Lymph Node–Positive, Estrogen Receptor–Positive Breast Cancer. Journal of Oncology Practice 2011; 7(2):94-9.
113. Paik S, Shak S, Tang G et al. A multigene assay to predict recurrence of tamoxifen-treated, node-negative breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2004; 351(27):2817-26.
114. Paik S, Shak S, Tang G et al. Risk classification of breast cancer patients by the Recurrence Score assay: comparison to guidelines based on patient age, tumor size, and tumor grade. [Meeting Abstract]. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2004; 88(suppl 1): A104.
115. Paik S, Shak S, Tang G, et al. (2004). A Multigene Assay to Predict Recurrence of Tamoxifen-Treated, Node-Negative Breast Cancer. NEJM. 351(27):2817-26.
116. Paik S, Shak S, Tang G, et al. Expression of the 21 genes in the Recurrence Score assay and prediction of clinical benefit from tamoxifen in NSABP study B-14 and chemotherapy in NSABP study B-20. Presented at: 27th Annual San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium. 12/8-11/04. San Antonio, TX. Abstract #24.
117. Paik S, Shak S, Tang G, et al. Risk classification of breast cancer patients by the Recurrence Score assay: comparison to guidelines based on patient age, tumor size, and tumor grade. Presented at: 27th Annual San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium. 12/8-11/04. San Antonio, TX. Abstract #104.
118. Paik S, Tang G, Shak S et al. Gene expression and benefit of chemotherapy in women with node-negative, estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2006; 24(23):3726-34.
119. Paik, et.al. Expression of the 21 genes in the Recurrence Score assay and tamoxifen clinical benefit in the NSABP study B-14 of node-negative, estrogen receptor positive breast cancer. Presented at: 41st Annual Meeting of the American Society of Clinical Oncology. 5/13-17/05, Orlando, FL. Abstract #510.
120. Paik, S., Is gene array testing to be considered routine now? Breast, 2011. 20 Suppl 3: p. S87-91.
121. Parker JS, Mullins M, Cheang MC et al. Supervised risk predictor of breast cancer based on intrinsic subtypes. J Clin Oncol 2009; 27(8):1160-7.
122. Prat A, Parker JS, Fan C et al. Concordance among gene expression-based predictors for ER-positive breast cancer treated with adjuvant tamoxifen. Ann Oncol 2012.
123. Prat, A., et al., Concordance among gene expression-based predictors for ER-positive breast cancer treated with adjuvant tamoxifen. Ann Oncol, 2012. 23(11): p. 2866-73.
124. Prat, A., et al., Prediction of Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy Using Core Needle Biopsy Samples with the Prosigna Assay. Clin Cancer Res, 2015.
125. Prosigna. Use PAM50 to generate an individualized Prosigna Score* for every patient. 2015 [cited 2015 June 29]; Available from: http://prosigna.com/overview/.
126. Reid JF, Lusa L, De Cecco L et al. Limits of predictive models using microarray data for breast cancer clinical treatment outcome. J Natl Cancer Inst 2005; 97(12):927-30.
127. Retel, VP, Joore, MA, Knauer, M, et al. (2010). Cost-effectiveness of the 70-gene signature versus St. Gallen guidelines and Adjuvant Online for early breast cancer. Eur J Cancer 46.8: 1382-91.
128. Ring BZ, Seitz RS, Beck R et al. Novel prognostic immunohistochemical biomarker panel for estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2006; 24(19):3039-47.
129. Roepman P, Horlings HM, Krijgsman O, et al. Microarray-based determination of estrogen receptor, progesterone receptor, and HER2 receptor status in breast cancer. Clin Cancer Res. 2009;15(22):7003-7011.
130. Ross DT, Kim CY, Tang G et al. Chemosensitivity and stratification by a five monoclonal antibody immunohistochemistry test in the NSABP B14 and B20 trials. Clin Cancer Res 2008; 14(20):6602-9.
131. Rutgers E, Piccart-Gebhart MJ, Bogaerts J et al. The EORTC 10041/BIG 03-04 MINDACT trial is feasible: results of the pilot phase. Eur J Cancer 2011; 47(18):2742-9.
132. Saghatchian, M., et al., Additional prognostic value of the 70-gene signature (MammaPrint((R))) among breast cancer patients with 4-9 positive lymph nodes. Breast, 2013.
133. Society, A.C. Breast Cancer Overview. 2013. [cited 2013 July]; Available from: http://www.cancer.org/acs/groups/cid/documents/webcontent/003037-pdf.pdf
134. Solin L, Gray R, Baehner F et al. A Quantitative Multigene RT-PCR Assay For Predicting Recurrence Risk After Surgical Excision Alone Without Irradiation For Ductal Carcinoma in Situ (DCIS): A Prospective Validation Study of the DCIS Score From ECOG E5194. Presented at: 34th Annual San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium; December 6-10, 2011; San Antonio, TX. 2011: Abstract S4-6.
135. Sotiriou, C, Piccart, MJ. (2007). Taking gene-expression profiling to the clinic: when will molecular signatures become relevant to patient care? Nat Rev Cancer 7.7: 545-53.
136. Sparano JA, Solin LJ. Defining the clinical utility of gene expression assays in breast cancer: the intersection of science and art in clinical decision making. J Clin Oncol 2010; 28(10):1625-7.
137. Sun, Y., et al. (2007). Improved breast cancer prognosis through the combination of clinical and genetic markers. Bioinformatics. 23(1): p. 30-7.
138. Tang G, Shak S, Paik S et al. Comparison of the prognostic and predictive utilities of the 21-gene Recurrence Score assay and Adjuvant! for women with node-negative, ER-positive breast cancer: results from NSABP B-14 and NSABP B-20. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2011; 127(1):133-42.
139. Toi M, Iwata H, Yamanaka T et al. Clinical significance of the 21-gene signature (Oncotype DX) in hormone receptor-positive early stage primary breast cancer in the Japanese population. Cancer 2010; 116(13):3112-8.
140. Torrisi, R., et al., Potential impact of the 70-gene signature in the choice of adjuvant systemic treatment for ER positive, HER2 negative tumors: A single institution experience. Breast, 2013. 22(4): p. 419-24.
141. Tutt A, Wang A, Rowland C et al. Risk estimation of distant metastasis in node-negative, estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer patients using an RT-PCR based prognostic expression signature. BMC Cancer 2008; 8:339.
142. Tzeng JP, Mayer D, Richman AR et al. Women's experiences with genomic testing for breast cancer recurrence risk. Cancer 2010; 116(8):1992-2000.
143. van de Vijver, M.J., et al., (2002). A gene-expression signature as a predictor of survival in breast cancer. N Engl J Med. 347(25): p. 1999-2009.

Genetic Testing: Gene Expression Profiling in the Management of Breast Cancer, **continued**

144. van 't Veer LJ, Dai H, van de Vijver MJ et al. Gene expression profiling predicts clinical outcome of breast cancer. Nature 2002; 415(6871):530-6.
145. Weigelt, B., et al. (2005). Molecular portraits and 70-gene prognosis signature are preserved throughout the metastatic process of breast cancer. Cancer Res. 65(20): p. 9155-8.
146. Welsh AW, Moeder CB, Kumar S et al. Standardization of estrogen receptor measurement in breast cancer suggests false-negative results are a function of threshold intensity rather than percentage of positive cells. J Clin Oncol 2011; 29(22):2978-84.
147. Wittner BS, Sgroi DC, Ryan PD et al. Analysis of the MammaPrint breast cancer assay in a predominantly postmenopausal cohort. Clin Cancer Res 2008; 14(10):2988-93.
148. Wolff AC, Hammond ME, Schwartz JN et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology/College of American Pathologists guideline recommendations for human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 testing in breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2007; 25(1):118-45.
149. Yang, M., S. Rajan, and A.M. Issa, Cost effectiveness of gene expression profiling for early stage breast cancer: a decision-analytic model. Cancer, 2012. 118(20): p. 5163-70.
150. Zujewski JA, Kamin L. Trial assessing individualized options for treatment for breast cancer: the TAILORx trial. Future Oncol 2008; 4(5):603-10.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: GENETIC MUTATION ANALYSIS UTILIZING SOLID TUMOR TISSUE

Policy # 570
Implementation Date: 7/28/15
Review Dates: 10/20/16, 7/21/17, 9/18/18, 8/8/19, 10/21/20, 5/19/22, 1/17/23
Revision Dates: 7/21/17, 10/26/18, 11/29/18, 8/23/19, 10/18/19, 9/23/20, 1/29/21, 7/1/23, 8/17/23

Related Medical Policies:
#581 Genetic Testing: Cell-Free Tumor DNA/Liquid Biopsy

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS) and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Cancer is a complex genetic disease influenced by both inherited variants in germline DNA and somatic alterations acquired during formation of the tumor. Prior to tumor genome sequencing, many genes that play a role in cancer were discovered through studies of the germline. Linkage studies in families with inherited, typically childhood cancers, identified rare germline mutations in genes related to DNA damage repair, RAS signaling, or PIK3 signaling. In contrast to childhood cancers, adult tumors have largely been considered 'sporadic'; however, mounting evidence points to a potentially substantial influence from the germline.

Somatic genetic testing for the purpose of cancer management guidance is a rapidly evolving field of molecular medicine. Genetic testing of a solid or hematologic tumor can provide important information regarding the prognosis, risk for recurrence, or help predict tumor response to chemotherapeutic agents. In addition, genetic testing of tissue (e.g., blood) or stool, for evidence of a tumor is becoming an important tool in the early detection of cancer. While this is an area of rapid and ongoing research, clinical validity and utility is proven for only a subset of companion diagnostic genetic tests at this time.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

Select Health covers multi-marker tumor panels using next-generation sequencing in the diagnosis and treatment of cancer as a method to guide the selection of therapeutic agents for malignant tumors in *limited circumstances*.

Genetic Testing: Genetic Mutation Analysis Utilizing Solid Tumor Tissue, **continued**

Members must meet one of the following (A, B, C, D, or E) of the following to be eligible for next-generation sequencing:

A. Member is considering participating in a clinical trial* intended to assess the effectiveness of targeted therapies based on tumor marker, **OR**

B. Non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) regardless of stage; **OR**

C. For any stage III or IV solid organ tumor, and the panel must include BRAF, TMB, MSI, and NTRK; (NTRK using RNA is mandatory in secretory carcinoma of breast and salivary glands, congenital fibrosarcoma, and cellular mesoblastic nephroma, and suggested in all other tumors with <1% risk of harboring NTRK fusion) **OR**

D. Comprehensive next-generation sequencing for endometrial cancers, including endometrioid, clear cell, serous and carcinosarcoma subtypes, will be covered if either of the following criteria have been met:

1. Intact mismatch repair (MMR) protein expression with abnormal p53 immunohistochemical staining pattern; or

2. High/high-intermediate risk as determined by GOG 99 criteria with or without abnormal p53 immunohistochemical staining pattern; **OR**

E. A genomic biomarker-linked therapy has been approved by the FDA for their cancer clinical scenario, or there are established genomic biomarker-based treatment contraindications or exclusions.

Specifically related to homologous recombination deficiency (HRD), possibly present in breast, ovarian, pancreatic, and prostate cancer, the following tests must be performed to identify HRD: including BRCA1/2, genomic patterns of loss of heterozygosity (gLOH)[a], number of telomeric imbalances (TAI)[b], and large-scale transitions (LST)[c]

[a] which are regions of intermediate size (>15 MB and < whole chromosome)

[b] which are the number of regions with allelic imbalance which extend to the sub-telomere but not cross the centromere

[c] which are chromosome breaks (translocations, inversions, or deletions)

*Clinical trial must meet one (i–iii) of the following clinical conditions:

i. Any advanced stage III or IV solid tumors*, or
ii. All lymphomas, or
iii. Multiple myeloma

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Molecular profiling for malignant tumors catalogues specific biomarker information and generates potential treatment options. The personalized tumor molecular profiling services or tests addressed in this document are similar in that they all take an individual's tumor tissue and, from it, produce a molecular profile of the tumor and a list of potential therapies. However, their individual testing methods vary from matching over-expressed genes with drugs to more complex systems biology approaches.

Foundation CDx uses next generation sequencing: "… to interrogate the entire coding sequence of 236 cancer-related genes (3,769 exons) plus 47 introns from 19 genes frequently altered or rearranged in cancer." Foundation CDx helps match the genomic alterations present in a tumor with specific targeted therapies or clinical trials. Recent small studies (Drilon, 2013; Lipson, 2012; Vignot, 2013) have investigated next-generation sequencing in individuals with lung cancer. Others have used next-generation sequencing in those with breast cancer (Ross, 2013a); colorectal cancer (Lipson, 2012), ovarian cancer (Ross, 2013b), and prostate cancer (Beltran, 2013). Limitations of these studies include small sample sizes.

The most widely used of the tumor molecular profiles has been the Target Now Molecular Profiling Service (Caris Life Sciences). According to the Caris Life Sciences website, their tumor profiling service is now being promoted as the Molecular Intelligence™ Service. The published literature addressing these services is limited. Von Hoff and colleagues (2010) evaluated 86 individuals with refractory metastatic cancer. Progression-free survival (PFS) using a treatment regimen selected by Target Now molecular profiling of a malignant tumor was compared with the PFS of the most recent treatment regimen on which the individual experienced progression. A molecular target was detected in 84 of 86 (98%) participants. A total of 66 (78.6%) individuals were treated according to the molecular profile results with 18 of the 66 (27%) having a PFS ratio (defined as PFS on molecular profile–selected therapy or PFS on prior therapy) of greater than or equal to 1.3 (95% confidence interval [CI], 17% to 38%; P=0.007).

An editorial (Doroshow, 2010) accompanying the study reported that the trial had several significant limitations, including uncertainty surrounding the achievement of time to progression (the study's primary endpoint), and a lack of a randomized design. Additional limitations include a small number of participants and lack of duplication of study results by an independent dataset. GeneKey and OncInsights have even less validation. To date, there are no studies in the published literature specifically addressing these tests.

In a related study examining intratumor heterogeneity, Gerlinger and colleagues (2012) obtained multiple spatially separated biopsy samples from primary renal carcinomas and associated metastatic sites of 4 individuals. Intratumor heterogeneity was characterized using immunohistochemical analysis, profiling of messenger ribonucleic acid (mRNA) expression, and mutation functional analysis. An unexpected finding of this study revealed intratumor heterogeneity at the RNA-expression level, with gene expression signatures of good and poor prognosis detected in different regions of the same tumor. The authors concluded that genomics analyses from single tumor biopsy specimens may underestimate the mutational burden of heterogeneous tumors. It was also noted that this may explain difficulties encountered in the validation of oncology biomarkers owing to sampling bias, contribute to Darwinian selection of preexisting drug-resistant clones, and predict therapeutic resistance.

Molecular profiling has also been investigated for gastric cancer. Lei and colleagues (2013) sought to identify subtypes of gastric adenocarcinomas with particular biological properties and responses to chemotherapy and targeted agents. Gene expression patterns among 248 gastric tumors were compared. Three major subtypes of gastric adenocarcinoma were identified: proliferative, metabolic, and mesenchymal. Tumors of the proliferative subtype had high levels of genomic instability, TP53 mutations, and DNA hypomethylation. Cancer cells of the metabolic subtype were more sensitive to 5-fluorouracil than the other subtypes. Also, in two independent groups of subjects, those with tumors of the metabolic subtype appeared to have greater benefits with 5-fluorouracil treatment. Tumors of the mesenchymal subtype contain cells with features of cancer stem cells, and cell lines of this subtype were particularly

sensitive to phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase-AKT-mTOR inhibitors in vitro. The authors concluded that if study results are confirmed and extended in future studies, the classification of gastric adenocarcinomas reported here could guide development of therapies tailored to the molecular subtypes.

In 2012, Tsimberidou and colleagues developed a personalized medicine program at a single facility in the context of early clinical trials. Their goal was to observe whether molecular analysis of advanced cancer and use of targeted therapy to counteract the effects of specific aberrations would be associated with improved clinical outcomes. Participants with advanced or metastatic cancer refractory to standard therapy underwent molecular profiling. A total of 175 subjects were treated with matched therapy, and the overall response rate was 27%. Of the 116 subjects treated with non-matched therapy, the response rate was 5%. The median time-to-failure was 5.2 months for those on matched therapy versus 2.2 months on non-matched therapy. At a median of 15 months follow-up, median survival was 13.4 months versus 9.0 months in favor of matched therapy.

Jameson and colleagues in 2012 performed a small pilot study investigating multi-omic molecular profiling (MMP) for the selection of breast cancer treatment. MMP treatment recommendations were selected in 25 cases and original treatment plans were revised accordingly. Partial responses were reported in 5/25 (25%), stable disease in 8/25 (32%) and 9/25 had no disease progression at 4 months. This study was limited by its small size and non-randomization. A large randomized prospective trial is needed for further evaluation. Primarily marketed to researchers, Life Technologies Inc. offers several variations of their Ion Torrent Next Generation Sequencing Ion AmpliSeq panels, according to the company website. The Ion AmpliSeq Comprehensive Cancer Panel analyzes more than 400 cancer-related genes and tumor suppressor genes. The Ion AmpliSeq Cancer Hotspot Panel v2 analyzes the "hotspot" regions of 50 cancer-related and tumor suppressor genes.

The nonrandomized study by Haslem et al. in 2016 adds some support to NGS from both the clinical utility and cost-effectiveness standpoint. In their retrospective matched cohort study of 72 patients (36 tested and 36 matched controls), the precision medicine treated cohort had longer progression-free survival than did the control group (22.0 vs 12-week, p = .002) and had similar weekly costs ($4,665 vs $5000). The study is small, but the findings warrant validation in a larger prospective study. Some studies are finding a high rate of clinical actionability, at least in terms of tumors found to have mutations for which there is a therapy. Hirshfield and coworkers in 2016 found that 96% (88/92) patients with rare refractory tumors had at least one mutation that triggered a guided therapy in 35% of cases, but this study did not report on the effect of this therapy.

Other studies (also small) have been less supportive. Blumenthal et al. in 2016 reported use in 43 patients with glioblastoma. In 13 of these an actionable target was found but none responded to the therapy. Grenader et al. in 2016 studied 30 patients with advanced tumors using tumor sequencing. Ten of the patients received treatments based on genomic profiling. Of these only 3 benefited. Median progression-free survival in this small cohort was actually worse in the profile-guided group (12 weeks) compared to the control group (48 weeks).

In summary, there is a growing body of evidence which though insufficient to support the general use of molecular profiling to guide treatment decisions for all malignant tumors, provides a basis for allowing limited coverage of this testing in support of advancing current clinical knowledge and potentially improving patient outcomes.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

Covered for the indications listed above if criteria are met

0022U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, non-small cell lung neoplasia, DNA and RNA analysis, 23 genes, interrogation for sequence variants and rearrangements, reported as presence/absence of variants and associated therapy(ies) to consider
0037U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis, solid organ neoplasm, DNA analysis of 324 genes, interrogation for sequence variants, gene copy number amplifications, gene rearrangements, microsatellite instability and tumor mutational burden
0048U	Oncology (solid organ neoplasia), DNA, targeted sequencing of protein-coding exons of 468 cancer-associated genes, including interrogation for somatic mutations and microsatellite instability, matched with normal specimens, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tumor tissue, report of clinically significant mutation(s)

Genetic Testing: Genetic Mutation Analysis Utilizing Solid Tumor Tissue, **continued**

0239U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, cell-free DNA, analysis of 311 or more genes, interrogation for sequence variants, including substitutions, insertions, deletions, select rearrangements, and copy number variations
0244U	Oncology (solid organ), DNA, comprehensive genomic profiling, 257 genes, interrogation for single-nucleotide variants, insertions/deletions, copy number alterations, gene rearrangements, tumor-mutational burden and microsatellite instability, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin embedded tumor tissue
0326U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, cell-free circulating DNA analysis of 83 or more genes, interrogation for sequence variants, gene copy number amplifications, gene rearrangements, microsatellite instability and tumor mutational burden
0334U	Oncology (solid organ), targeted genomic sequence analysis, formalin-fixed paraffin embedded (FFPE) tumor tissue, DNA analysis, 84 or more genes, interrogation for sequence variants, gene copy number amplifications, gene rearrangements, microsatellite instability and tumor mutational burden
0379U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, DNA (523 genes) and RNA (55 genes) by next-generation sequencing, interrogation for sequence variants, gene copy number amplifications, gene rearrangements, microsatellite instability, and tumor mutational burden
81445	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, DNA analysis, 5-50 genes (e.g., ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, NRAS, MET, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed
81449	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, 5-50 genes (EG, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, MET, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed; RNA analysis
81451	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 5-50 genes (EG, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangments, or isoform expression or MRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis
81455	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm, DNA and RNA analysis when performed, 51 or greater genes (e.g., ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NPM1, NRAS, MET, NOTCH1, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed
81456	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (EG, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or MRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

Not covered for the indications listed above

0250U	Oncology (solid organ neoplasm), targeted genomic sequence DNA analysis of 505 genes, interrogation for somatic alterations (SNVs [single nucleotide variant], small insertions and deletions, one amplification, and four translocations), microsatellite instability and tumor-mutation burden
81450	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, DNA and RNA analysis when performed, 5–50 genes (e.g., BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KRAS, KIT, MLL, NRAS, NPM1, NOTCH1), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. Beltran H, Yelensky R, Frampton GM. Targeted next-generation sequencing of advanced prostate cancer identifies potential therapeutic targets and disease heterogeneity. Eur Urol. 2013; 63(5):920-926.
2. Blumenthal, D. T., A. Dvir, A. Lossos, T. Tzuk-Shina, T. Lior, D. Limon, S. Yust-Katz, A. Lokiec, Z. Ram, J. S. Ross, S. M. Ali, R. Yair, L. Soussan-Gutman and F. Bokstein (2016). "Clinical utility and treatment outcome of comprehensive genomic profiling in high grade glioma patients." J Neurooncol. 130(1): 211-219.
3. Doroshow JH. Selecting systemic cancer therapy one patient at a time: is there a role for molecular profiling of individual patients with advanced solid tumors? J Clin Oncol. 2010; 28(33):4869-4871.
4. Drilon A, Wang L, Hasanovic A. Response to Cabozantinib in patients with RET fusion-positive lung adenocarcinomas. Cancer Discov. 2013; 3(6):630-635.
5. Garber K. Ready or not: personal tumor profiling tests take off. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2011; 103(2):84-86.
6. Gerlinger M, Rowan AJ, Horswell S, et al. Intratumor heterogeneity and branched evolution revealed by multiregion sequencing. N Engl J Med. 2012; 366(10):883-892.
7. Grenader, T., R. Tauber and L. Shavit (2016). "Next-generation sequencing in patients with advanced cancer: are we ready for widespread clinical use? A single institute's experience." Anticancer Drugs 27(9): 899-907.
8. Haslem, D. S., S. B. Van Norman, G. Fulde, A. J. Knighton, T. Belnap, A. M. Butler, S. Rhagunath, D. Newman, H. Gilbert, B. P. Tudor, K. Lin, G. R. Stone, D. L. Loughmiller, P. J. Mishra, R. Srivastava, J. M. Ford and L. D. Nadauld (2016). "A Retrospective Analysis of Precision Medicine Outcomes in Patients With Advanced Cancer Reveals Improved Progression-Free Survival Without Increased Health Care Costs." J Oncol Pract.
9. Hirshfield, K. M., D. Tolkunov, H. Zhong, S. M. Ali, M. N. Stein, S. Murphy, H. Vig, A. Vazquez, J. Glod, R. A. Moss, V. Belyi, C. S. Chan, S. Chen, L. Goodell, D. Foran, R. Yelensky, N. A. Palma, J. X. Sun, V. A. Miller, P. J. Stephens, J. S. Ross, H. Kaufman, E. Poplin, J. Mehnert, A. R. Tan, J. R. Bertino, J. Aisner, R. S. DiPaola, L. Rodriguez-Rodriguez and S. Ganesan (2016). "Clinical Actionability of Comprehensive Genomic Profiling for Management of Rare or Refractory Cancers." Oncologist.
10. Jameson GS, Petricoin EF, Sachdev J, et al. A pilot study utilizing multi-omic molecular profiling to find potential targets and select individualized treatments for patients with previously treated metastatic breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2014; 147(3):579-588.
11. Lei Z, Tan IB, Das K, et al. Identification of molecular subtypes of gastric cancer With different responses to PI3-kinase inhibitors and 5-fluorouracil. Gastroenterology. 2013; 145(3):554-565.
12. Lipson D, Capelletti M, Yelensky R. Identification of new ALK and RET gene fusions from colorectal and lung cancer biopsies. Nat Med. 2012; 18(3):382-384.
13. Marchio, C, Scaltriti, M., Ladanyi, M., Lafrate, A.J., Bibeau, A.F., Dietel, M. ... Reis-Filho, J.S. ESMO recommendations on the standard methods to detect NTRK fusions in daily practice and clinical research. *Annals of Oncology*. 30: 1417–1427, 2019 doi:10.1093/annonc/mdz204
14. Ross JS, Ali SM, Wang K. Comprehensive genomic profiling of epithelial ovarian cancer by next generation sequencing-based diagnostic assay reveals new routes to targeted therapies. Gynecol Oncol. 2013a; 130(3):554-559.
15. Ross JS, Wang K, Sheehan CE. Relapsed classic E-cadherin (CDH1)-mutated invasive lobular breast cancer shows a high frequency of HER2 (ERBB2) gene mutations. Clin Cancer Res. 2013b; 19(10):2668-2676.
16. Tsimberidou AM, Iskander NG, Hong DS, et al. Personalized medicine in a phase I clinical trials program: the MD Anderson Cancer Center initiative. Clin Cancer Res. 2012;18(22):6373-6383.
17. Vignot S, Frampton GM, Soria JC. Next-generation sequencing reveals high concordance of recurrent somatic alterations between primary tumor and metastases from patients with non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2013; 31(17):2167-2172.
18. Von Hoff DD, Stephenson JJ Jr., Rosen P, et al. Pilot study using molecular profiling of patients' tumors to find potential targets and select treatments for their refractory cancers. J Clin Oncol. 2010; 28(33):4877-4883.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are

Genetic Testing: Genetic Mutation Analysis Utilizing Solid Tumor Tissue, **continued**

determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: HEARING LOSS

Policy # 666

Implementation Date: 7/1/23

Review Dates:

Revision Dates:

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Prelingual hearing loss affects about 1 out of every 500 individuals. Approximately 20% of cases are attributed to environmental causes, including viral (cytomegalovirus) or bacterial (meningitis) infection, trauma, prenatal exposure to certain drugs, and other environmental factors. The remaining 80% of cases are thought to be genetic, either as part of a recognized genetic syndrome, or as isolated, nonsyndromic hearing loss (NSHL).

70-80% of genetic hearing loss is nonsyndromic, with no related systemic findings. Some syndromic forms of hearing loss and deafness may masquerade as nonsyndromic in infancy and early childhood, before additional symptoms emerge. For example, goiter does not develop until puberty or adulthood in Pendred syndrome; retinitis pigmentosa emerges in adolescence in Usher syndrome; and males with Deafness-Dystonia-Optic Neuronopathy (Mohr-Tranebjaerg) Syndrome begin having progressive neurological symptoms in their teens.

There are various methods used to test for mutations in genes which can cause hearing loss and deafness.

- Single gene analysis
- Panel testing using next generation sequencing

Until recently, most sequencing tests used the Sanger sequencing methodology that was originally developed in the 1970s. Sanger sequencing is labor intensive and did not lend itself to high-throughput applications.

Next generation sequencing (NGS), which is also sometimes called massively parallel sequencing, has been developing since about 2005 to allow larger scale and more efficient gene sequencing. NGS relies on sequencing many copies of small pieces of DNA simultaneously and using bioinformatics to assemble the sequence.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

Genetic Testing: Hearing Loss, **continued**

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic testing for non-syndromic hearing loss, mild or greater (Dcbl level > 25), when the following criteria are met:

A. After testing for secondary conditions has been excluded (e.g., environmental/infectious causes); either panel testing, or individual gene testing can be performed.

The following genes can be tested: CDH23, CLRN1, GJB2, GPR98, MTRNR1, MYO7A, MYO15A, PCDH15, OTOF, SLC26A4, TMC1, TMPRSS3, USH1C, USH1G, USH2A, and WFS1 [this list is not meant to be all-inclusive].

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

81252 GJB2 (gap junction protein, beta 2, 26kDa, connexin 26) (eg, nonsyndromic hearing loss) gene analysis; full gene sequence

81253 GJB2 (gap junction protein, beta 2, 26kDa, connexin 26) (eg, nonsyndromic hearing loss) gene analysis; known familial variants

81254 GJB6 (gap junction protein, beta 6, 30kDa, connexin 30) (eg, nonsyndromic hearing loss) gene analysis, common variants (eg, 309kb [del(GJB6-D13S1830)] and 232kb [del(GJB6- D13S1854)])

81400 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 1(eg, identification of single germline variant [eg, SNP] by techniques such as restriction enzyme digestion or melt curve analysis)

81401 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 2 (eg, 2-10 SNPs, 1 methylated variant, or 1 somatic variant [typically using nonsequencing target variant analysis], or detection of a dynamic mutation disorder/triplet repeat)

81403 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 4 (eg, analysis of single exon by DNA sequence analysis, analysis of >10 amplicons using multiplex PCR in 2 or more independent reactions, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 2-5 exons)

81404 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 5 (eg, analysis of 2-5 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 6-10 exons, or characterization of a dynamic mutation disorder/triplet repeat by Southern blot analysis)

81405 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 6 (eg, analysis of 6-10 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 11-25 exons, regionally targeted cytogenomic array analysis)

81406 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 7 (eg, analysis of 11-25 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 26-50 exons, cytogenomic array analysis for neoplasia)

81407 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 8 (eg, analysis of 26-50 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of >50 exons, sequence analysis of multiple genes on one platform)

81408 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 9 (eg, analysis of >50 exons in a single gene by DNA sequence analysis)

81430 Hearing loss (eg, nonsyndromic hearing loss, Usher syndrome, Pendred syndrome); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 60 genes, including CDH23, CLRN1, GJB2, GPR98, MTRNR1, MYO7A, MYO15A, PCDH15, OTOF, SLC26A4, TMC1, TMPRSS3, USH1C, USH1G, USH2A, and WFS1

81431 Hearing loss (eg, nonsyndromic hearing loss, Usher syndrome, Pendred syndrome); duplication/deletion analysis panel, must include copy number analyses for STRC and DFNB1 deletions in GJB2 and GJB6 genes

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

Key References

1. Alford, R. L., et al. American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics guideline for the clinical evaluation and etiologic diagnosis of hearing loss. ACMG Practice Guidelines. April 2014; 16(4): 347−355. Available at: doi:10.1038/gim.2014.2
2. Belcher, R, Virgin, R, Duis, J., & Wootten, C. Genetic and Non-genetic Workup for Pediatric Congenital Hearing Loss. *frontiers in Pediatrics*. 22 March 2021. https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2021.536730
3. EviCore. Genetic Testing for Nonsyndromic Hearing Loss and Deafness. V2.0.2020.
4. Liming, B.J., et al. International Pediatric Otolaryngology Group (IPOG) consensus recommendations: Hearing loss in the pediatric patient. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*. 5 Sep 2016, 90:251-258. doi: 10.1016/j.ijporl.2016.09.016 PMID: 27729144
5. Shearer, A. E., Hildebrand, M. S., Schaefer, A. M., & Smith, R. J. H. Genetic Hearing Loss Overview. National Library of Medicine. Last Revision: April 27, 2023. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK1434/
6. Smith, R. J. H., & Jones, MK. N. Nonsyndromic Hearing Loss and Deafness., DFNB1. National Library of Medicine. Last Update: August 18, 2016. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK1272/#:~:text=Hearing%20is%20considered%20normal%20if,or%20profound%20(90%20dB).

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Genetic Testing: Hearing Loss, **continued**

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: HEREDITARY HEMORRHAGIC TELANGIECTASIA (HHT)

Policy # 240

Implementation Date:	3/1/04
Review Dates:	1/13/05, 12/15/05, 2/16/06, 2/15/07, 2/21/08, 2/26/09, 2/18/10, 2/17/11, 2/16/12, 4/25/13, 2/20/14, 3/19/15, 2/11/16, 2/16/17, 2/15/18, 2/18/19, 1/31/23
Revision Dates:	7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia (HHT) results from the presence of multiple arteriovenous malformations (AVMs) that lack intervening capillaries and result in direct connections between arteries and veins. Small arteriovenous malformations are called telangiectasias. Telangiectasias present on the nose, lips, and tongue typically vary in size from pinpoint to that of a small pea. Because of their thin walls, narrow tortuous paths, and closeness to the surface of the skin or to a mucous membrane, these vessels can rupture and bleed after only slight trauma. Since the contractile elements in the vessel wall are lacking, the bleeding may not stop spontaneously.

The term AVM usually refers to the "large" telangiectasias, greater than 0.5 inch in diameter and sometimes up to 3–6 inches in diameter. Large AVMs frequently cause symptoms and complications when they occur in the brain, lung, or gastrointestinal tract. Complications of large AVMs may be catastrophic and may occur without warning. Common complications include hemorrhage of the nose, mouth, tongue, gastrointestinal tract, lungs, fingers, toes, and occasionally the eyes, liver, and other organs.

Hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia presents with unexpected or difficult to control bleeding problems. It can present as iron deficiency anemia. It may not manifest clinical signs to alert patients and their physicians to its presence until age 40 or 50. The most common manifestations are epistaxis (nosebleeds) and telangiectasias. Epistaxis is usually the earliest symptom with an average age of onset of about 12 years of age. As many as 95% of affected individuals eventually experience recurrent epistaxis, with 1/3 having onset by age 10 years and 80%–90% by age 21 years. Bleeding can occur from other sites of telangiectasias also. About one-quarter of all individuals with HHT have gastrointestinal bleeding.

Cerebral AVMs may manifest as a hemorrhage, however, often the presenting symptom may be transient ischemic attacks (TIAs), embolic stroke, and cerebral abscess. Migraine headache, polycythemia, hypoxemia with cyanosis, and clubbing of the nails are other frequent complications of pulmonary AVMs. The presenting signs of pulmonary AVMs are usually exercise intolerance and cyanosis.

Hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia is inherited in an autosomal dominant manner. Most individuals have an affected parent. Each child of a proband and the sibs of most probands have a 50% risk of inheriting the mutation.

Indications for HHT genetic testing are: 1) to confirm the diagnosis in symptomatic individuals; and 2) to identify a familial mutation in clinically affected individuals, enabling diagnostic testing of at-risk relatives covered by the health plan. HHT is caused by mutations in 3 genes (ACVRL1, ENG, and SMAD4); however, mutations in other genes (RASA1 and BMP9) can cause findings with significant clinical overlap.

Genetic Testing: Hereditary Hemorrhagic Telangiectasia (HHT), continued

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic testing for hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia (HHT), as available evidence strongly supports its clinical utility, and such testing is the accepted standard of care in the at-risk population.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

No systematic reviews were identified related to HHT. Several recent traditional reviews were identified and obtained. Search of the medical literature database revealed 1,563 "hits" on HHT. Seven clinical trials (5 on epistaxis treatment [total n = 122] and 2 relating to AVMs in the liver [total n = 105]) were identified from this group. Only 1 of these was a randomized controlled trial (RCT). There is a distinct absence of diagnostic studies (e.g., observational trials) on this topic.

Analysis of the available literature identifies significant costs related to the treatment of unrecognized HHT. Given its incidence and prevalence in the U.S., identification of patients with HHT prior to development of significant medical complications and elimination from consideration those patients without the genetically inheritable traits is a cost-effective strategy and in the patient's interest.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES

Genetic Testing: Hereditary Hemorrhagic Telangiectasia (HHT), **continued**

81405 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 6

81406 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 7

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. ARUP Technical Bulletin, 1/2004: Hereditary Hemorrhagic Telangiectasia.
2. Begbie ME, Wallace GM, Shovlin CL. Hereditary haemorrhagic telangiectasia (Osler-Weber-Rendu syndrome): a view from the 21st century. Postgrad Med J. 2003 Jan; 79(927): 18-24. Review. PMID: 12566546
3. de Gussem, E. M., et al. (2014). "Outcomes of pregnancy in women with hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia." Obstet Gynecol 123(3): 514-520.
4. Dupuis-Girod, S., et al. (2010). "Hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia: from molecular biology to patient care." J Thromb Haemost 8(7): 1447-1456.
5. Dupuis-Girod, S., et al. (2014). "ELLIPSE Study: A Phase 1 study evaluating the tolerance of bevacizumab nasal spray in the treatment of epistaxis in hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia." MAbs 6(3).
6. Fuchizaki U, Miyamori H, Kitagawa S, Kaneko S, Kobayashi K. Hereditary haemorrhagic telangiectasia (Rendu-Osler-Weber disease). Lancet. 2003 Nov 1; 362(9394): 1490-4. No abstract available. PMID: 14602446
7. Guttmacher AE & J McDonald. Hereditary Hemorrhagic Telangiectasia. GeneClinics. org.
8. McDonald, J., et al. (2011). "Hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia: an overview of diagnosis, management, and pathogenesis." Genet Med 13(7): 607-616.
9. Mei-Zahav M. [Osler-Weber-Rendu--a life-threatening disease in adults and children] Harefuah. 2003 Dec; 142(12): 852-6, 876. Hebrew. PMID: 14702755
10. Shovlin CL, Guttmacher AE, Buscarini E, Faughnan ME, Hyland RH, Westermann CJ, Kjeldsen AD, Plauchu H, On behalf of the Scientific Advisory Board of the HHT Foundation International. Diagnostic criteria for hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia (Rendu-Osler-Weber syndrome). Am J Med Genet. 2000 Mar 6;91(1):66-7. PMID: 10751092
11. Susan O. Lewin, M.D., Medical Geneticist, HHT Clinic, University of Utah (letter dated: 1-9-04).

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: HERITABLE THORACIC AND ABDOMINAL ANEURYSM AND DISSECTION (TAAD) RELATED DISORDERS

Policy # 453
Implementation Date: 8/9/10
Review Dates: 9/15/11, 11/29/12, 12/19/13, 12/18/14, 12/10/15, 12/15/16, 12/21/17, 12/20/18, 3/7/23
Revision Dates: 4/6/15, 7/1/23, 11/27/23, 12/6/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Aortic aneurysms, dissections, and rupture have ranked as high as the 15th major cause of death in the United States, accounting for nearly 15,000 deaths annually. Family studies demonstrate that up to 19% of persons with TAAD without a known genetic syndrome have a first-degree relative with TAAD. Heritable thoracic and abdominal aneurysm and dissection (TAAD) related disorders are an overlapping group of conditions that result in dilation of the aorta, and, depending on the condition, other vessels with an elevated risk of dissection and rupture. Included in this growing group of conditions are the better-known syndromic forms of aortopathy, including Marfan and Loeys-Deitz syndromes, but the various types of non-syndromic heritable TAAD are also included.

There is significant overlap in clinical features of heritable TAAD-related disorders such that clinical evaluation and family history is often insufficient to diagnose a specific TAAD disorder. Determining which TAAD-associated gene harbors a mutation has direct implications on treatment and surveillance. Examples of how molecular results guide treatment:

- TGFBR1 and TGFBR2 mutations are associated with aortic dissection at smaller aortic measurements than patients with other types of aortopathy. For this reason, prophylactic repair of the aorta is indicated in these patients at an ascending aortic measurement of 4.2cm by TEE (Hiratzka et al., 2010).
- Patients with TGFBR2 mutations are also at risk for aneurysms and dissections of other vessels including cerebral aneurysms, which can benefit from early surveillance and treatment (Loeys et al., 2005; Loeys et al., 2006; LeMaire et al., 2007; Tran-Fadulu et al., 2009).
- ACTA2 mutations can lead to early onset occlusive vascular disease including coronary artery disease, stroke, and Moyamoya-like disease such that patients with ACTA2 mutations can benefit from early surveillance and treatment of these disorders (Guo et al., 2009; Milewicz et al., 2010).
- The need and frequency for this surveillance can be defined within the members of a family using family specific mutation testing after defining a mutation in a proband.

Given the inability to clinically discern which specific gene mutation may be present, the use of gene panels allows for an accurate and rapid determination of the most appropriate clinical approach to patients. Marfan syndrome is the most common heritable connective tissue disorder occurring in approximately 1 in every 5,000 births. In Marfan syndrome, the chemical makeup of the connective tissue is not normal, and as a result, many of these structures are not as stiff as they should be, resulting in certain physical features characteristic of the condition. Marfan syndrome physical features include crowded teeth, flat feet, flexible joints, long arms and legs, long, thin fingers, scoliosis or kyphosis, and tall and thin body type. In addition, other manifestations of Marfan syndrome include retinal detachment,

dislocated lenses, early cataract formations, early glaucoma, and most concerning, aortic aneurysm/dissection and mitral valve prolapse. However, not everyone expresses the genetic defect equally and sometimes the diagnosis may be difficult to discern.

The altered gene that causes Marfan syndrome (MFS), FBN1, can be inherited or it can be the result of a spontaneous mutation at the time of conception. About 25% of Marfan syndrome cases result from a new mutation in the gene. Marfan syndrome is inherited in an autosomal dominant fashion. Thus, a parent who has Marfan syndrome has a 50% chance of passing the disease on to his/her child.

Marfan syndrome overlaps clinically with other heritable disorders of connective tissue caused by mutations in other genes. Most patients with the typical Marfan phenotype harbor different mutations involving the Fibrillin-1 (FBN1) gene. However, FBN1 mutations occur across a wide range of milder phenotypes that overlap the classic Marfan phenotype. Since the FBN1 gene was identified in 1991, more than 97 different diseases causing mutations, have been described in patients with MFS. Some patients who have a clinical diagnosis may have mutations in the TGFBR1, TGFBR2, SMAD3, or TGFB2 genes. The associated prognostic spectra appear to remain unclear.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

Select Health covers panel genetic testing for thoracic and abdominal inherited aortopathy disorders (TAAD) when either I or II are met:

I. **Select Health considers panel genetic testing for TAAD as medically necessary,** if recommended by Intermountain Heart Institute. (Genes include, but are not limited to: FBN1, LOX, COL3A1, TGFBR1, TGFBR2, SMAD3, TGFB2, ACTA2, MYH11, MYLK, and PRKG1);

OR

II. For all other clinicians, Select Health considers panel genetic testing for TAAD as medically necessary, when the following criteria are met:

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

AND when the following criteria are met:

3. **Select Health covers panel genetic testing for TAAD in limited circumstances when specific criteria are met. (**Genes include, but are not limited to: FBN1, LOX, COL3A1, TGFBR1, TGFBR2, SMAD3, TGFB2, ACTA2, MYH11, MYLK, and PRKG1.)

   a) The patient is under age 60 and displays a major clinical feature* or a constellation of features suspicious for a TAAD-related disease, with at least 3 minor clinical features**; or

   b) A patient age 60 or above must display a major clinical feature* in addition to either at least 3 minor clinical features** or a first- or second-degree relative with a major clinical feature

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

Select Health covers mutation specific testing for patients at direct risk of inheriting a disease-causing mutation, based on family history.

Select Health does not cover this testing, if the only concern is hypermobile Ehlers Danlos Syndrome and the member does not meet the above criteria, this test lacks clinical utility. There must also be concern for other types of connective tissue disorders with cardiovascular involvement, which first must be excluded.

*Major clinical features include aortic aneurysm, dilation, or dissection, unexplained arterial rupture, unexplained intestinal rupture, unexplained uterine rupture; ectopia lentis

**Minor clinical features include pectus carinatum/excavatum, scoliosis, mitral valve prolapse, clubfoot, bifid uvula, pneumothorax, wrist and thumb sign, acrogeria (aged appearance to extremities, particularly hands); Arteriovenous carotid cavernous sinus fistula; or Characteristic facial appearance (thin lips and philtrum, small chin, thin nose, large eyes); or Chronic joint subluxations/dislocations; or Clubfoot; or Congenital dislocation of the hips; or Early-onset varicose veins; or Easy bruising (spontaneous or with minimal trauma); or Gingival recession; or Hypermobility of small joints; or Pneumothorax/pneumohemothorax; or Tendon/muscle rupture; or Thin, translucent skin (especially noticeable on chest/abdomen)

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Genetic alterations that lead to abnormalities in connective tissue metabolism predispose to thoracic aortic aneurysm. Genetically-mediated TAA accounts for about 5 percent of TAA. About 20 percent of patients with a TAA/aortic dissection have a family history of aneurysmal disease that is independent of any known genetic connective tissue syndrome. Genetic syndromes such as Marfan syndrome, Ehlers Danlos (ED) syndrome, Turner syndrome, and Loeys-Dietz syndrome, have more aggressive rates of aortic expansion and are more likely than sporadic TAA to require intervention.

Familial TAA refers to patients who have thoracic aortic disease associated with a family history of aneurysmal disease who do not meet strict criteria for known connective tissue syndrome. Familial TAA/dissection is increasingly being recognized and can include patients with a dilated aorta and a family history of dissection, rupture, or sudden unexplained death. The ascending thoracic aorta is involved in about 80 percent and the descending aorta is affected in the remaining 20 percent. Patients with familial TAA generally present at an earlier age (56.8 years) compared with patients with sporadic TAA (57 versus 64 years in one study), and also have faster rates of aortic expansion.

Studies of the family trees of patients with isolated TAA or dissection have found that at least 21 percent of probands have at least one family member with a known arterial aneurysm. The rate of inheritance may be higher, since many family members may not be aware that an aneurysm is present. About 80 percent of familial TAA appears to be inherited in an autosomal-dominant manner, but other genetic patterns are also expressed**.** The reduced penetrance and variable expression of these genetic conditions make obtaining a definitive clinical diagnosis difficult. Mutations in the transforming growth factor beta

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

receptor 2 gene (TGFBR2) may be responsible for about 5 percent of familial cases. Other mutations include ACTA2 and MYH11. ACTA2 is the most common cause of familial TAA, accounting for up to 14 percent of genetic mutations associated with familial syndromes.

The location of the TAA in the proband closely mirrors aneurysm location in family members, supporting the notion that the etiology of aneurysmal disease is differentiated proximal and distal to the ligamentum arteriosum. Disease proximal to the ligament is predominantly nonatherosclerotic in nature, whereas disease distal to it, is strongly associated with atherosclerosis.

Marfan syndrome — Marfan syndrome, which is associated with mutations in the FBN-1 gene, is usually localized to the aortic root, but may extend to the ascending aorta and is associated with an accelerated expansion compared with degenerative aneurysms and a high risk of aortic complications at a relatively young age. Aortic root dilatation, aortic regurgitation, and aortic dissection are the main causes of morbidity and mortality. Marfan syndrome is discussed in detail elsewhere.

As recommended in the 2010 ACC/AHA/AATS guidelines for thoracic aortic disease, patients with MFS should have echocardiography performed at the time of diagnosis and six months later to determine the aortic root and ascending aortic diameters and their rate of enlargement.

In adults, if the aortic diameter is documented as stable over time, then annual imaging is recommended if the aortic dimension is less than 45 mm. If the aortic diameter is ≥ 45 mm or shows significant growth over time, then more frequent imaging is suggested (e.g., twice yearly) and surgery may be indicated. More frequent imaging is also recommended if the aortic diameter shows rapid change (≥ 0.5 cm/year) or if there are concerns regarding heart or valve function.

For children with MFS, annual imaging is recommended if the aortic dimension is documented as stable over time and not markedly enlarged. There are no validated age-specific absolute aortic diameters that can be used to determine when more frequent imaging should be performed or when prophylactic aortic surgery is indicated. It is recommended that aortic measurements be compared to the body surface area. Sonographic measurement of aortic diameter should be performed annually, as long as the increase in aortic size remains proportional to the increase in body surface area. Twice-yearly measurements are recommended if aortic size (expressed as a percentage increase) diverges from the height when expressed in the same fashion.

Individuals under 20 years of age with systemic findings suggestive of MFS, but without cardiovascular involvement, should also have annual echocardiograms due to the potential risk of development of aortic disease. Adults with repeatedly normal and stable aortic measurements, without a definitive genetic predisposition for aortic enlargement, but with a sense of predisposition based upon family history or borderline aortic measurements can be seen at two- to three-year intervals

Loeys-Dietz syndrome — Loeys-Dietz syndrome is an autosomal dominant condition due to mutations in the transforming growth factor beta receptor genes (TGFBR1, TGFBR2). Patients with Loeys-Dietz syndrome have many clinical features in common with patients with Marfan syndrome and are also at high risk for aortic dilation, rupture, or dissection at a young age.

As recommended in the 2010 ACC/AHA/AATS guidelines, complete aortic imaging should be performed at the time of diagnosis, and 6 months after in patients with Loeys-Dietz syndrome or a confirmed genetic mutation associated with aortic aneurysms and aortic dissections (eg, TGFBR1, TGFBR2, SMAD3, TGFB2, FBN1, ACTA2, or MYH11), to determine if aortic enlargement is occurring.

If the aortic dimension is stable and no other specific problem in another vascular segment has been identified, patients with Loeys-Dietz syndrome (potentially caused by mutations in TGFBR1, TGFBR2, SMAD3, TGFB2, or TGFB3) should have serial MRI from the cerebrovascular circulation to the pelvis (with a maximal interval between studies of two years) since they commonly develop aneurysms that are amenable to prophylactic surgical management. Prophylactic repair of the aorta is indicated in these patients at an ascending aortic measurement of 4.2cm by TEE.

Ehlers-Danlos syndrome — The Ehlers-Danlos syndrome is a group of conditions due to defects in type III procollagen that cause hyperelasticity and fragility of the skin and hypermobility of the joints. Most types of Ehlers-Danlos are not associated with aortic dilation, although mild mitral valve prolapse is often present. However, in the vascular type (previously Type IV) Ehlers-Danlos syndrome, vascular and

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

connective tissue integrity is markedly impaired and spontaneous rupture of large and medium-sized arteries can occur.

Aneurysm-osteoarthritis syndrome — Aneurysm osteoarthritis syndrome, caused by pathogenic variants of SMAD3 (mothers against decapentaplegic homolog 3), is a recently described autosomal dominant syndrome characterized by aneurysms and arterial tortuosity in combination with early-onset osteoarthritis. Aneurysms are most frequently localized to the aortic root, but can be found throughout the arterial tree, including the iliac, visceral, and intracranial arteries. In one review of 38 patients, 71 percent had aortic root dilation.

Billing/Coding Information
Covered: For the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES

81405	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 6 (eg, analysis of 6-10 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 11-25 exons, regionally targeted cytogenomic array analysis)
81410	Aortic dysfunction or dilation (eg, Marfan syndrome, Loeys Dietz syndrome, Ehler Danlos syndrome type IV, arterial tortuosity syndrome); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 9 genes, including FBN1, TGFBR1, TGFBR2, COL3A1, MYH11, ACTA2, SLC2A10, SMAD3, and MYLK
81411	Aortic dysfunction or dilation (eg, Marfan syndrome, Loeys Dietz syndrome, Ehler Danlos syndrome type IV, arterial tortuosity syndrome); duplication/deletion analysis panel, must include analyses for TGFBR1, TGFBR2, MYH11, and COL3A1
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

HCPCS CODES

G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Adams JN, Trent RJ. Aortic complications of Marfan's syndrome. Lancet 1998; 352:1722. http://www.marfan.org/marfan/2290/Loeys-Dietz-Syndrome/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK1133/.
2. Cameron DE, Alejo DE, Patel ND, et al. Aortic root replacement in 372 Marfan patients: evolution of operative repair over 30 years. Ann Thorac Surg 2009; 87:1344.
3. Chiu HH, Wu MH, Wang JK, et al. Losartan added to β-blockade therapy for aortic root dilation in Marfan syndrome: a randomized, open-label pilot study. Mayo Clin Proc 2013; 88:271.
4. David TE, Armstrong S, Maganti M, et al. Long-term results of aortic valve-sparing operations in patients with Marfan syndrome. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2009; 138:859.
5. David TE. Surgical treatment of ascending aorta and aortic root aneurysms. Prog Cardiovasc Dis 2010; 52:438.
6. Diagnostic Criteria for Hypermobile Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome (hEDS). The Ehlers Danlos Society. Available at: https://www.ehlers-danlos.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/hEDS-Dx-Criteria-checklist-1.pdf
6. Germain DP, Herrera-Guzman Y. Vascular Ehlers-Danlos syndrome. Ann Genet 2004; 47:1.
7. Guo, D. C., et al. (2009). "Mutations in smooth muscle alpha-actin (ACTA2) cause coronary artery disease, stroke, and Moyamoya disease, along with thoracic aortic disease." Am J Hum Genet 84(5): 617-627.
8. Hiratzka, L. F., et al. (2010). "2010 ACCF/AHA/AATS/ACR/ASA/SCA/SCAI/SIR/STS/SVM guidelines for the diagnosis and management of patients with thoracic aortic disease: executive summary. A report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines, American Association for Thoracic Surgery, American College of Radiology, American Stroke Association, Society of Cardiovascular Anesthesiologists, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, Society of Interventional Radiology, Society of Thoracic Surgeons, and Society for Vascular Medicine." Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 76(2): E43-86.
9. Hiratzka LF, Bakris GL, Beckman JA, et al. 2010 ACCF/AHA/AATS/ACR/ASA/SCA/SCAI/SIR/STS/SVM guidelines for the diagnosis and management of patients with Thoracic Aortic Disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines, American Association for Thoracic Surgery, American College of Radiology, American Stroke Association, Society of Cardiovascular Anesthesiologists, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, Society of Interventional Radiology, Society of Thoracic Surgeons, and Society for Vascular Medicine. Circulation 2010; 121: e266.
10. Helder MR, Schaff HV, Dearani JA, et al. Management of mitral regurgitation in Marfan syndrome: Outcomes of valve repair versus replacement and comparison with myxomatous mitral valve disease. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2014; 148:1020.
11. Isselbacher, E. M., Preventza, O., Black, J. H., et al. 2022 ACC/AHA Guideline for the Diagnosis and Management of Aortic Disease: A Report of the American Heart Association/American College of Cardiology Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation.* 2022;146: e334–e482.
12. Joint Task Force on the Management of Valvular Heart Disease of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC), European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS), Vahanian A, et al. Guidelines on the management of valvular heart disease

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

(version 2012). Eur Heart J 2012; 33:2451.

13. Kallenbach K, Karck M, Pak D, et al. Decade of aortic valve sparing reimplantation: are we pushing the limits too far? Circulation 2005; 112: I253.
11. Kunkala MR, Schaff HV, Li Z, et al. Mitral valve disease in patients with Marfan syndrome undergoing aortic root replacement. Circulation 2013; 128: S243.
12. Lacro RV, Dietz HC, Sleeper LA, et al. Atenolol versus losartan in children and young adults with Marfan's syndrome. N Engl J Med 2014; 371:2061.
13. LeMaire, S. A., et al. (2007). "Severe aortic and arterial aneurysms associated with a TGFBR2 mutation." Nat Clin Pract Cardiovasc Med 4(3): 167-171.
14. Loeys, B. L., et al. (2005). "A syndrome of altered cardiovascular, craniofacial, neurocognitive and skeletal development caused by mutations in TGFBR1 or TGFBR2." Nat Genet 37(3): 275-281.
15. Loeys, B. L., et al. (2006). "Aneurysm syndromes caused by mutations in the TGF-beta receptor." N Engl J Med 355(8): 788-798.
16. Loeys BL, Schwarze U, Holm T, et al. Aneurysm syndromes caused by mutations in the TGF-beta receptor. N Engl J Med 2006; 355:788.
17. Loeys BL, Dietz HC, Braverman AC, et al. The revised Ghent nosology for the Marfan syndrome. J Med Genet 2010; 47:476.
18. Martens T, Van Herzeele I, De Ryck F, et al. Multiple aneurysms in a patient with aneurysms-osteoarthritis syndrome. Ann Thorac Surg 2013; 95:332.
19. Meijboom LJ, Nollen GJ, Merchant N, et al. Frequency of coronary ostial aneurysms after aortic root surgery in patients with the Marfan syndrome. Am J Cardiol 2002; 89:1135.
20. Milewicz, D. M., et al. (2010). "De novo ACTA2 mutation causes a novel syndrome of multisystemic smooth muscle dysfunction." Am J Med Genet A 152A (10): 2437-2443.
21. Milewicz DM, Dietz HC, Miller DC. Treatment of aortic disease in patients with Marfan syndrome. Circulation 2005; 111: e150.
22. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC guideline for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. J Am Coll Cardiol 2014; 63: e57.
23. Shores J, Berger KR, Murphy EA, Pyeritz RE. Progression of aortic dilatation and the benefit of long-term beta-adrenergic blockade in Marfan's syndrome. N Engl J Med 1994; 330:1335.
24. Silverman DI, Burton KJ, Gray J, et al. Life expectancy in the Marfan syndrome. Am J Cardiol 1995; 75:157.Silverman DI, Gray J, Roman MJ, et al. Family history of severe cardiovascular disease in Marfan syndrome is associated with increased aortic diameter and decreased survival. J Am Coll Cardiol 1995; 26:1062.
25. Tinkle, B. T., Lacro, R. V, & Burke., L. W. Health Supervision for Children and Adolescents with Marfan Syndrome. *Pediatrics*. 2023; 151(4): e2023061450.
25. Tran-Fadulu, V., et al. (2009). "Analysis of multigenerational families with thoracic aortic aneurysms and dissections due to TGFBR1 or TGFBR2 mutations." J Med Genet 46(9): 607-613.
26. Volguina IV, Miller DC, LeMaire SA, et al. Valve-sparing and valve-replacing techniques for aortic root replacement in patients with Marfan syndrome: Analysis of early outcome. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2009; 137:1124.
27. van der Linde D, Bekkers JA, Mattace-Raso FU, et al. Progression rate and early surgical experience in the new aggressive aneurysms-osteoarthritis syndrome. Ann Thorac Surg 2013; 95:563.
28. van der Linde D, van de Laar IM, Bertoli-Avella AM, et al. Aggressive cardiovascular phenotype of aneurysms-osteoarthritis syndrome caused by pathogenic SMAD3 variants. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2012; 60:397.
29. Wright, MJ, Dietz, HC, III. Connective tissue diseases. In: Oski's Principles and Practice of Pediatrics, McMillan, J, Oski, F (Eds), Lippincott Raven, Philadelphia 1999.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: INHERITABLE COLORECTAL CANCER

Policy # 222
Implementation Date: 4/20/04
Review Dates: 4/14/05, 6/22/06, 7/12/07, 6/11/09, 6/17/10, 8/16/11, 8/16/12, 8/15/13, 6/19/14, 6/11/15, 6/16/16, 9/25/17, 9/17/18, 10/15/19, 1/31/23
Revision Dates: 6/19/08, 1/16/16, 5/2/17, 9/25/17, 10/2/18, 7/1/23

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Of the nearly 150,000 cases of colorectal cancer expected to be diagnosed this year in the US, about 5% are inherited. In these cases, mutations in key genes dramatically increase cancer risk. These mutations give rise to multiple colorectal cancer syndromes, including:

- Lynch syndrome (formerly known as hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer [HNPCC])
- Familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP)
- Attenuated familial adenomatous polyposis (AFAP), a variation of FAP
- MUTYH-associated polyposis (MAP)

Lynch syndrome, the most common syndrome, is caused by a mutation in one of the specific genes responsible for proteins that repair DNA mismatches. Microsatellite instability is a marker for this syndrome. Usually, the colon cancers are located on the right side of the colon. Familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP) and attenuated AFP (AFAP) are the result of mutations in the gene that codes for the key tumor-suppressor protein adenomatous polyposis coli (APC). MUTYH-associated polyposis (MAP) results from mutations in the MUTYH gene that codes for adenine DNA glycosylase which plays a major role in DNA base excision repair. Unlike Lynch syndrome, FAP and AFAP, which are dominantly inherited conditions, MAP is inherited in a recessive manner.

Although Lynch Syndrome, FAP/AFAP, and MAP are biologically different, families affected with these syndromes exhibit accelerated and amplified colorectal carcinogenesis. This is most obvious in the family's history, which features frequent early-onset colorectal cancer. In the case of MAP, however, the family history may not be significant for multiple cases of colorectal cancer. Screening, early prophylactic surgery, close follow-up, and chemoprevention (when appropriate) are important in managing the disease in individual patients. Gene-based tests are used to diagnose susceptibility to these hereditary colorectal cancer syndromes, specifically Lynch syndrome, Familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP), Attenuated FAP (A-FAP), or MUTYH-associated polyposis (MAP).

Multiple molecular testing laboratories offer colon cancer multi-gene panels specific to the needs of a given patient based on personal or family cancer history. These tests include: (1) panels for Lynch Syndrome that includes gene sequence analysis of the MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, EPCAM and PMS2 genes; (2) panels for polyposis syndromes (FAP, AFAP and MAP) that include the APC and MUTYH genes; (3) single site mutation analyses for individuals with known colon cancer gene mutations via previous testing in a family member.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Genetic Testing: Inheritable Colorectal Cancer, **continued**

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when recommended by a genetic counselor, medical geneticist, or other provider with recognized expertise in this area; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers multi-gene panel testing for hereditary colorectal cancer (CRC) syndromes* when <u>any</u> of the following criteria are met:

A. Individuals with personal or family history[a] of, at the time of a colonoscopy:

1) ≥ 10 adenomatous polyps

or

2) ≥ 2 hamartomatous polyps

or

3) ≥ 5 serrated polyps/lesions proximal to the rectum

OR

B. Personal history of CRC

OR

C. Personal or family history of a Lynch syndrome (LS)-related cancer[b] or mutation, or a personal history of a tumor with deficient mismatch repair (dMMR)[c]

a- Personal or family history of polyps is based on cumulative lifetime history of adenomas, hamartomas, and/or serrated polyps/lesions in the proband or a single family member.

b- LS-related cancers include colorectal, endometrial, gastric, ovarian, pancreas, urothelial, brain (usually glioblastoma), biliary tract, and small intestine, as well as sebaceous adenomas, sebaceous carcinomas, and keratoacanthomas as seen in Muir-Torre syndrome.

c- Any tumor that 1) is microsatellite instability-high (MSI-H) by polymerase chain reaction (PCR) or next-generation sequencing (NGS); or 2) has abnormal/ deficient MMR protein expression (dMMR) on immunohistochemistry (IHC) without concurrent MLH1 promoter hypermethylation or BRAF 600E mutation.

*<u>Associated CRC Syndromes:</u>

- Lynch syndrome
- Classical familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP),
- Attenuated FAP (AFAP), BMPR1A, MUTYH-associated polyposis (MAP)
- Rare genetic causes of multiple adenomatous polyps
- Colonic adenomatous polyposis of unknown etiology (CPUE)
- Puetz-Jeghers syndrome (PJS), Juvenile polyposis syndrome (JPS)
- Cowden/PTEN hamartoma syndrome

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

The evidence related to the effectiveness of gene-based testing for diagnosis, prognosis, and prediction of increased risk of colorectal cancer has been previously reviewed (SelectHealth Tech Assessment November 2001). Additional information obtained from discussions with genetic testing experts since then continues to support these conclusions.

It is now known that Lynch syndrome results from an inherited mutation in 1 of the mismatch repair (MMR) genes. Normally, MMR genes produce proteins that identify and correct base-pairing mismatches that can occur during DNA replication. Consequently, a mutation that inactivates an MMR gene leads to accumulation of other mutations which significantly increases the likelihood of developing cancer. Mutations that disrupt the function of MMR genes (mutations in MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, EPCAM and PMS2) have been linked to Lynch syndrome.

It has been known that germline mutations in MLH1, MSH2, and MSH6 account for most detected mutations in families with Lynch syndrome. More recently it has been discovered that PMS2 and EPCAM also play an important role in Lynch syndrome.

As 1 of the 4 primary mismatch repair genes associated with Lynch syndrome, the functional importance of PMS2 has been clear, but its total contribution to Lynch syndrome was historically considered to be quite low. More recent studies suggest that the prevalence of PMS2 mutations is comparable to MSH6, with as much as 15% of all Lynch syndromes attributable to PMS2.

Finally, the EPCAM gene is a recently discovered contributor to Lynch syndrome, accounting for an estimated 1–3% of all detectable Lynch syndrome mutations. Studies indicate that large deletions in the end of this gene, which is located directly "upstream" of MSH2, can lead to a loss of MSH2 expression and result in Lynch syndrome.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0069U Oncology (colorectal), microRNA, RT-PCR expression profiling of miR-31-3p, formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as an expression score

0101U Hereditary colon cancer disorders (eg, Lynch syndrome, PTEN hamartoma syndrome, Cowden syndrome, familial adenomatosis polyposis); genomic sequence analysis panel utilizing a combination of NGS, Sanger, MLPA and array CGH, with MRNA analytics to resolve variants of unknown significance when indicated [15 genes (sequencing and deletion/duplication), EPCAM and GREM1 (deletion/duplication only)]

Genetic Testing: Inheritable Colorectal Cancer, **continued**

0130U	Hereditary colon cancer disorders (eg, Lynch syndrome, PTEN hamartoma syndrome, Cowden syndrome, familial adenomatosis polyposis), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (APC, CDH1, CHEK2, MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, MUTYH, PMS2, PTEN, and TP53) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0157U	APC (APC regulator of WNT signaling pathway) (eg, familial adenomatosis polyposis [FAP]) mRNA sequence analysis (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0158U	MLH1 (mutL homolog 1) (eg, hereditary non-polyposis colorectal cancer, Lynch syndrome) mRNA sequence analysis (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0159U	MSH2 (mutS homolog 2) (eg, hereditary colon cancer, Lynch syndrome) mRNA sequence analysis (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0160U	MSH6 (mutS homolog 6) (eg, hereditary colon cancer, Lynch syndrome) mRNA sequence analysis (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0161U	PMS2 (PMS1 homolog 2, mismatch repair system component) (eg, hereditary non-polyposis colorectal cancer, Lynch syndrome) mRNA sequence analysis (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0162U	Hereditary colon cancer (Lynch syndrome), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, PMS2) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0229U	BCAT1 (Branched chain amino acid transaminase 1) and IKZF1 (IKAROS family zinc finger 1) (eg, colorectal cancer) promoter methylation analysis
0235U	PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome), full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions
0238U	Oncology (Lynch syndrome), genomic DNA sequence analysis of MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, PMS2, and EPCAM, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions
81201	APC (adenomatous polyposis coli) (eg, familial adenomatosis polyposis [FAP], attenuated FAP) gene analysis; full gene sequence 81202 APC (adenomatous polyposis coli) (eg, familial adenomatosis polyposis [FAP], attenuated FAP) gene analysis; known familial variants
81202	APC (adenomatous polyposis coli) (eg, familial adenomatosis polyposis [FAP], attenuated FAP) gene analysis; known familial variants
81203	APC (adenomatous polyposis coli) (eg, familial adenomatosis polyposis [FAP], attenuated FAP) gene analysis; duplication/deletion variants
81210	BRAF (B-Raf proto-oncogene, serine/threonine kinase) (eg, colon cancer, melanoma), gene analysis, V600 variant(s)
81288	MLH1 (mutL homolog 1, colon cancer, nonpolyposis type 2) (eg, hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer, Lynch syndrome) gene analysis; promoter\ methylation analysis
81292	MLH1 (mutL homolog 1, colon cancer, nonpolyposis type 2) (eg, hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer, Lynch syndrome) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

Genetic Testing: Inheritable Colorectal Cancer, **continued**

81293	;known familial variants
81294	;duplication/deletion variants
81295	MSH2 (mutS homolog 2, colon cancer, nonpolyposis type 1) (eg, hereditary non-polyposis colorectal cancer, Lynch syndrome) gene analysis; full sequence analysis
81296	;known familial variants
81297	MSH2 (mutS homolog 2, colon cancer, nonpolyposis type 1) (eg, hereditary duplication/deletion variants duplication/deletion variants
81298	MSH6 (mutS homolog 6 [E. coli]) (eg, hereditary non-polyposis colorectal cancer, Lynch syndrome) gene analysis; full sequence analysis
81299	;known familial variants
81300	;duplication/deletion variants
81301	Microsatellite instability analysis (eg, hereditary non-polyposis colorectal cancer, Lynch syndrome) of markers for mismatch repair deficiency (eg, BAT25, BAT26), includes comparison of neoplastic and normal tissue, if performed
81309	PIK3CA (phosphatidylinositol-4, 5-biphosphate 3-kinase, catalytic subunit alpha) (eg, colorectal and breast cancer) gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (eg, exons 7, 9, 20)
81317	PMS2 (postmeiotic segregation increased 2 [S. cerevisiae]) (eg, hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer, Lynch syndrome) gene analysis; full sequence analysis
81318	;known familial variants
81319	;duplication/deletion variants
81321	PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome) gene analysis; full sequence analysis
81322	PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome) gene analysis; known familial variant
81327	SEPT9 (Septin9) (eg, colorectal cancer) promoter methylation analysis
81401	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 2
81403	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 4 (eg, analysis of single exon by DNA sequence analysis, analysis of >10 amplicons using multiplex PCR in 2 or more independent reactions, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 2-5 exons): EPCAM (epithelial cell adhesion molecule) (eg, Lynch syndrome), duplication/deletion analysis
81406	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 7
81435	Hereditary colon cancer disorders (eg, Lynch syndrome, PTEN hamartoma syndrome, Cowden syndrome, familial adenomatosis polyposis); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 10 genes, including APC, BMPR1A, CDH1, MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, MUTYH, PTEN, SMAD4, and STK11
81436	;duplication/deletion analysis panel, must include analysis of at least 5genes, including MLH1, MSH2, EPCAM, SMAD4, and STK11
81445	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, 5-50 genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, MET, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed; DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis
81449	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, 5-50 genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, MET, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed; RNA analysis

Genetic Testing: Inheritable Colorectal Cancer, **continued**

81455	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis
81456	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure
81528	Oncology (colorectal) screening, quantitative real-time target and signal amplification of 10 DNA markers (KRAS mutations, promoter methylation of NDRG4 and BMP3) and fecal hemoglobin, utilizing stool, algorithm reported as a positive or negative result

Key References

1. NCCN Guidelines. Colorectal Cancer Screening. Version 3.2022 – September 30, 2022
.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: KRAS MUTATION TESTING

Policy # 414
Implementation Date: 2/9/09
Review Dates: 2/18/10, 2/17/11, 2/16/12, 4/25/13, 6/19/14, 6/11/15, 6/16/16, 6/15/17, 9/18/18, 8/8/19, 3/1/23
Revision Dates: 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer-related death, and colorectal cancer is the third most common cancer in the United States. Surgery is the primary approach for both lung and CRC tumors that have not spread beyond the lung/colon and is often curative. For patients with more advanced disease, either before or after palliative surgery, chemotherapy, sometimes with radiotherapy, is given to patients with more advanced cancer (stage III or IV). Several single or multi-agent chemotherapy regimens may be chosen based on the drugs that are currently approved for treating metastatic lung or CRC.

Two drugs generally used for second- or third-line treatment in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer following failure of first-line chemotherapy are Cetuximab (Erbitux) and panitumumab (Vextibix). Patients who cannot tolerate standard first-line chemotherapy regimens may receive cetuximab monotherapy as first-line treatment. These drugs are in the class of drugs called anti–epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) monoclonal antibodies.

Lung cancer is complicated by the different types of lung cancer which are essentially divided into small cell and non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC); NSCLC is more common. Similar to colorectal cancer, several new anti-EGFR agents have been developed to treat NSCLC. This class of anti-EGFR therapy for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs). Gefitinib (Iressa, AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP) and erlotinib (Tarceva, Genentech USA, Inc.) are related quinazoline small molecule reversible inhibitors that compete with ATP at the ATP binding site in the tyrosine kinase domain of EGFR.

Epidermal growth factor receptor is expressed on the cell surface of both normal and cancer cells. Epidermal growth factor receptor is a transmembrane tyrosine kinase receptor that, on ligand binding by a wide variety of hormones, growth factors and differentiation factors, triggers two main signaling pathways. These include the RAS-RAF-MAPK axis, which is mainly involved in cell proliferation, and the PI3KPTEN-AKT pathway, which is mainly involved in cell survival and motility. After activation, the EGFR activates the various pathways, which in turn results in modulation of the cell cycle, growth, apoptosis, and angiogenesis.

Clinical evidence suggests that the benefit from the anti-EGFR agents is limited to a subgroup of CRC and NSCLC patients. For instance, cetuximab and panitumumab, developed with the belief that EGFR would be a logical target for molecular-based therapy, have proven to be of benefit in only 10%–20% of CRC patients. Similarly, gefitinib and erlotinib have been found to be ineffective in a subset of patients. Accordingly, biomarkers are being developed to help select those patients who will benefit from treatment with these highly expensive and potentially toxic EGFR inhibitors.

One of the biomarkers investigated as a negative prognostic indicator is the presence of sequence variants in the Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene homolog (KRAS) gene. The KRAS test is performed on a fresh, frozen or paraffin-embedded sample of the tumor. KRAS mutation analysis is offered by many

laboratories, utilizing different assay methods. All commercially available assays identified interrogate both codons 12 and 13 (on chromosome 12 at band p12.1), where most known mutations arise, and some labs also interrogate codon 61. As of January 2009, there is no FDA approved test for KRAS testing. KRAS testing can be performed using laboratory developed tests provided that the laboratory is accredited by the CAP or another CMS-deemed agency and has conducted the appropriate validation testing required by CLIA'88 regulations.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers KRAS mutation testing for colon and rectal cancer (CRC). KRAS mutation testing, when anti-EGFR monoclonal antibody therapy is being considered, has proven clinical evidence of utility.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Karapetis et al. analyzed 394 tumor samples with colorectal cancer who were randomly assigned to receive cetuximab plus best supportive care or best supportive care alone, to look for activating mutations in the KRAS gene. In patients with wild-type KRAS tumors, treatment with cetuximab as compared with supportive care alone significantly improved overall survival (median, 9.5 vs. 4.8 months; hazard ratio for death, 0.55; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.41-0.74; $p < 0.001$). Among patients with mutated KRAS tumors, there was no significant difference between those who were treated with cetuximab and those who received supportive care alone with respect to overall survival (hazard ratio, 0.98; $p = 0.89$) or

progression-free survival (hazard ratio, 0.99; p = 0.96). That is, patients with a colorectal tumor bearing mutated KRAS did not benefit from cetuximab, whereas patients with a tumor bearing wild-type KRAS did benefit from cetuximab. The mutation status of the KRAS gene had no influence on survival among patients treated with best supportive care alone.

Both Hayes and BCBS TEC completed reviews of this topic in November 2008. Hayes rated this testing as a 'B,' despite the acknowledged lack of prospective trials using KRAS testing to guide the use of anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies. The BCBS TEC review states that: "… use of KRAS mutation analysis to predict nonresponse to anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies cetuximab and panitumumab to treat metastatic colorectal cancer meets the TEC criteria." In addition to published literature, BCBS TEC also included data from phase II and III randomized trials presented at the 2008 American Society of Clinical Oncology meeting.

Additional evidence includes the European Medicines Agency requiring that Erbitux and Vectibix are indicated only in those with metastatic CRC who are KRAS wild-type.

The use of anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies among KRAS mutation positive CRC patients yields no patient benefit with additional adverse events compared to best supportive care alone. Even among such patients who are KRAS wild type, only about 15% of patients benefit from the addition of anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies, with a modest average survival benefit (i.e., 9.5 months vs. 4.8 months with supportive care alone). In fact, when cost-effectiveness analysis is applied to these drugs for this indication, but without stratification by KRAS mutation, they are frequently not approved for provision due to their marginal benefit at high cost.

In NSCLC, the literature suggests KRAS mutations are a negative predictor for TKIs. In a study by Pau et al., which looked at a small number of patients previously treated with erlotinib or gefitinib. Pau et al. demonstrated that none (0/21) of the patients with radiographic response to therapy with erlotinib or gefitinib, 9/38 had KRAS mutations (p = 0.02. In a prospective trial of erlotinib treatment in patients with advanced bronchioloalveolar carcinoma or adenocarcinoma with bronchioloalveolar features, the value of KRAS mutations as a negative predictor of response was confirmed. In that trial, none of the 18 patients with KRAS mutations had a radiographic response to treatment with erlotinib. This contrasts with a response rate of 20% in the overall population and a response rate of 83% in patients with EGFR mutations. This role of KRAS mutations as a negative predictor of response to erlotinib in patients with NSCLC has also been confirmed in several other studies.

Literature evaluating the role of KRAS and monoclonal antibodies in NSCLC is emerging. Some preliminary data on over 200 patients with a mutation rate of 15% showed no difference in clinical outcomes.

From the overall analysis for NSCLC, the pooled sensitivity is shown to be quite low; suggesting that resistance to EGFR TKIs also occurs in a substantial number of patients with essentially wild type KRAS. However, the test seems to be highly specific, suggesting that complete and partial response to anti-EGFR TKIs is highly unlikely in the presence of KRAS mutation.

A 2014 literature review identified continued support for the use of KRAS in colon cancer as summarized in the policy. However, no new literature supporting use in NSCLC was identified. As stated by Roberts et al. in their 2010 review: "… unlike colorectal cancer, KRAS mutations do not seem to identify patients who do not benefit from anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies in NSCLC." This opinion continues in a 2013 review (Roberts and Stinchcombe), stating: "Current data does not support the routine use of KRAS mutational analysis for predicting chemotherapy benefit." and that "An association between KRAS mutational status and benefit of anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies has not been demonstrated in NSCLC." Use of KRAS was not supported by the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) (Keedy et al., 2011) or the College of American Pathologists (CAP), International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer (IASLC), and Association for Molecular Pathology (MAP) (Linderman et al., 2013). The latest 2013 National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) clinical practice guidelines in oncology noted, while EGFR mutations are "critical determinants for proper therapy," KRAS "could be useful" as they are associated with intrinsic TKI resistance, but they did not go as far as recommending KRAS testing.

Billing/Coding Information

Genetic Testing: Kras Mutation Testing, continued

CPT CODES

0069U	Oncology (colorectal), microRNA, RT-PCR expression profiling of miR-31-3p, formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as an expression score
0111U	Oncology (colon cancer), targeted KRAS (codons 12, 13, and 61) and NRAS (codons 12, 13, and 61) gene analysis utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue
0368U	Oncology (colorectal cancer), evaluation for mutations of APC, BRAF, CTNNB1, KRAS, NRAS, PIK3CA, SMAD4, and TP53, and methylation markers (MYO1G, KCNQ5, C9ORF50, FLI1, CLIP4, ZNF132 and TWIST1), multiplex quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR), circulating cell-free DNA (cfDNA), plasma, report of risk score for advanced adenoma or colorectal cancer
81275	KRAS (v-Ki-ras2 Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene) (e.g., carcinoma) gene analysis, variants in codons 12 and 13
81276	KRAS (Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene homolog) (eg, carcinoma) gene analysis; additional variant(s) (eg, codon 61, codon 146)
81405	Molecular pathology procedure level 6
81449	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, 5-50 genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, MET, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed; RNA analysis
81445	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, DNA analysis, and RNA analysis when performed, 5-50 genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, NRAS, MET, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed
81442	Noonan spectrum disorders (eg, Noonan syndrome, cardio-facio-cutaneous syndrome, Costello syndrome, LEOPARD syndrome, Noonan-like syndrome), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 12 genes, including BRAF, CBL, HRAS, KRAS, MAP2K1, MAP2K2, NRAS, PTPN11, RAF1, RIT1, SHOC2, and SOS1
81451	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 5-50 genes (eg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis
81450	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, DNA analysis, and RNA analysis when performed, 5-50 genes (eg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KRAS, KIT, MLL, NRAS, NPM1, NOTCH1), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed
81455	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm, DNA analysis, and RNA analysis when performed, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NPM1, NRAS, MET, NOTCH1, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed
81456	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence

variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; RNA analysis

81528 Oncology (colorectal) screening, quantitative real-time target and signal amplification of 10 DNA markers (KRAS mutations, promoter methylation of NDRG4 and BMP3) and fecal hemoglobin, utilizing stool, algorithm reported as a positive or negative result

HCPCS CODES

G0452 Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

G9840 KRAS gene mutation testing performed before initiation of anti-EGFR MoAb

G9841 KRAS gene mutation testing not performed before initiation of anti-EGFR MoAb

Key References

1. BCBS TEC. KRAS Mutations and Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor Inhibitor Therapy in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer, 2008.
2. Calvert P, Fruct H. Molecular genetics of colorectal cancer. 16.3. September 22, 2008. Website. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/online/content/topic.do?topicKey=gicancer/15517&selectedTitle=1~150&source=search_result. Date Accessed: January 5, 2009.
3. Di Nicolantonio F, Martini M, Molinari F, et al. "Wild-type BRAF is required for response to panitumumab or cetuximab in metastatic colorectal cancer." J Clin Oncol 26.35 (2008): 5705-12.
4. Ettinger, D. S., et al. (2013). "Non-small cell lung cancer, version 2.2013." J Natl Compr Canc Netw 11(6): 645-653; quiz 653.
5. Ettinger, D. S., et al. (2016). "NCCN Guidelines Insights: Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer, Version 4.2016." J Natl Compr Canc Netw 14(3): 255-264.
6. European Medicines Agency. Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use Post-Authorization Summary of Positive Opinion for Erbitux. London: Evaluation of Medicines for Human Use, 2008.
7. Garcia J, Riely GJ, Nafa K, Ladanyi M. "KRAS mutational testing in the selection of patients for EGFR-targeted therapies." Semin Diagn Pathol 25.4 (2008): 288-94.
8. Hayes Directory. "KRAS Sequence Variant Analysis for Predicting Response to Colorectal Cancer Drug Therapy." (2008).
9. Karapetis CS, Khambata-Ford S, Jonker DJ, et al. "K-ras mutations and benefit from cetuximab in advanced colorectal cancer." N Engl J Med 359.17 (2008): 1757-65.
10. Keedy, V. L., et al. (2011). "American Society of Clinical Oncology provisional clinical opinion: epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) Mutation testing for patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer considering first-line EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy." J Clin Oncol 29(15): 2121-2127.
11. Lindeman, N. I., et al. (2013). "Molecular testing guideline for selection of lung cancer patients for EGFR and ALK tyrosine kinase inhibitors: guideline from the College of American Pathologists, International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer, and Association for Molecular Pathology." J Thorac Oncol 8(7): 823-859.
12. Linardou H, Dahabreh IJ, Kanaloupiti D, et al. "Assessment of somatic k-RAS mutations as a mechanism associated with resistance to EGFR-targeted agents: a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer and metastatic colorectal cancer." Lancet Oncol 9.10 (2008): 962-72.
13. Messersmith WA, Ahnen DJ. "Targeting EGFR in colorectal cancer." N Engl J Med 359.17 (2008): 1834-6.
14. NICE. Bevacizumab and cetuximab for the treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, 2007.
15. Nicosia M. "Clinical Spotlight: Biomarkers in Colorectal Cancer." Oncology Times Supplement (2008).
16. Ramos FJ, Macarulla T, Capdevila J, Elez E, Tabernero J. "Understanding the predictive role of K-ras for epidermal growth factor receptor-targeted therapies in colorectal cancer." Clin Colorectal Cancer 7 Suppl 2 (2008): S52-7.
17. Roberts, P. J., et al. (2010). "Personalized medicine in non-small-cell lung cancer: is KRAS a useful marker in selecting patients for epidermal growth factor receptor-targeted therapy?" J Clin Oncol 28(31): 4769-4777.
18. Tsao M ZH, Sakurada A, Zhang T, Whitehead M, Kamel-Reid S, Ding K, Seymour K, Shepherd F. "An analysis of the prognostic and predictive importance of K-ras mutation status in the National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group BR.21 study of erlotinib versus placebo in the treatment of non-small cell lung cancer." Journal of Clinical Oncology 24.18S (2006): Supplement.
19. Zhang X, & Chang, A. "Molecular predictors of EGFR-TKI sensitivity in advanced non-small cell lung cancer." Int J Med Sci 5.4 (2008): 209-17.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

Genetic Testing: Kras Mutation Testing, continued

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: LACTOSE INTOLERANCE

Policy # 318	
Implementation Date:	8/10/06
Review Dates:	8/23/07, 8/21/08, 8/13/09, 8/19/10, 9/15/11, 11/29/12, 12/19/13, 12/18/14, 12/10/15, 12/15/16, 12/21/17, 12/4/18, 2/14/23
Revision Dates:	7/1/23

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Adult-type hypolactasia (primary lactose malabsorption) is determined by a genetically programmed reduction in lactase activity at the intestinal brush border. It affects most of the world's human population and limits the use of fresh milk due to lactose intolerance. The incidence of lactose malabsorption ranges from 11%−60% in Europe and this condition can cause gastrointestinal symptoms such as abdominal pain, bloating, flatulence, and diarrhea. Lactose intolerance can cause bloating and indigestion from consuming milk or milk products. More than 30 million Americans, mostly African-American or Asian, are prone to the condition. However, the correlation between lactose malabsorption and clinical symptoms is unclear: many malabsorbers are in fact able to tolerate a certain quantity of milk without presenting symptoms, while many cases of self-reported milk-intolerance remain asymptomatic after lactose oral load. The diagnosis of adult-type hypolactasia has been difficult to establish because of unsatisfactory diagnostic methods.

C/T(-13910) single nucleotide polymorphism residing 13910 base pairs from the 5' end of the lactase gene has been shown to be associated with lactase deficiency.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

SelectHealth does not cover genetic testing for lactose intolerance as there is a lack of clinical utility as it relates to this testing; this meet's the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Carroccio et al., in their study of 323 subjects in 1998 demonstrated the difficulties identifying patients who have lactose malabsorption but no tolerants, and who have lactose malabsorption and intolerants. They concluded that in studies of the general population, the frequency of lactose intolerance is much lower than that of lactose malabsorption. Gastrointestinal symptoms after lactose load in self-reported milk-intolerants are found in only a very low number of these subjects. However, the lay public is very aware of lactose intolerance as a cause of gastrointestinal distress and often adjusts their diet due to concern about this phenomenon risking inadequate nutritional and calcium intake.

Additionally, the symptoms of lactose malabsorption can be ill-defined dependent upon the level of lactase enzyme activity persisting in an individual. These symptoms are the same presenting symptoms seen in Celiac disease (Sprue), early inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), and irritable bowel syndrome (IBS).

Measurement of lactase and sucrase levels in intestinal biopsy specimens is required for a definitive diagnosis of the condition. However, due to the invasive and costly manner of obtaining these specimens, the diagnosis of intestinal malabsorption of lactose has been confirmed by a test of absorption (e.g., lactose absorption test) or malabsorption (lactose breath hydrogen test). Less direct tests, such as low fecal pH or reducing substances in the stool, are only valid when lactose has been ingested, intestinal transit time is rapid, stools are collected fresh, assays are performed immediately, and bacterial metabolism of colonic carbohydrate is incomplete. These tests, however, had significant limits impairing diagnostic accuracy.

The utility of the lactose tolerance test is limited by many false negative results that may occur in patients with diabetes or bacterial overgrowth. Abnormal gastric emptying also can lead to spurious results; the blood glucose may be relatively higher with rapid emptying and depressed with delayed gastric emptying. In adults, the lactose tolerance test has a sensitivity of 75% and a specificity of 96%. However, it is cumbersome (particularly in children), and time-consuming, and has largely been replaced by the lactose breath hydrogen test.

The lactose breath hydrogen test measures lactose non-absorption. It is simple to perform, noninvasive, and has a sensitivity and specificity that are superior to the absorption test. Both false-positive and false-negative results can occur. False-positive results are seen with inadequate pretest fasting or recent smoking; false-negative results can be seen after the recent use of antibiotics, in patients with lung disorders, or in the approximately 1% of subjects who are nonhydrogen producers. A normal breath hydrogen test does not rule out an intestinal mucosal lesion and should not be used to avoid an intestinal biopsy. A significant proportion of patients with symptoms suggestive of lactose intolerance have normal breath hydrogen tests. In 2 series described above, for example, 30%−42% of subjects with severe symptoms of milk intolerance had normal tests. Other possibilities that must be considered include psychologic factors and intolerance to other factors in milk.

In 2002, Enattah et al. published their findings identifying a DNA variant, C/T-13910, roughly 14 kb upstream from the LCT locus, that completely associates with biochemically verified lactase non-persistence in Finnish families and a sample set of 236 individuals from 4 different populations. A second variant, G/A-22018, 8 kb telomeres to C/T-13910, is also associated with the trait in 229 of 236 cases. Prevalence of the C/T-13910 variant in 1,047 DNA samples is consistent with the reported prevalence of adult-type hypolactasia in 4 different populations.

Rasinpera et al. confirmed this finding in their study published in *Gut* in 2004. In a comparison with lactase enzyme levels obtained during duodenal biopsies as the "gold standard" of lactose malabsorption, the genetic variant with C/C-13910 was associated with low lactase enzyme in the majority of 8-year-old and all children 12 years of age. Sensitivity and specificity were 93% and 100%, respectively, which is comparable to the accuracy of the lactose tolerance test and breath hydrogen tests.

Hogenauer et al., in 2005, confirmed this sensitivity and specificity in their prospective trial comparing the DNA testing to lactose hydrogen breath test. In this study, 97% of patients testing positive for the CC genotype of the -13910 T>C polymorphism suggesting lactase non-persistence also had a positive

hydrogen test, 86% with either a TC or a TT genotype suggestive of lactase persistence tested negative on the hydrogen test. They concluded that DNA testing had an excellent correlation between a CC genotype and a positive hydrogen test, whereas the correlation between a TC or TT genotype and a negative hydrogen test result is less strong. Analysis of the -13910 T/C variant can be considered a good test for predicting the presence of lactase non-persistence in a patient population with suspected lactose malabsorption.

This testing is only available in the U.S. through Prometheus Laboratories Inc. under the name Lacto*TYPE*, as they have an exclusive marketing arrangement with the National Public Health Institute, Finland, who hold the patent on this genetic test.

A November 2015 review of the literature found no new studies to change the recommendation. One study of note was found. Sontonocito and coworkers examined over 1,400 patients and concluded that use of the variants upstream of LPH (C/T-13910 and G/A-22018 mutations) are not useful for routine screening, support the policy stipulation for use in atypical patients who have not been diagnosed by other means.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

81400 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 1 (eg, identification of single germline variant [eg, SNP] by techniques such as restriction enzyme digestion or melt curve analysis)

HCPCS CODES

G0452 Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Carroccio, MD, G. Montalto, G. Cavera, MD, A. Notarbatolo, MD and the Lactase Deficiency Study Group. Lactose Intolerance and Self-Reported Milk Intolerance: Relationship with Lactose Maldigestion and Nutrient Intake. Journal of the American College of Nutrition, Vol. 17, No. 6, 631-636 (1998).
2. Chitkara DK, Montgomery RK, Grand RJ, Büller HA Lactose intolerance. UpToDate®©2006 Last updated July 27, 2005.
3. Enattah NS, Sahi T, Savilahti E, Terwilliger JD, Peltonen L, Jarvela I. Identification of a variant associated with adult-type hypolactasia. Nat Genet. 2002 Feb;30(2):233-7. Epub 2002 Jan 14 PMID: 11788828
4. Hogenauer C, Hammer HF, Mellitzer K, Renner W, Krejs GJ, Toplak H. Evaluation of a new DNA test compared with the lactose hydrogen breath test for the diagnosis of lactase non-persistence. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2005 Mar;17(3):371-6 PMID: 15716664
5. Jarvela IE. Molecular genetics of adult-type hypolactasia. Ann Med. 2005;37(3):179-85. PMID: 16019716
6. John R Saltzman, Robert M Russell, Barbara Golner, Susan Barakat, Gerard E Dallal and Barry R Goldin. A randomized trial of Lactobacillus acidophilus BG2FO4 to treat lactose intolerance. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, Vol. 69, No. 1, 140-146, January 1999.
7. Johnson, AO, Semenya, JG, Buchowski, MS, et al. Correlation of lactose maldigestion, lactose intolerance, and milk intolerance. Am J Clin Nutr 1993; 57:399.
8. Joseph, F, Rosenberg, AJ. Identifying lactose malabsorbers through breath hydrogen measurements. Lab Med 1986; 17:85.
9. Newcomer, AD, McGill, DB, Thomas, PJ, Hofmann, AF. Prospective comparison of indirect methods for detecting lactose deficiency. N Engl J Med 1975; 293:1232.
10. Rasinpera H, Savilahti E, Enattah NS, Kuokkanen M, Totterman N, Lindahl H, Jarvela I, Kolho KL. A genetic test which can be used to diagnose adult-type hypolactasia in children. Gut. 2004 Nov;53(11):1571-6. PMID: 15479673
11. Santonocito, C., et al. (2015). "Lactose intolerance genetic testing: is it useful as routine screening? Results on 1426 south-central Italy patients." Clin Chim Acta 439: 14-17.
12. Suarez, FL, Savaiano, DA, Levitt, MD. A comparison of symptoms after the consumption of milk or lactose-hydrolyzed milk by people with self-reported severe lactose intolerance. N Engl J Med 1995; 333:1.
13. Suarez, FL, Savaiano, D, Arbisi, P, Levitt, MD. Tolerance to the daily ingestion of two cups of milk by subjects claiming lactose intolerance. Am J Clin Nutr 1997; 65:1502.
14. Vesa, TH, Seppo, LM, Marteau, PR, et al. Role of irritable bowel syndrome in subjective lactose intolerance. Am J Clin Nutr 1998; 67:710.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Genetic Testing: Lactose Intolerance, **continued**

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: LEBER'S HEREDITARY OPTIC NEUROPATHY (LHON)

Policy # 356

Implementation Date:	6/23/07
Review Dates:	6/19/08, 6/11/09, 6/17/10, 8/16/11, 8/12/12, 8/15/13, 6/19/14, 6/11/15, 6/16/16, 6/15/17, 6/16/18, 6/8/19, 2/21/23
Revision Dates:	2/21/19, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Leber's hereditary optic neuropathy (LHON) is a maternally inherited bilateral optic neuropathy that typically produces severe and permanent visual loss. The disorder occurs predominantly in young adult males. The initial symptoms include visual dysfunction with blurring of vision and loss of central vision, most often beginning in the late teens. Painless vision loss is typically the only symptom of LHON. Affected individuals are usually entirely asymptomatic, until they develop visual blurring and clouding, affecting the central visual field (i.e., a centrocecal scotoma or "blind spot"). These vision problems may begin in one eye or simultaneously in both eyes. However, if vision loss starts in one eye, the other eye is usually affected within several weeks or months. Over time, the blind spot enlarges and vision in both eyes worsens with a severe loss of visual acuity and color vision. Visual acuity is typically reduced to finger-counting in most cases. Although central vision gradually improves in a small percentage of cases, in most cases, the vision loss is profound and permanent.

LHON has a mitochondrial pattern of inheritance. This inheritance pattern applies to genes contained in mitochondrial DNA. Because human egg cells, but not sperm cells, contribute mitochondria to the developing embryo, only females pass mitochondrial conditions to their children. Mitochondrial disorders can appear in every generation of a family and can affect both males and females, but fathers do not pass mitochondrial traits to their children. Mutations in the mitochondrial genes that encode subunits of NADH dehydrogenase (MTND1, MTND2, MTND4, MTND5, MTND6) are known to cause LHON. Mutations in additional genes (MTCO3, MTCOI, MTATP6, MTND4L AND MTCYB) are also thought to cause LHON.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

Genetic Testing: Leber's Hereditary Optic Neuropathy (LHON), **continued**

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic testing for Leber's hereditary optic neuropathy (LHON) ***in limited circumstances*** when standard clinical exams, genetic counseling, and conventional diagnostic studies do not provide a definitive diagnosis.

Any other circumstances for this testing meet the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

The limited research evidence examining the clinical use of genetic testing for LHON suggests that this testing may be most useful in specific situations involving atypical symptoms without a clear pattern of maternal inheritance. For patients with typical signs and maternal inheritance, genetic testing is likely unnecessary for establishing a diagnosis of LHON. In terms of predictive testing, the incomplete penetrance of LHON mutations limits the prognostic value of positive test results, particularly in females in whom penetrance is only about 10%. Penetrance is higher in males, though, still only around 50%. De novo mutations are rare in LHON and confer no risk to siblings or parents. A male (affected or unaffected) with a primary LHON-causing mtDNA mutation cannot transmit the mutation to any of his offspring. A female (affected or unaffected) with a primary LHON-causing mtDNA mutation will transmit the mutation to all of her offspring. But again, presence of a mutation in an asymptomatic individual does not predict occurrence, age of onset, or severity of diseases. A negative test result confers a high likelihood of not developing symptoms, and thus, may be informative in cases where a clear family history is not evident. In most cases, however, clinical and family history are likely sufficient to establish risk for developing LHON.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

81401	Molecular Path Level 2: includes the following genes: MT-TS1, MT-RNR1, MT-ATP6, MT-ND4, MT-ND6, MT-ND5, MT-TL1, MT-TS1, MT-RNR1
81403	Molecular Path Level 4: includes the following genes: MT-RNR1, MT-TS1
81434	Hereditary retinal disorders (eg, retinitis pigmentosa, Leber congenital amaurosis, cone-rod dystrophy), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 15

	genes, including ABCA4, CNGA1, CRB1, EYS, PDE6A, PDE6B, PRPF31, PRPH2, RDH12, RHO, RP1, RP2, RPE65, RPGR, and USH2A
81460	Whole mitochondrial genome (eg, Leigh syndrome, mitochondrial encephalomyopathy, lactic acidosis, and stroke-like episodes [MELAS], myoclonic epilepsy with ragged-red fibers [MERFF], neuropathy, ataxia, and retinitis pigmentosa [NARP], Leber hereditary optic neuropathy [LHON]), genomic sequence, must include sequence analysis of entire mitochondrial genome with heteroplasmy detection

HCPCS CODES

G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Achilli, A., et al. (2012). "Rare primary mitochondrial DNA mutations and probable synergistic variants in Leber's hereditary optic neuropathy." *PLoS One*, 7(8): e42242.
2. Cavelier L, Gyllensten U, Dahl N. "Intrafamilial variation in Leber hereditary optic neuropathy revealed by direct mutation analysis." *Clin Genet*, 43.2 (1993): 69-72.
3. Chinnery PF. Leber Hereditary Optic Neuropathy. 2005. GeneClinics.org. Available: http://www.geneclinics.org/servlet/access?id=8888890&db=genetests&fcn=y&dontshowglossarylinks=yes&key=ypcXpOGCvHKFh&filename=/profiles/lhon/index.html. Date Accessed: March 8, 2007.
4. Cruse RP. Hereditary neuropathies associated with generalized disorders. 2006. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=ped_neur/7406&type=A&selectedTitle=1~5. Date Accessed: March 8, 2007.
5. Genetics Home Reference. Leber hereditary optic neuropathy. 2007. National Library of Medicine. Available: http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/condition=leberhereditaryopticneuropathy. Date Accessed: March 8, 2007.
6. Harding AE, Sweeney MG, Govan GG, Riordan-Eva P. "Pedigree analysis in Leber hereditary optic neuropathy families with a pathogenic mtDNA mutation." *Am J Hum Genet*, 57.1 (1995): 77-86.
7. Macmillan C, Kirkham T, Fu K, et al. "Pedigree analysis of French Canadian families with T14484C Leber's hereditary optic neuropathy." *Neurology*, 50.2 (1998): 417-22.
8. Man PY, Turnbull DM, Chinnery PF. "Leber hereditary optic neuropathy." J Med Genet 39.3 (2002): 162-9.
9. Seedorff T. "The inheritance of Leber's disease. A genealogical follow-up study." *Acta Ophthalmol (Copenh)*, 63.2 (1985): 135-45.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: LONG QT SYNDROME

Policy # 674
Implementation Date: 11/12/07
Review Dates: 10/23/08, 12/17/09, 10/21/10, 10/13/11, 11/29/12, 12/19/13, 12/10/15, 6/15/17, 7/20/18, 6/13/19, 2/21/23
Revision Dates: 12/29/15, 6/30/16, 7/1/23, 12/6/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Long QT syndrome (LQTS) is a disorder of myocardial repolarization characterized by a prolonged QT interval on the electrocardiogram (ECG) and an increased risk of sudden cardiac death. A range of dysrhythmias can occur with LQTS, the most common being Torsade de pointes (TdP), a form of polymorphic ventricular tachycardia (VT). In the specific case of TdP, these variations take the form of a progressive, sinusoidal, cyclic alteration of the QRS axis. The peaks of the QRS complexes appear to twist around the isoelectric line of the recording; hence the name torsade de pointes or "twisting of the points."

Bradycardia (a resting heart rate less than 60 beats/min) is also common in patients with LQTS (20%−31% in recent registry studies). Bradycardia appears to be more common in children during the first 3 years of life and has been reported in fetuses and neonates with LQTS.

Long QT syndrome may be either genetic or acquired. Acquired LQTS usually results from drug therapy, hypokalemia, or hypomagnesemia. Congenital LQTS is associated with 13 genes and 2 clinical phenotypes have been described that vary with the type of inheritance and the presence or absence of sensorineural hearing loss.

- The more common autosomal dominant form, **Romano-Ward syndrome,** is characterized by QT prolongation and T-wave abnormalities on the ECG, associated with tachyarrhythmias that include the ventricular tachycardia torsade de pointes (TdP), which may degenerate into ventricular fibrillation. TdP is usually self-terminating, thus, causing a syncopal event, the most common symptom in Romano-Ward syndrome.
- **Jervell and Lange-Nielsen syndrome (JLNS)**, the autosomal recessive form of LQTS, is characterized by congenital profound bilateral sensorineural hearing loss and long QTc, usually greater than 500 msec. Prolongation of the QTc interval is associated with tachyarrhythmias, including ventricular tachycardia, episodes of torsade de pointes ventricular tachycardia, and ventricular fibrillation, which may culminate in syncope or sudden death. The classic presentation of JLNS is a deaf child who experiences syncopal episodes during periods of stress, exercise, or fright. 50% of individuals had cardiac events before age 3 years.

Prolonged QT interval is an essential component of the diagnosis of LQTS. Under normal circumstances, the duration of repolarization depends upon the heart rate. The QT interval is longer at slower rates and shorter at faster rates. As a result, the QT interval is often corrected for heart rate (or the duration of the RR interval) using a common formula: Corrected QT (QTc) = QT interval ÷ square root of the RR interval

(in sec). There are many ways of calculating the QTc. The most common method is the Bazett formula as described above.

Testing should be performed using the updated Heart Rhythm Society/European Heart Rhythm Association Expert Consensus Recommendations on LQTS Genetic Testing.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

Select Health covers genetic testing for long QT syndrome (LQTS) when either I or II are met:

I. **Select Health considers genetic testing for LQTS as medically necessary,** if recommended by Intermountain Heart Institute;

OR

II. For all other clinicians, Select Health considers genetic testing for LQTS as medically necessary, when the following criteria are met:

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

AND when the following criteria are met:

3. Select Health covers genetic testing for LQTS in *limited* clinical circumstances. Clinical circumstances in which LQTS Genetic Testing is covered, include any of the following:

A. Comprehensive LQTS genetic testing by multi-gene next generation sequencing is recommended for any patient in whom a cardiologist has established a strong clinical index of suspicion for LQTS based on examination of the patient's clinical history, family history, and expressed electrocardiographic (resting 12-lead ECGs and/or provocative stress testing with exercise or catecholamine infusion) phenotype; or

B. Comprehensive LQTS genetic testing is recommended for any asymptomatic patient with QT prolongation in the absence of other clinical conditions that might prolong the QT interval (such as electrolyte abnormalities, medications, hypertrophy, bundle branch block, etc., i.e., otherwise idiopathic) on serial 12-lead ECGs defined as QTc > 450 ms 12 years and younger, > 460 ms in females and > 450 ms in males over 12 years of age; or

C. Mutation-specific genetic testing is recommended for family members and other appropriate relatives subsequently following the identification of the LQTS-causative mutation in an index case; or

D. Reflex deletion/duplication testing is indicated only if sequencing is negative.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

There exist few articles discussing the relevance of genetic testing for Long QT Syndrome. The most significant articles are: *The Long QT Family of Cardiac Ion Channelopathies* and *Genetic Testing in the Long QT syndrome*. Both articles focus on the insensitivity of the routine ECG in accurately diagnosing a prolonged QTc. The availability of clinical studies on a large series of genotyped patients with LQTS has highlighted major locus specific differences in the prognosis, and in response to therapy it has shown that carriers of LQTS mutations with a normal QTc who cannot be identified by clinical evaluation have a 10% probability of cardiac events by age 40 years if they are not appropriately treated. These data provide a rational for moving genetic analysis from research to diagnostic laboratories and highlight the need for defining optimal screening strategies to make genetic analysis clinically available, efficient, and potentially affordable.

A recent American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association position paper states that the use of β-blocker therapy is appropriate in patients whose molecular testing is positive, thus, supporting the use of genetic testing in this syndrome. Even though the accuracy of genetic testing is 70% in the most common genotypes, the authors suggest that this test is much more predictive than other older tests which have a high false-negative rate.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: For the conditions outlined above

CPT CODES

Effective 1/01/17 Possibly covered for Commercial, Covered PA for Medicare & Not Covered for Medicaid

0237U Cardiac ion channelopathies (eg, Brugada syndrome, long QT syndrome, short QT syndrome, catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia), genomic sequence analysis panel including ANK2, CASQ2, CAV3, KCNE1, KCNE2, KCNH2, KCNJ2, KCNQ1, RYR2, and SCN5A, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions

81400 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 1 (eg, identification of single germline variant [eg, SNP] by techniques such as restriction enzyme digestion or melt curve analysis) [when specified as the following]: F2 (coagulation factor 2) (eg, hereditary hypercoagulability), 1199G>A variant

81401 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 2 (eg, 2-10 SNPs, 1 methylated variant, or 1 somatic variant [typically using nonsequencing target variant analysis], or detection of a dynamic mutation disorder/triplet repeat) [when specified as the following]: CFH/ARMS2 (complement factor H/age-related maculopathy susceptibility 2) (eg, macular degeneration), common variants (eg, Y402H [CFH], A69S [ARMS2])

81402 Tier 2 Molecular Pathology Procedures

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

81403	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 4 (eg, analysis of single exon by DNA sequence analysis, analysis of >10 amplicons using multiplex PCR in 2 or more independent reactions, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 2-5 exons) [when specified as the following]: ANG (angiogenin, ribonuclease, RNase A family, 5) (eg, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis), full gene sequence GJB1 (gap junction protein, beta 1) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth X-linked), full gene sequence
81404	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 5 (eg, analysis of 2-5 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 6-10 exons, or characterization of a dynamic mutation disorder/triplet repeat by Southern blot analysis) [when specified as the following]: EGR2 (early growth response 2) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth), full gene sequence HSPB1 (heat shock 27kDa protein 1) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease), full gene sequence LITAF (lipopolysaccharide-induced TNF factor) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth), full gene sequence SCN1B (sodium channel, voltage-gated, type 1, beta) (eg, Brugada syndrome), full gene sequence SOD1 (superoxide dismutase 1, soluble) (eg, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis), full gene sequence
81405	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 6 (eg, analysis of 6-10 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 11-25 exons, regionally targeted cytogenomic array analysis) [when specified as the following]: ANKRD1 (ankyrin repeat domain 1) (eg, dilated cardiomyopathy), full gene sequence GDAP1 (ganglioside-induced differentiation-associated protein 1) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease), full gene sequence HTRA1 (HtrA serine peptidase 1) (eg, macular degeneration), full gene sequence MPZ (myelin protein zero) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth), full gene sequence NEFL (neurofilament, light polypeptide) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth), full gene sequence PRX (periaxin) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease), full gene sequence PSEN1 (presenilin 1) (eg, Alzheimer disease), full gene sequence RAB7A (RAB7A, member RAS oncogene family) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease), full gene sequence TARDBP (TAR DNA binding protein) (eg, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis), full gene sequence
81406	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 7 (eg, analysis of 11-25 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of 26-50 exons, cytogenomic array analysis for neoplasia) [when specified as the following]: APP (amyloid beta [A4] precursor protein) (eg, Alzheimer disease), full gene sequence CACNB2 (calcium channel, voltage-dependent, beta 2 subunit) (eg, Brugada syndrome), full gene sequence FIG4 (FIG4 homolog, SAC1 lipid phosphatase domain containing [S. cerevisiae]) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease), full gene sequence FUS (fused in sarcoma) (eg, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis), full gene sequence GARS (glycyl-tRNA synthetase) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease), full gene sequence GRN (granulin) (eg, frontotemporal dementia), full gene sequence JUP (junction plakoglobin) (eg, arrhythmogenic right ventricular dysplasia/ cardiomyopathy 11), full gene sequence LDB3 (LIM domain binding 3) (eg, familial dilated cardiomyopathy, myofibrillar myopathy), full gene sequence MAPT (microtubule-associated protein tau) (eg, frontotemporal dementia), full gene sequence MFN2 (mitofusin 2) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease), full gene sequence OPTN (optineurin) (eg, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis), full gene sequence PSEN2 (presenilin 2 [Alzheimer disease 4]) (eg, Alzheimer disease), full gene sequence SH3TC2 (SHE domain and tetratricopeptide repeats 2) (eg, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease), full gene sequence
81407	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 8 (eg, analysis of 26-50 exons by DNA sequence analysis, mutation scanning or duplication/deletion variants of >50 exons, sequence analysis of multiple genes on one platform) [when specified as the following]: APOB (apolipoprotein B) (eg, familial hypercholesterolemia type B), full gene sequence MYBPC3 (myosin binding protein C, cardiac) (eg, familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy), full gene sequence [for HCM, DCM testing] MYH7 (myosin, heavy chain 7, cardiac muscle, beta) (eg, familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, Liang distal myopathy), full gene sequence [for HCM testing] SCN5A (sodium channel, voltage-gated, type V, alpha subunit) (eg, familial dilated cardiomyopathy), full gene sequence [for long QT and

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

Genetic Testing: Long QT Syndrome, **continued**

	Brugada syndrome testing only] TSC2 (tuberous sclerosis 2) (eg, tuberous sclerosis), full gene sequence
81408	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 9 (eg, analysis of >50 exons in a single gene by DNA sequence analysis) [when specified as the following]: FBN1 (fibrillin 1) (eg, Marfan syndrome), full gene sequence RYR1 (ryanodine receptor 1, skeletal) (eg, malignant hyperthermia), full gene sequence RYR2 (ryanodine receptor 2 [cardiac]) (eg, catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia, arrhythmogenic right ventricular dysplasia), full gene sequence or targeted sequence analysis of >50 exons [for CPVT testing only]
81413	Cardiac ion channelopathies (e.g, Brgada syndrome, long QT syndrome, short QT syndrome, catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 10 genes, including ANK2, CASQ2, CAV3, KCNE1, KCNE2, KCNH2, KCNJ2, KCNQ1, RYR2, and SCN5A
81414	Cardiac ion channelopathies (e.g. Brugada syndrome, long QT syndrome, short QT syndrome, catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia); duplication deletion gene analysis panel, must include analysis of at least 2 genes, including KCNH2 and KCNQ
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. Ackerman, M, Tester, DJ., Jones, GS., WIll, ML., Burrow, CR., Curran, ME. (2003). Ethinic differences in cardiac potassium channel variants: implications for genetic susceptibility to sudden cardiac death and genetic testing for congenital long QT syndrome. Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research. 78. 1479-1487.
2. Ackerman MJ, Priori SG, Willems S, Berul C, et al. HRS/EHRA Consensus Statement on the State of Genetic Testing for Channelopathies and Cardiomyopathies. Heart Rhythm. 2011; 8:1308-39.
3. Akhtar, N, Ahmed, W, Mehboob, M. (2005). Case report congenital LQTS--an electrocardiographic and genotype correlation. J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad. 17. 4:74-6.
4. Allan, W, Timothy, K., Vincent, GM., Palomaki, GE., Neveux, LM, and Haddow, JE. (2001). Long QT syndrome in children: the value of rate corrected QT interval and DNA analysis as screening tests in the general population. Journal of Medical Screening. 8.4. 173-175.
5. Association Task Force and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Develop Guidelines for Management of Patients With Ventricular Arrhythmias and the Prevention of Sudden Cardiac Death). J Am Coll Cardiol. 48. 5: e247-346.
6. Aytemir, K, Maarouf, N, Gallagher, MM, et al. (1999). Comparison of formulae for heart rate correction of QT interval in exercise electrocardiograms. Pacing Clin Electrophysiol. 22. 9:1397-401.
7. Benatar, A, Decraene, T. (2001). Comparison of formulae for heart rate correction of QT interval in exercise ECGs from healthy children. Heart. 86. 2:199-202.
8. Berul, CI, Seslar, SP, Zimetbaum, PJ, et al. (2007). Acquired long QT syndrome. Last Update: Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=carrhyth/54644. Date Accessed: October 6. 2007.
9. Ching, C, Tan, EC. (2006). Congenital long QT syndromes: clinical features, molecular genetics and genetic testing. Expert Review of Molecular Diagnosis. 6. 3:365-374.
10. Daley, SM, Tranebjærg, L, Samson, RA, et al. (2007). Jervell and Lange-Nielsen Syndrome. GeneReviews. Last Update: Available: http://geneclinics.org/servlet/access?db=geneclinics&site=gt&id=8888891&key=oMWKkBaEJFOea&gry=&fcn=y&fw=KapO&file name=/profiles/jln/index.html. Date Accessed: October 6. 2007.
11. Heller, S. (2002). Abnormalities of the electrocardiogram during hypoglycaemia: the cause of the dead in bed syndrome? Int J Clin Pract Suppl. 129:27-32.
12. Josefson, D. (1998). Genotype linked to long QT syndrome. BMJ. 317:969.
13. Kaufman, E. (2003). Saving lives in congenital long QT syndrome: who benefits from implantable cardioverter defibrillator therapy? J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 14. 342-343.
14. Khan, I. (2002). Long QT syndrome: diagnosis and management. American heart Journal. 143. 1:
15. Malik, M. (2002). The imprecision in heart rate correction may lead to artificial observations of drug induced QT interval changes. Pacing and Clinical Electrophysiology. 25. 2:209-216.
16. Merck & Co. Inc. (2004). Symptoms and Diagnosis of Heart and Blood Vessel Disorders. Merck Manual of Medical Information--2nd Home Edition, Online Version. Ed. Beers M. Whitehouse Station, N.J.: Merck Research Laboratories.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

17. Modell, S, Lehmann, M. (2006). The long QT syndrome family of cardiac ion channelopathies: a huge review. Genet Med. 8. 3:143-155.
18. Moss, AJ, Liu, JE, Gottlieb, S, et al. (1991). Efficacy of permanent pacing in the management of high-risk patients with long QT syndrome. Circulation. 84. 4:1524-9.
19. Moss, AR, J. (1992). Clinical features of the idiopathic long QT syndrome. Circulation. 85. 1: I140-144.
20. Napolitano, C, Priori, SG, Schwartz, PJ, et al. (2005). Genetic testing in the long QT syndrome: development and validation of an efficient approach to genotyping in clinical practice. Jama. 294. 23:2975-80.
21. Priori, S, Napolitano, C., Schwartz, PJ. (2003). Risk stratification in the long QT syndrome. New England Journal of Medicine. 348. 1866-1874.
22. Priori SG, Wilde AA, Horie M, Cho Y, et al. Executive summary: HRS/EHRA/APHRS expert consensus statement on the diagnosis and management of patients with inherited primary arrhythmia syndromes. Europace. 2013 Oct;15(10):1389-406.
23. Priori, S, Napolitano, C., Schwartz, PJ., Grillo, M., Bloise, R., Ronchetti, E., et al. (2004). Association of long QT syndrome loci and cardiac events among patients treated with beta blockers. JAMA. 292. 11:1341-1344.
24. Regence. (2006). Medical Policy - Laboratory Section - Genetic testing for congenital long QT syndrome.
25. Schwartz, P, Priori, SG., Spazzolini, C., Moss, AJ., Vincent, GM., Napolitano, C., Denjoy I., et al. (2001). Genotype-phenotype correlation in the long-QT syndrome: gene-specific triggers for life-threatening arrhythmias. Circulation. 103. 1:89-95.
26. Schwartz, PJ. (2005). Management of long QT syndrome. Nat Clin Pract Cardiovasc Med. 2. 7:346-51.
27. Schwartz PJ, Ackerman MJ, George AL Jr, Wilde AA. Impact of genetics on the clinical management of channelopathies. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2013 Jul 16;62(3):169-80.
28. Seslar, S, Zimebaum, PJ., Berul, CI., Josephson, ME. (2007). Clinical features of congenital long QT syndrome. UpToDate.
29. Seslar, S, Zimebaum, PJ., Berul, CI., Josephson, ME. (2007). Diagnosis of congenital long QT syndrome. UpToDate.
30. Shimizu, W. (2005). The long QT syndrome: therapeutic implications of a genetic diagnosis. Cardiovasc Res. 67. 3:347-56.
31. Vincent, G. (1998). The molecular genetic of the long QT syndrome: genes causing faiting and sudden death. Annual Review of Medicine. 49. 263-274.
32. Vincent, G. (2003). Atrial arrhythmias in the inherited long QT syndrome: laboratory qurik of clinical arrhythmia? Journal of Cardiovascular Electrophysiology. 14. 10:1034.
33. Vincent, G. (2005). Romano-Ward Syndrome. GeneReviews. Last Update: Available: http://www.genetests.org/query?dz=rws. Date Accessed: 20 September 2007. 2007.
34. Vincent, GM. (1998). The molecular genetics of the long QT syndrome: genes causing fainting and sudden death. Annu Rev Med. 49. 263-74.
35. Vincent, GM, Jaiswal, D, Timothy, KW. (1991). Effects of exercise on heart rate, QT, QTc and QT/QS2 in the Romano-Ward inherited long QT syndrome. Am J Cardiol. 68. 5:498-503.
36. Vincent, GT, KW; Leppert, M; Keating, M. (1992). The spectrum of symptoms and QT intervals in carriers of the gene for the long-QT syndrome. The New England Journal of Medicine. 327. 12:846-852.
37. Wehrens, XH, Vos, MA, Doevendans, PA, et al. (2002). Novel insights in the congenital long QT syndrome. Ann Intern Med. 137. 12:981-92.
38. Zareba, W, Moss, AJ, Schwartz, PJ, et al. (1998). Influence of genotype on the clinical course of the long-QT syndrome. International Long-QT Syndrome Registry Research Group. N Engl J Med. 339. 14:960-5.
39. Zimetbaum, PJ, ME. (2005). Pathophysiology of the long QT syndrome. UpToDate.
40. Zimetbaum, PJ, ME; Kwaku, KF. (2006). Genetics of congenital and acquired long QT syndrome. UpToDate.
41. Zipes, DP, Camm, AJ, Borggrefe, M, et al. (2006). ACC/AHA/ESC 2006 guidelines for management of patients with ventricular arrhythmias and the prevention of sudden cardiac death: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: METHYLENETETRAHYDROFOLATE REDUCTASE (MTHFR) POLYMORPHISMS IN CANCER, CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE, AND NEURAL TUBE DEFECTS

Policy # 426

Implementation Date:	10/12/09
Review Dates:	2/17/11, 2/16/12, 4/25/13, 6/19/14, 6/11/15, 6/16/16, 6/15/17, 12/19/18, 3/1/23
Revision Dates:	7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling
#590 Pharmacogenomic Testing for Drug Metabolism

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase (MTHFR) is a pivotal enzyme in one-carbon metabolism. One carbon metabolism is used to alter ingested compounds, so they may become metabolically active. This mechanism of action is used to 'activate' many compounds in the body, so they may enter cells and function. Compounds involved in this process include folate, methionine, vitamin B6 and B12, homocysteine, and many other vitamins, along with cofactors, and numerous other enzymes. The central biochemical reaction of this complex metabolic pathway is methylation, which is critical for DNA replication and repair, regulation of gene expression, and synthesis of phospholipids (e.g., myelin, neurotransmitters, and membranes) in more than 80 biological reactions. Mutations in patients with severe MTHFR deficiency may lead to pathologic levels of homocysteine in the blood, which causes developmental delay, various neurological problems (such as seizures), and has been proposed to be responsible for thromboses and vascular lesions.

Although only 50 or so patients have been diagnosed worldwide with this type of deficiency, it is the most common inborn error of folate metabolism. MTHFR polymorphisms have consequences similar to those seen with folate or vitamin B12 deficiency as MTHFR deficiency leads to failure of these compounds to be changed into their metabolically active forms. The most important MTHFR polymorphism associated with complex disease (C677T) has been shown to modulate the risk of cardiovascular disease, neural tube defects, adverse pregnancy outcomes, Down syndrome, neuropsychiatric disorders and cognitive impairment, and cancer. In contrast to the C677T polymorphism, the role of another MTHFR polymorphism associated with disease, A1298C, has been less extensively studied and is less convincing. However, some studies have found that the A1298C genotype is associated with a decreased risk of leukemia and colorectal cancer with similar gene-nutrient/environment interactions that are observed with the C677T polymorphism.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

SelectHealth does NOT cover genetic testing for the methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase (MTHFR) protein. There is a lack of clinical outcome data demonstrating the clinical utility of MTHFR polymorphism testing; therefore, this is considered investigational/experimental.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

One systematic review addressed one aspect of the MTHFR mutation. Their focus was on the role of the enzyme in thromboembolism and homocysteinemia. Homocysteinemia has been proposed to increase the rate of thromboembolism.

Pertinent literature discussing the comparative testing approach for homocysteinemia using MTHFR or other biochemical end products, which include homocysteine, are not available. Most of the literature discusses the potential role of homocysteine as a mediator in cardiovascular disease, cancer, and neural tube defects.

It is noted the literature poses unanswered questions related to the need for MTHFR testing as there is the lack of scientific evidence to explain the clinical outcomes observed in patients with polymorphisms. Specifically, questions remain unanswered as to how MTHFR polymorphisms are associated with an increase in the rate of NT defects; the role of homocysteine in the process is unclear.

Articles concerning cancer and MTHFR polymorphsims demonstrate both an increase and decrease in cancer rates/risk depending on the circumstance. Regardless of the association between MTHFR polymorphisms and cancer risk, there are currently no clear clinical pathways leading to improvements in patient outcomes. Outcome studies comparing genetic testing with biochemical markers are not available.

A 2014 review of the literature found limited new data regarding the utility of MTHFR testing. Cohen et al. (2013), in a study of over-utilization of MTHFR genotyping took as fact that: “The methylene tetrahydrofolate reductase (MTHFR) C677T variant has been demonstrated to have negligible utility in patient management” based on expert practice guidelines from the College of American Pathologists (Eldibany et al., 2007) and the American College of Medical Genetics (Hickey et al., 2013) that recommend against MTHFR testing in thrombophilia. Additionally, the expert consensus recommendations from American Heart Association continue to suggest that testing may be appropriate only in the setting of hyperhomocysteinemia (Varga et al., 2005), however no new evidence to support this has been published. No new publications demonstrating utility in neural tube defects or cancer were found. Thus, evidence remains insufficient to recommend coverage of MTHFR for any condition.

Billing/Coding Information

Not covered: Experimental/Investigational/Unproven for this indication

CPT CODES

0078U	Pain management (opioid-use disorder) genotyping panel, 16 common variants (ie, ABCB1, COMT, DAT1, DBH, DOR, DRD1, DRD2, DRD4, GABA, GAL, HTR2A, HTTLPR, MTHFR, MUOR, OPRK1, OPRM1), buccal swab or other germline tissue sample, algorithm reported as positive or negative risk of opioid-use disorder
81291	MTHFR (5, 10-methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase) (e.g., hereditary hypercoagulability) gene analysis, common variants (e.g., 677T, 1298C)

HCPCS CODES

G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. AHRQ. Outcomes of Genetic Testing in Adults with a History of Venous Thromboembolism. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research, 2009.
2. Bezemer ID, Doggen CJ, Vos HL, Rosendaal FR. "No association between the common MTHFR 677C->T polymorphism and venous thrombosis: results from the MEGA study." Arch Intern Med 167.5 (2007): 497-501.
3. Cohen, D. A., et al. (2013). "Laboratory informatics based evaluation of methylene tetrahydrofolate reductase C677T genetic test overutilization." J Pathol Inform 4: 33.
4. Eldibany, M. M. and J. A. Caprini (2007). "Hyperhomocysteinemia and thrombosis: an overview." Arch Pathol Lab Med 131(6): 872-884.
5. Hayes Directory. Thrombosis Risk Assessment (Factor V Leiden G1691A, Prothrombin G20210A, and MTHFR C677T) for Hypercoagulation (Various Manufacturers). November 6, 2008. Date Accessed: August 25, 2009.
6. Hickey, S. E., et al. (2013). "ACMG Practice Guideline: lack of evidence for MTHFR polymorphism testing." Genet Med 15(2): 153-156
7. Hochberg L, Stone J. Prenatal screening and diagnosis of neural tube defects. 17.2. May 2009. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/online/content/topic.do?topicKey=antenatl/9177&selectedTitle=1~150&source=search_result. Date Accessed: August 25, 2009.
8. Kim YI. "Role of the MTHFR polymorphisms in cancer risk modification and treatment." Future Oncol 5.4 (2009): 523-42.
9. Leclerc D, Sibani S, Rozen R. Molecular Biology of Methylenetetrahydrofolate Reductase (MTHFR) and Overview of Mutations/Polymorphisms. MTHFR Polymorphisms and Disease. Ed. Ueland PM. Austin: Landes Bioscience, 2005.
10. Naess IA, Christiansen SC, Romundstad PR, et al. "Prospective study of homocysteine and MTHFR 677TT genotype and risk for venous thrombosis in a general population--results from the HUNT 2 study." Br J Haematol 141.4 (2008): 529-35.
11. Thomas P, Fenech M. "Methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase, common polymorphisms, and relation to disease." Vitam Horm 79 (2008): 375-92.
12. Toffoli G, De Mattia E. "Pharmacogenetic relevance of MTHFR polymorphisms." Pharmacogenomics 9.9 (2008): 1195-206.
13. Trabetti E. "Homocysteine, MTHFR gene polymorphisms, and cardio-cerebrovascular risk." J Appl Genet 49.3 (2008): 267-82.
14. Ulrich CM, Reed MC, Nijhout HF. "Modeling folate, one-carbon metabolism, and DNA methylation." Nutr Rev 66 Suppl 1 (2008): S27-30.
15. van Beynum IM, den Heijer M, Blom HJ, Kapusta L. "The MTHFR 677C->T polymorphism and the risk of congenital heart defects: a literature review and meta-analysis." Qjm 100.12 (2007): 743-53.
16. Varga, E. A., et al. (2005). "Cardiology patient pages. Homocysteine and MTHFR mutations: relation to thrombosis and coronary artery disease." Circulation 111(19): e289-293.
17. Xu X, Chen J. "One-carbon metabolism and breast cancer: an epidemiological perspective." J Genet Genomics 36.4 (2009): 203-14.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: MINIMAL RESIDUAL DISEASE (MRD) ASSESSMENT

Policy # 673

Implementation Date: 7/21/23
Review Dates:
Revision Dates:

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Minimal residual disease, also called measurable residual disease or MRD, refers to the subclinical levels of residual diseases, such as acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL), acute myeloid leukemia (AML), and multiple myeloma (MM). MRD is a postdiagnosis, prognostic indicator that can be used for risk stratification and to guide therapeutic options when used alongside other clinical and molecular data. Many different techniques have been developed to detect residual disease. However, PCR-based techniques, multicolor flow cytometry, and deep sequencing based MRD generally provide better sensitivity, specificity, reproducibility, and applicability than other techniques, such as fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH), Southern blotting, or cell culture.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

3. Select Health covers minimal residual disease (MRD) assessment for specific hematologic malignancies, including:

   a) acute myeloid leukemia (AML)
   b) acute lymphoblastic leukemias
   c) chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL)
   d) chronic myeloid leukemia (CML)
   e) multiple myeloma

4. Select Health will also cover MRD assessment in other similar clinical circumstances (such as in the context of clinical trials) in other hematologic malignancies (e.g., hairy cell leukemia, some myeloid/lymphoid neoplasms with eosinophilia, follicular lymphoma, and mantle cell lymphoma).

The use of MRD assessment for all other indications is considered experimental/investigational.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

Covered for the indications listed above when criteria are met

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure [when specified as NGS tumor DNA testing for MRD]

81599 Unlisted multianalyte assay with algorithmic analysis [when specified as NGS tumor DNA testing for MRD]

0364U Oncology (hematolymphoid neoplasm), genomic sequence analysis using multiplex (PCR) and next-generation sequencing with algorithm, quantification of dominant clonal sequence(s), reported as presence or absence of minimal residual disease (MRD) with quantitation of disease burden, when appropriate clonoSEQ® Assay, Adaptive Biotechnologies

0306U Oncology (minimal residual disease [MRD]), next-generation targeted sequencing analysis, cell-free DNA, initial (baseline) assessment to determine a patient-specific panel for future comparisons to evaluate for MRD

0307U Oncology (minimal residual disease [MRD]), next-generation targeted sequencing analysis of a patient-specific panel, cell-free DNA, subsequent assessment with comparison to previously analyzed patient specimens to evaluate for MRD

Not Covered for the indications listed above

0340U Oncology (pan-cancer), analysis of minimal residual disease (MRD) from plasma, with assays personalized to each patient based on prior next-generation sequencing of the patient's tumor and germline DNA, reported as absence or presence of MRD, with disease-burden correlation, if appropriate

Key References

1. ARUP Laboratories. Minimal Residual Disease Testing. Available at: https://arupconsult.com/content/minimal-residual-disease-testing
2. Horton, T. M., & Steuber, C. P. (2022, June 10). Risk group stratification and prognosis for acute lymphoblastic leukemia/lymphoblastic lymphoma in children and adolescents. Available at: https://www.uptodate.com/contents/risk-group-stratification-and-prognosis-for-acutelymphoblastic-leukemia-lymphoblastic-lymphoma-in-children-and-adolescents
3. Larson, R. A. (2020, April 17). Remission criteria in acute myeloid leukemia and monitoring for

Genetic Testing: Minimal Residual Disease (MRD) Assessment, **continued**

4. residual disease. Available at: https://www.uptodate.com/contents/remission-criteria-in-acute-myeloidleukemia-and-monitoring-for-residual-disease
5. Rajkumar, S. V. (2022, May 27). Multiple myeloma: Evaluating response to treatment. Available at: https://www.uptodate.com/contents/multiple-myeloma-evaluating-response-to-treatment
6. Stock, W., & Estrov, Z. (2020a, 02/14/2020). Clinical use of measurable residual disease detection in acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Available at: https://www.uptodate.com/contents/clinical-use-of-measurable-residual-disease-detection-inacute-lymphoblastic-leukemia
7. Stock, W., & Estrov, Z. (2020b, 04/21/2020). Detection of measurable residual disease in acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Available at: https://www.uptodate.com/contents/detection-of-measurable-residual-disease-in-acutelymphoblastic-leukemia

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: MYELOPROLIFERATIVE NEOPLASMS

Policy # 668
Implementation Date: 7/1/23
Review Dates:
Revision Dates: 11/8/23

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Myeloid neoplasms encompass a large and diverse group of clonal myeloid neoplasms with distinct clinicopathologic features. Current classification schemes (WHO 5th edition, ICC 2022) incorporate a combination of clinical, morphological, immunophenotypic, cytogenetic, and molecular features to classify these entities allowing for more accurate prognostication and therapeutic decisions. Current classification systems group these disease entities into categories of which include: 1) myeloproliferative neoplasms, 2) mastocytosis, 3) myeloid/lymphoid neoplasms with eosinophilia and gene rearrangement, 4) myelodysplastic/myeloproliferative neoplasms, 5) myelodysplastic syndromes, 6) acute myeloid leukemia and related precursor neoplasms, and 7) acute leukemia is of mixed or ambiguous lineage.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when recommended by a genetic counselor, medical geneticist, or other provider with recognized expertise in this area; and
2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

Select Health covers the following groups of molecular studies when the following criteria are met for each group:

A. Myeloproliferative Neoplasms

Select Health covers the following molecular studies in the workup of myeloproliferative neoplasms:
1. Qualitative and quantitative RT-PCR studies for BCR-ABL1 fusion transcripts
2. BCR-ABL1 mutation analysis for TKI resistance by NGS
3. i. JAK2 V617F mutation by ddPCR, or
   ii. JAK2 V617F mutation by ddPCR with reflex to JAK2 exon 12 mutation analysis; also applicable for abdominal thrombosis evaluation

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

4. The NGS panel must at a minimum include the following genes: **ASXL1, CALR, CBL, CSF3R, DNMT3A, EZH2, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KRAS, MPL, NF1, NRAS, PTPN11, RUNX1, SRSF2, SF3B1, SH2B3, TP53, and U2AF1.**

B. Mastocytosis

Select Health covers the following studies in the work-up for systemic mastocytosis:

1. Molecular testing for KIT D816V using an assay with high-sensitivity (i.e., ddPCR).
2. Multigene NGS panel that includes genes such as SRSF2, ASXL1, and RUNX1 (e.g., TheraMap myeloid malignancies NGS panel or similar myeloid-specific NGS panel).
   a. The NGS panel must, at a minimum, include the following genes: **ASXL1, CBL, DNMT3A, EZH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, NRAS, RUNX1, SRSF2, TET2**.

C. Myeloid/Lymphoid Neoplasms with Eosinophilia and Gene Rearrangement

Select Health covers the following studies in the work-up for myeloid/lymphoid neoplasms with eosinophilia and gene rearrangement:

1. T-cell clonality studies by PCR
2. Myeloid mutation panel by next generation sequencing* (i.e., TheraMap myeloid malignancies panel or similar myeloid-specific panel).
   a. The panel should at a minimum include the following genes: **ABL1, ETV6, FLT3, PCM1, JAK2, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, FIP1L1, FGFR1, ZMYM2**

*Given the importance of identifying recurrent fusions in this disease category the utilization of an NGS panel that detects fusion events may be favored (i.e., FoundationOne Heme panel). If a recurrent fusion is detected then quantitative RT-PCR studies should be covered, if available, as they may be used in the monitoring of minimal residual disease.

D. Myelodysplastic Neoplasms/Myelodysplastic Syndromes and Clonal Hematopoiesis

Select Health covers the following molecular studies in the work-up of patients with persistent and unexplained cytopenias.

1. Myeloid-specific next generation sequencing panel (e.g., TheraMap myeloid malignancies panel or other similar myeloid-specific NGS panel).
   a. The panel should at a minimum include the following genes: **ANKRD26**, **ASXL1, BCOR, CALR, CBL, CSF3R, DDX41, DNMT3A, ETV6, EZH2, FLT3, GATA2, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KRAS, MPL, NRAS, NF1, NPM1, PHF6, PPM1D, PTPN11, RUNX1, SETBP1, SF3B1, SRSF2, STAG2, STAT3, TP53, TET2, UBA1, U2AF1, WT1, ZRSR2**

2. Cytogenomic SNP microarray-oncology.
3. Qualitative/quantitative RT-PCR studies for BCR-ABL1

E. Myelodysplastic/Myeloproliferative Neoplasms

Select Health covers the following molecular studies in the work-up of myelodysplastic/myeloproliferative neoplasms:

1. Myeloid-specific next generation sequencing panel (e.g., TheraMap myeloid malignancies panel or other similar myeloid-specific NGS panel).
   a. The panel should at a minimum include the following genes: **ANKRD26**, **ASXL1, BCOR, CALR, CBL, CSF3R, DDX41, DNMT3A, ETV6, EZH2, FLT3, GATA2, IDH1, IDH2,**

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

JAK2, KRAS, MPL, NRAS, NF1, NPM1, PHF6, PPM1D, PTPN11, RUNX1, SETBP1, SF3B1, SRSF2, STAG2, STAT3, TP53, TET2, UBA1, U2AF1, WT1, ZRSR2

2. Cytogenomic SNP microarray-oncology.
3. Qualitative/quantitative RT-PCR studies for BCR-ABL1

F. Acute Leukemia is of Mixed or Ambiguous Lineage

Select Health covers the following studies should in the work-up of acute myeloid leukemia:

1. Myeloid-specific next generation sequencing panel (e.g., TheraMap myeloid malignancies panel or other similar myeloid-specific NGS panel).
   a. The panel should at a minimum include the following genes: **ANKRD26**, **ASXL1, BCOR, CALR, CBL, CEBPA, DDX41, DNMT3A, ETV6, EZH2, FLT3, GATA2, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, KMT2A (MLL), MPL, NRAS, NF1, NPM1, PHF6, PPM1D, RUNX1, SETBP1, SF3B1, SRSF2, STAG2, STAT3, TP53, TET2, U2AF1, WT1, ZRSR2**
2. Cytogenomic SNP microarray-oncology.
3. FLT3 ITD and TKD mutation analysis by PCR
4. Quantitative RT-PCR for CBFB-MYH11 inv(16) if detected by FISH or karyotype
5. Quantitative RT-PCR for RUNX1-RUNX1T1 t(8;21) if detected by FISH or karyotype
6. Quantitative RT-PCR for NPM1 if detected by NGS
7. Quantitative RT-PCR for PML-RARa t(15;17) if detected by FISH or karyotype
8. Qualitative/Quantitative RT-PCR for BCR-ABL1 if detected by FISH or Karyotype
9. KIT mutations in AML by fragment analysis and sequencing or equivalent assay if t(8;21) or inv(16)/t(16;16) detected.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

81206 BCR/ABL1 (t(9;22)) (eg, chronic myelogenous leukemia) translocation analysis; major breakpoint, qualitative or quantitative

81207 BCR/ABL1 (t(9;22)) (eg, chronic myelogenous leukemia) translocation analysis; minor breakpoint, qualitative or quantitative

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

81208	BCR/ABL1 (t(9;22)) (eg, chronic myelogenous leukemia) translocation analysis; other breakpoint, qualitative or quantitative
81245	FLT3 (fms-related tyrosine kinase 3) (eg, acute myeloid leukemia), gene analysis; internal tandem duplication (ITD) variants (ie, exons 14, 15)
81246	FLT3 (fms-related tyrosine kinase 3) (eg, acute myeloid leukemia), gene analysis; tyrosine kinase domain (TKD) variants (eg, D835, I836)
81273	KIT (v-kit Hardy-Zuckerman 4 feline sarcoma viral oncogene homolog) (eg, mastocytosis), gene analysis, D816 variant(s)
81277	Cytogenomic neoplasia (genome-wide) microarray analysis, interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and loss-of-heterozygosity variants for chromosomal abnormalities
81310	NPM1 (nucleophosmin) (eg, acute myeloid leukemia) gene analysis, exon 12 variants
81315	PML/RARalpha, (t(15;17)), (promyelocytic leukemia/retinoic acid receptor alpha) (eg, promyelocytic leukemia) translocation analysis; common breakpoints (eg, intron 3 and intron 6), qualitative or quantitative
81342	TRG@ (T cell antigen receptor, gamma) (eg, leukemia and lymphoma), gene rearrangement analysis, evaluation to detect abnormal clonal population(s)
81401	Molecular pathology procedure, Level 2 (eg, 2-10 SNPs, 1 methylated variant, or 1 somatic variant [typically using nonsequencing target variant analysis], or detection of a dynamic mutation disorder/triplet repeat)
81450	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 5-50 genes (eg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, 11 NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis
81455	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, 51 or greater genes (eg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MET, MLL, NOTCH1, NPM1, NRAS, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed; DNA analysis or combined DNA and RNA analysis
81219	CALR (calreticulin) (eg, myeloproliferative disorders), gene analysis, common variants in exon 9
81270	JAK2 (Janus kinase 2) (eg, myeloproliferative disorder) gene analysis, p.Val617Phe (V617F) variant
81279	JAK2 (Janus kinase 2) (eg, myeloproliferative disorder) targeted sequence analysis (eg, exons 12 and 13)
81339	MPL (MPL proto-oncogene, thrombopoietin receptor) (eg, myeloproliferative disorder) gene analysis; sequence analysis, exon 10
81338	MPL (MPL proto-oncogene, thrombopoietin receptor) (eg, myeloproliferative disorder) gene analysis; common variants (eg, W515A, W515K, W515L, W515R)

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

Genetic Testing: Myloproliferative Neoplasms, **continued**

81236	EZH2 (enhancer of zeste 2 polycomb repressive complex 2 subunit) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome, myeloproliferative neoplasms) gene analysis, full gene sequence
81175	ASXL1 (additional sex combs like 1, transcriptional regulator) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome, myeloproliferative neoplasms, chronic myelomonocytic leukemia), gene analysis; full gene sequence
81176	ASXL1 (additional sex combs like 1, transcriptional regulator) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome, myeloproliferative neoplasms, chronic myelomonocytic leukemia), gene analysis; targeted sequence analysis (eg, exon 12)
81237	EZH2 (enhancer of zeste 2 polycomb repressive complex 2 subunit) (eg, diffuse large B-cell lymphoma) gene analysis, common variant(s) (eg, codon 646)
0027U	JAK2 (Janus kinase 2) (eg, myeloproliferative disorder) gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis exons 12-15
0171U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, acute myeloid leukemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, and myeloproliferative neoplasms, DNA analysis, 23 genes, interrogation for sequence variants, rearrangements and minimal residual disease, reported as presence/absence
0040U	BCR/ABL1 (t(9;22)) (eg, chronic myelogenous leukemia) translocation analysis, major breakpoint, quantitative
0016U	Oncology (hematolymphoid neoplasia), RNA, BCR/ABL1 major and minor breakpoint fusion transcripts, quantitative PCR amplification, blood or bone marrow, report of fusion not detected or detected with quantitation
81348	SRSF2 (serine and arginine-rich splicing factor 2) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome, acute myeloid leukemia) gene analysis, common variants (eg, P95H, P95L)
81272	KIT (v-kit Hardy-Zuckerman 4 feline sarcoma viral oncogene homolog) (eg, gastrointestinal stromal tumor [GIST], acute myeloid leukemia, melanoma), gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (eg, exons 8, 11, 13, 17, 18)
81316	PML/RARalpha, (t(15;17)), (promyelocytic leukemia/retinoic acid receptor alpha) (eg, promyelocytic leukemia) translocation analysis; single breakpoint (eg, intron 3, intron 6 or exon 6), qualitative or quantitative
81233	BTK (Bruton's tyrosine kinase) (eg, chronic lymphocytic leukemia) gene analysis, common variants (eg, C481S, C481R, C481F)
81218	CEBPA (CCAAT/enhancer binding protein [C/EBP], alpha) (eg, acute myeloid leukemia), gene analysis, full gene sequence
81305	MYD88 (myeloid differentiation primary response 88) (eg, Waldenstrom's macroglobulinemia, lymphoplasmacytic leukemia) gene analysis, pLeu265Pro (L265P) variant
81347	SF3B1 (splicing factor [3b] subunit B1) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome/acute myeloid leukemia) gene analysis, common variants (eg, A672T, E622D, L833F, R625C, R625L)
81357	U2AF1 (U2 small nuclear RNA auxiliary factor 1) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome, acute myeloid leukemia) gene analysis, common variants (eg, S34F, S34Y, Q157R, Q157P)

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

Genetic Testing: Myloproliferative Neoplasms, **continued**

81360	ZRSR2 (zinc finger CCCH-type, RNA binding motif and serine/arginine-rich 2) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome, acute myeloid leukemia) gene analysis, common variant(s) (eg, E65fs, E122fs, R448fs)
81348	SRSF2 (serine and arginine-rich splicing factor 2) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome, acute myeloid leukemia) gene analysis, common variants (eg, P95H, P95L)
81320	PLCG2 (phospholipase C gamma 2) (eg, chronic lymphocytic leukemia) gene analysis, common variants (eg, R665W, S707F, L845F)
81175	ASXL1 (additional sex combs like 1, transcriptional regulator) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome, myeloproliferative neoplasms, chronic myelomonocytic leukemia), gene analysis; full gene sequence
81263	IGH@ (Immunoglobulin heavy chain locus) (eg, leukemia and lymphoma, B-cell), variable region somatic mutation analysis
81272	KIT (v-kit Hardy-Zuckerman 4 feline sarcoma viral oncogene homolog) (eg, gastrointestinal stromal tumor [GIST], acute myeloid leukemia, melanoma), gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (eg, exons 8, 11, 13, 17, 18)
81176	ASXL1 (additional sex combs like 1, transcriptional regulator) (eg, myelodysplastic syndrome, myeloproliferative neoplasms, chronic myelomonocytic leukemia), gene analysis; targeted sequence analysis (eg, exon 12)
0049U	NPM1 (nucleophosmin) (eg, acute myeloid leukemia) gene analysis, quantitative
0050U	Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, acute myelogenous leukemia, DNA analysis, 194 genes, interrogation for sequence variants, copy number variants or rearrangements
0040U	BCR/ABL1 (t(9;22)) (eg, chronic myelogenous leukemia) translocation analysis, major breakpoint, quantitative
0046U	FLT3 (fms-related tyrosine kinase 3) (eg, acute myeloid leukemia) internal tandem duplication (ITD) variants, quantitative
0023U	Oncology (acute myelogenous leukemia), DNA, genotyping of internal tandem duplication, p.D835, p.I836, using mononuclear cells, reported as detection or non-detection of FLT3 mutation and indication for or against the use of midostaurin

Key References

1. Intermountain Precision Genomics. Genetic Testing for Myloproliferative Neoplasms. June 2023.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: Myloproliferative Neoplasms , **continued**

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: *NOTCH3* TESTING FOR CEREBRAL AUTOSOMAL DOMINANT ARTERIOPATHY WITH SUBCORTICAL INFARCTS AND LEUKOENCEPHALOPATHY (CADASIL)

Policy # 353

Implementation Date:	6/23/07
Review Dates:	6/11/09, 6/17/10, 8/16/11, 8/16/12, 8/15/13, 6/19/14, 6/11/15, 6/16/16, 6/15/17, 9/12/18, 8/7/19, 2/14/23
Revision Dates:	6/19/08, 2/26/19, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Cerebral autosomal dominant arteriopathy with subcortical infarcts and leukoencephalopathy (CADASIL) is an inherited form of angiopathy affecting small blood vessels. All arteries are affected but the brain is most severely affected. Patients with CADASIL may also be at increased risk of myocardial infarction because of damaged blood vessels in the heart. Most patients with CADASIL do not have the common risk factors for stroke and heart attack, such as high blood pressure and high cholesterol, although in some cases these features may also be present.

Transient ischemic attacks (TIAs) and stroke at a young age (mean age of onset = 46 years) are the most common presentation, occurring in 85%. Cognitive disturbances (dysexecutive syndrome), the second most frequent feature, are observed in about 60% of symptomatic individuals—these disturbances may start as early as age 35 years—and about 75% of affected individuals develop dementia. Migraine occurs in about 40% of individuals, and 90% of individuals with migraine have migraine with aura. Psychiatric disturbance is observed in 30% of individuals with CADASIL, varying from personality changes to severe depression.

NOTCH3 (19p13.2-p13.1) is the only gene known to be associated with CADASIL. CADASIL is inherited in an autosomal dominant pattern (i.e., only 1 allele is sufficient to cause the disorder). In most cases, an affected person has one parent with the condition. In extremely rare cases, a family history is not evident, and a new mutation in the *NOTCH3* gene is identified. Penetrance of the disease approaches 100%, though, expressivity varies.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested; and

SelectHealth covers *NOTCH3* testing for CADASIL under *limited circumstances,* when all the criteria below have been met.

Criteria required for coverage:

A. When the family history is suggestive of an autosomal dominant pattern of inheritance, or there is a strong suspicion of CADASIL; and

B. Transient ischemic attacks (TIA) or cerebral vascular accidents (CVA) are clinically present in patients with atypical risk factors; and

C. MRI brain scan shows white matter hyper intensities in anterior temporal lobes in young adults.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

The medical and empirical literature reviewed suggests that *NOTCH3* testing provides valuable information confirming the clinical utility of this testing in patients suspected to have CADASIL. This was best identified by Markus et al. in 2002. In this study, the associated mutations were noted to be 100% penetrant with variable expressivity. Additionally, it was identified that this testing and higher sensitivity than the gold standard for diagnosing CADASIL, skin biopsy. This confirmed the findings noted by Joutel et al. in 2001.

CADASIL is an extremely rare disorder, suggesting that *NOTCH3* testing is only appropriate in cases when other more likely diagnoses have been excluded. In symptomatic patients with a clear family history, *NOTCH3* appears to be more reliable than skin biopsy at diagnosing CADASIL. The high penetrance and the fact that children of individuals with a *NOTCH3* mutation have a 50% chance of inheriting the mutation suggests a potential use for presymptomatic testing in these individuals, though, the utility of this indication has not yet been evaluated in the literature.

Genetic Testing: *Notch3* Testing for CADASIL, continued

Lack of clinical guidance is apparent in the literature, but a decrease in extensive laboratory testing may occur if genetic testing for CADASIL is permitted. *NOTCH3* testing may be used as a diagnostic, predictive, or prenatal test. Positive test results are diagnostic for CADASIL. As a predictive test in asymptomatic individuals, testing is not useful in predicting age of onset, severity, type of symptoms, or rate of progression. Predictive testing of at-risk individuals should be preceded by testing an affected family member to confirm that the mutation is identifiable by currently available techniques. The mutation detection rate ranges from 57%–96% in individuals with well-defined or biopsy-proven CADASIL. Most authors agree that sensitivity exceeds 90%.

Prenatal testing is possible by analysis of DNA extracted from fetal cells obtained by amniocentesis performed at 15–18 weeks' gestation or chorionic villus sampling at about 10–12 weeks. As with predictive testing, a disease-causing mutation must be identified in an affected family member before prenatal testing can be performed.

Recent literature identified one study by Stojanov et al. (2014) which described a case of a de novo NOTCH3 mutation in a patient with CADASIL, supporting testing in rare instances even when a family history is absent.

Billing/Coding Information

Covered: Under the circumstances listed above

CPT CODES

81406 Molecular pathology procedure, Level 7

HCPCS CODES

G0452 Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Brulin P, Godfraind C, Leteurtre E, Ruchoux MM. "Morphometric analysis of ultrastructural vascular changes in CADASIL: analysis of 50 skin biopsy specimens and pathogenic implications." Acta Neuropathol (Berl) 104.3 (2002): 241-8.
2. Dichgans M. Cerebral autosomal dominant arteriopathy with subcortical infarcts and leukoencephalopathy (CADASIL). 2006. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=cva_dise/15759&type=A&selectedTitle=1~5. Date Accessed: March 7, 2007.
3. Furby A, Vahedi K, Force M, et al. "Differential diagnosis of a vascular leukoencephalopathy within a CADASIL family: use of skin biopsy electron microscopy study and direct genotypic screening." J Neurol 245.11 (1998): 734-40.
4. Genetics Home Reference. CADASIL. 2007. National Library of Medicine. Available: http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/condition=cadasil. Date Accessed: March 7, 2007.
5. Joutel A, Favrole P, Labauge P, et al. "Skin biopsy immunostaining with a Notch3 monoclonal antibody for CADASIL diagnosis." Lancet 358.9298 (2001): 2049-51.
6. Markus HS, Martin RJ, Simpson MA, et al. "Diagnostic strategies in CADASIL." Neurology 59.8 (2002): 1134-8.
7. Oberstein SAL, Boon EM, Dichgans M. CADASIL. 2006. GeneClinics.org. Available: http://geneclinics.org/servlet/access?db=geneclinics&site=gt&id=8888891&key=9u7Nz2zmGiyoV&gry=&fcn=y&fw=qYxG&filename=/profiles/cadasil/index.html. Date Accessed: March 7, 2007.
8. Personal Communication. Williams J, 2007
9. Peters N, Opherk C, Bergmann T, Castro M, Herzog J, Dichgans M. "Spectrum of mutations in biopsy-proven CADASIL: implications for diagnostic strategies." Arch Neurol 62.7 (2005): 1091-4.
10. United Leukodystrophy Association. Cerebral Autosomal Dominant Arteriopathy with Subcortical Infarcts and Leukoencephalopathy (CADASIL). 2006. Available: http://www.ulf.org/types/Cadasil.html. Date Accessed: April 3, 2007.
11. Stojanov, D., et al. (2014). "De novo mutation in the NOTCH3 gene causing CADASIL." Bosn J Basic Med Sci 14(1): 48-50.
12. Rutten, J. W., et al. (2014). "Interpretation of NOTCH3 mutations in the diagnosis of CADASIL." Expert Rev Mol Diagn 14(5): 593-603.
13. Khan, M. T., A. Murray and M. Smith (2016). "Successful Use of Intravenous Tissue Plasminogen Activator as Treatment for a Patient with Cerebral Autosomal Dominant Arteriopathy with Subcortical Infarcts and Leukoencephalopathy: A Case Report and Review of Literature." J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis 25(4): e53-57.
14. Rutten, J. and S. A. J. Lesnik Oberstein (1993). Cadasil. GeneReviews(R). R. A. Pagon, M. P. Adam, H. H. Ardinger et al. Seattle (WA).

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Genetic Testing: *Notch3* Testing for CADASIL, **continued**

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: OVARIAN CANCER

Policy # 676
Implementation Date: 12/13/23
Review Dates:
Revision Dates:

Related Medical Policies:
#664: Genetic Testing Breast Cancer

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Genetic testing is available for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. Genetic testing for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer looks for mutations in the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes. A doctor might suggest testing using a multigene panel, which looks for mutations in several genes at the same time, including BRCA1 and BRCA2. If someone is of Ashkenazi Jewish or Eastern European ancestry, a doctor might suggest testing for three specific BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations, called founder mutations. These are the most common mutations in people of Ashkenazi Jewish or Eastern European ancestry.

The breast cancer 1 (BRCA1) and breast cancer 2 (BRCA2) genes are the genes most affected in hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. Normally, the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes protect someone from getting certain cancers. But certain mutations in the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes prevent them from working properly, so that if someone inherits one of these mutations, they are more likely to get breast, ovarian, and other cancers. An individual and their family members are more likely to have a BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutation if their family has a strong history of breast or ovarian cancer. Because BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations are inherited, family members with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations usually share the same mutation.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when recommended by a genetic counselor, medical geneticist, or other provider with recognized expertise in this area; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

Select Health covers panel testing for high-penetrance ovarian cancer susceptibility genes, which must include the following genes (ATM, BRCA1, BRCA2, BRIP1, Lynch syndrome genes [MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, EPCAM, PMS2], PALB2, RAD51C, and RAD51D (an expanded panel is also acceptable), when one of the following criteria are met):

1. Personal history of epithelial ovarian cancer (including fallopian tube cancer or peritoneal cancer) at any age; **OR**
2. Family history of cancer only:

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

a) An individual unaffected with ovarian cancer (with a first- or second-degree blood relative with epithelial ovarian cancer (including fallopian tube cancer or peritoneal cancer) at any age; or

b) An individual unaffected with ovarian cancer who otherwise does not meet the criteria above but has a probability > 5% of a BRCA1/2 P/LP variant based on prior probability models (e.g., TyrerCuzick, BRCAPro, CanRisk); must be performed by the ordering physician.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0138U BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated), BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (e.g., hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) mRNA sequence analysis (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

81212 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated), BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; 185delAG, 5385insC, 6174delT variants

81162 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated), BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (e.g., hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full sequence analysis and full duplication/deletion analysis (i.e., detection of large gene rearrangements)

81163 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated), BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (e.g., hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

81164 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated), BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (e.g., hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full duplication/deletion analysis (i.e., detection of large gene rearrangements)

81166 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full duplication/deletion analysis (ie, detection of large gene rearrangements)

81167 BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full duplication/deletion analysis (ie, detection of large gene rearrangements)

0102U Hereditary breast cancer-related disorders (eg, hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer), genomic sequence analysis panel utilizing a combination of NGS, Sanger, MLPA, and array CGH, with mRNA analytics to resolve variants of unknown significance when indicated (17 genes [sequencing and deletion/duplication])

0103U Hereditary ovarian cancer (e.g., hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer), genomic sequence analysis panel utilizing a combination of NGS, Sanger, MLPA, and array

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: Ovarian Cancer, **continued**

CGH, with MRNA analytics to resolve variants of unknown significance when indicated (24 genes [sequencing and deletion/duplication], EPCAM [deletion/duplication only])

0129U Hereditary breast cancer-related disorders (eg, hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer), genomic sequence analysis and deletion/duplication analysis panel (ATM, BRCA1, BRCA2, CDH1, CHEK2, PALB2, PTEN, and TP53)

0131U Hereditary breast cancer-related disorders (eg, hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (13 genes) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

0132U Hereditary ovarian cancer-related disorders (e.g., hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (17 genes) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

0134U Hereditary pan cancer (e.g., hereditary breast and ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer, hereditary colorectal cancer), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (18 genes) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

0135U Hereditary gynecological cancer (e.g., hereditary breast and ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer, hereditary colorectal cancer), targeted mRNA sequence analysis panel (12 genes) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

81432 Hereditary Breast Cancer-related disorders (e.g., hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 10 genes, always including BRCA1, BRCA2, CDH1, MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, PALB2, PTEN, STK11, and TP53

81433 Hereditary Breast Cancer-related disorders (e.g., hereditary breast cancer, hereditary ovarian cancer, hereditary endometrial cancer); duplication/deletion analysis panel, must include analyses for BRCA1, BRCA2, MLH1, MSH2, and STK11

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

81216 BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

81217 BRCA2 (BRCA2, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; known familial variant

81165 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

81215 BRCA1 (BRCA1, DNA repair associated) (eg, hereditary breast and ovarian cancer) gene analysis; known familial variant

Key References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Genetic Testing for Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer.
2. NCCN Guidelines. Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Breast, Ovarian, and Pancreatic. Version 2.2023 – January 10, 2023.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: Ovarian Cancer, **continued**

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING FOR SCREENING AND DETECTION OF PROSTATE CANCER

Policy # 510

Implementation Date: 9/3/12
Review Dates: 10/24/13, 10/23/14, 10/18/14, 10/15/15, 10/20/16, 10/19/17, 3/16/23
Revision Dates: 7/1/23, 8/7/23, 9/21/23

Related Medical Policies:
#544 Genetic Testing for Prostate Cancer Prognosis

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the “Policy” section for more information.

Description

Prostate cancer (PCa) is the second leading cause of cancer death in men, exceeded only by lung cancer; a man’s lifetime risk of PCa is 1 in 6. Not everyone experiences symptoms of prostate cancer. Many times, signs of PCa are first detected by a doctor during a routine check-up. Part of the annual exam that men over the age of 50 undergo includes a digital rectal exam (DRE) to feel the prostate and a PSA to screen for asymptomatic prostate cancer. Use of the PSA has become controversial in the last couple of years due to the low sensitivity in screening for prostate cancer. Consequently, new tests which may be more sensitive and specific for identifying early or aggressive prostate cancer are being developed.

Prostate cancer is the most common cancer among men, with over 200,000 new cases identified each year in the United States. The median age at diagnosis is 66 years. Older men are more likely to be affected than younger men, and African American men have higher rates compared to men of other ethnic backgrounds.

Screening programs for prostate cancer allow for its early detection. Screening is typically performed by prostate-specific antigen (PSA) test and digital rectal examination (DRE). Diagnosis is confirmed by prostate biopsy. Biopsy is typically performed by collection of approximately 12 needle biopsy cores. Initial biopsies only detect 65-77% of prostate cancers, and repeat biopsies are frequently performed.9,10 The false negative rate of biopsy may be as high as 25%

The ConfirmMDx test (MDx Health) is a proprietary epigenetic assay that measures gene methylation associated with the presence of cancer. Results are intended to assist in determining which patients likely have a true negative biopsy, and which patients are at increased risk for occult cancer. Results may prevent unnecessary repeat biopsies in unaffected men, and triage higher risk patients for repeat biopsies and treatment, as needed.

SelectMDx is a proprietary test that is designed to identify an individual’s risk of prostate cancer without the need for a biopsy. SelectMDx is a urine-based assay that measures mRNA levels of DLX1 and HOXC6 to determine an individual’s risk of prostate cancer.

Another test is the urine Progensa PCA3 test. PCA3 (or Prostate Cancer Antigen-3, formerly known as DD3) is a prostate-tissue-specific, noncoding messenger RNA (mRNA) that is over-expressed in virtually all prostate carcinoma specimens compared to normal prostate tissue. These attributes of PCA3 mRNA expression make it a promising prostate-cancer-specific marker. Collecting the specimen is a bit more complicated than simply drawing blood as is done with a PSA test. After massaging each lobe of the

prostate 3 times, a urine sample is collected and the amount of PCA3 in the sample is analyzed. The result is reported as an absolute value but also as positive or negative based upon achieving a pre-specified threshold of 35. Based on the results, a patient's physician may decide whether to continue to biopsy or if active surveillance is more appropriate.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

A. Testing With Prior Biopsy

Select Health covers the following tests for those members needing a repeat biopsy, and who are thought to be at higher risk despite a prior negative biopsy: **percent-free PSA, Prostate Health Index (PHI), 4K Score, PCA 3, ExoDX, ConfirmMDx, MyProstate Score (MPS), and isoPSA,** when the following criteria are met:

1. Confirmed* moderately elevated PSA > 3ng/ml and < 10ng/ml, or PSA > 4ng/ml and < 10ng/ml in members > 75 years of age; with both of the following:

2. No other relative indication for prostate biopsy including ANY of the following:
   a) Digital rectal exam (DRE) suspicious for cancer (e.g., nodules, induration, or asymmetry); or
   b) Positive multiparametric MRI (Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System [PI-RADS] ≥ 3); or
   c) Positive prior biopsy (cancer Grade Group ≥ 1, intraductal carcinoma (IDC), atypical intraductal proliferation (AIP)); or
   d) Other major risk factor for prostate cancer, including:
      i. Ethnicity at higher risk for prostate cancer
      ii. First-degree relative with prostate cancer
      iii. High-penetrance prostate cancer risk gene(s) per NCCN (if known).

   AND

3. No other relative contraindication for prostate biopsy, including ANY of the following:
   a) < 10-year life expectancy, or otherwise not a candidate for prostate cancer treatment; or
   b) Invasive treatment for benign prostatic disease or taking medications that influence serum PSA levels within 6 months; or
   c) Active prostatitis on antibiotics.

*PSA elevation should be confirmed after a few weeks under standardized conditions (i.e., no ejaculation, manipulations, and urinary tract infections) in the same laboratory before considering a biopsy.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

B. Testing Without Biopsy

Select Health does NOT cover the SelectMDx test for prostate cancer screening, detection, or disease monitoring. The peer-reviewed medical literature does not support this test as having the sufficient sensitivity or specificity that would be necessary in defining a valid clinical role; this meet's the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

A Medical Technology Assessment performed in August 2012 identified 5 systematic reviews and 30 peer-reviewed journal articles concerning PCA3 testing for PCa indications. The literature spans the years 2006−2012 where more than 9,670 (mean per study ≈322) men were studied. Though the systematic reviews are dated, the addition of more current peer-reviewed literature adds or subtracts very little from the conclusions drawn by the authors of the reviews. Three key points frequently discussed in the literature include: 1) the clinical utility of PCA3, 2) defining the appropriate cut-off value for the PCA3 test, and 3) appropriate patient selection for use of the PCA3 assay.

Clinical Utility: The Hayes GTE update in July 2011 noted that PCA3 detection may be useful for guiding biopsy decisions and that it could possibly improve treatment decision-making in the clinic. This conclusion is largely based on their finding that the diagnostic accuracy of the PCA3 detection test (the ability of the test to predict biopsy outcome) is greater than that of PSA screening. Ultimately, the Hayes GTE report did not find PCA3 testing to be a viable screening test for men considering biopsy, for general population screening, or for disease monitoring, giving it a 'D2' rating. The 2009 BCBS TEC assessment echoes the concerns brought forth in the Hayes review, noting the most significant and persistent finding among all the literature identified for this review, that being: "PCA3 results have not been standardized and clinical utility studies of decision-making for initial biopsy, repeat biopsy or treatment have not been reported."

Similarly, Auprich et al., Henderson et al., Hessels et al., and others have all noted that the exact place of PCA3 as a prognostic test for PCa remains the subject of investigation and that no evidence for the usefulness of PCA3 in active surveillance programs has been presented.

Cut-Off Value: The issue of what constitutes an appropriate cut-off value was addressed throughout the studies (patients whose assay scores are above that cut-off would be qualified as high risk of having PCa). Of note, are the comments by van Poppel et al. who showed that a PCA3 cut-off of < 20 may be the most suitable to select men with clinically insignificant PCa in whom active surveillance may be appropriate. A PCA3 score threshold of 50 may be used to identify men at risk of harboring insignificant prostate cancer. Chun et al. was the only other study that stratified cut-offs correlating to predictive accuracy of PCa upon completion of biopsy. In all, twelve papers used cut-offs of between 17 and 66 with the average being 35. This, once again, points to the fact that PCA3 results and methods have not been stratified in large, prospective, blinded studies.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: PCA3 Testing for Prostate Cancer, **continued**

Where PSA has a relatively high sensitivity and low specificity, PCA3 has a relatively high specificity and low sensitivity. Combining the use of these 2 tests may be postulated to result in improved diagnostic performance. Aubin et al., Ochiai et al., and Pepe et al., all showed that when used in conjunction with PSA, PCA3 testing improves diagnostic accuracy of prostate biopsy for PCa. Only Nyberg et al. showed otherwise. These results came after studying 1,251 patients in total. Despite this, these studies only show potential clinical utility in 13% of all patients reported in this review. It has not been determined, as per the literature, if defining cut-off values for the PCA3 test will raise the sensitivity and specificity of the test to a clinically useful level.

Patient Selection: Though many of the papers illustrated promising outcomes, especially when compared to PSA screening, there is little evidence that PCA3 testing improves patient outcomes because of the lack of standardization and patient segmentation delineating for whom this test is most appropriate. The various studies used different populations and different primary endpoints. This, again, clouds the question as to the clinical utility of this test.

Though PCA3 testing has been shown to have better specificity, AUC, and odds ratio than PSA, currently there is no consensus among societies or authors regarding in whom this test should be performed, what cut-off value should be used to stratify risk or need for biopsy, and under what clinical constraints.

An AHRQ evaluation (Gutman et al., 2013) suggests that further comparative effectiveness research is needed to demonstrate utility of PCA3. Also, in 2013, a report from the EGAPP Working Group found insufficient evidence to recommend PCA3 testing to inform decisions about initial or re-biopsy for prostate cancer in at-risk men. They deemed the clinical validity and net health benefit “low” and recommended against use until additional evidence supports improved outcomes.

Wei et al. in 2014 studied 859 men (mean age, 62 years) from 11 centers who underwent prostate biopsy from 2009−2011 to assess whether PCA3 could improve the positive predictive value (PPV) for an initial biopsy (at a score > 60) and the negative predictive value (NPV) for a repeat biopsy (at a score < 20). PPV was 80% (95% CI, 72% to 86%) in the initial biopsy group, and NPV was 88% (95% CI, 81% to 93%) in the repeat biopsy group.

Recent NCCN Guidelines recommend use of the PCA3 assay in the screening and detection of prostate cancer: “Tests that improve specificity in the post-biopsy setting- including the Sentinel Prostate Cancer Test, percent-free PSA, 4KScore, PHI, PCA3, and ConfirmMDx should be considered in patients thought to be at higher risk despite a negative prostate biopsy.” (NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer Early Detection V.1.2022)

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

Covered for the indications listed above when criteria are met

0005U	Oncology (prostate) gene expression profile by real-time RT-PCR of 3 genes (ERG, PCA3, and SPDEF), urine, algorithm reported as risk score
0113U	Oncology (prostate), measurement of PCA3 and TMPRSS2-ERG in urine and PSA in serum following prostatic massage, by RNA amplification and fluorescence-based detection, algorithm reported as risk score
0359U	Oncology (prostate cancer), analysis of all prostate-specific antigen (PSA) structural isoforms by phase separation and immunoassay, plasma, algorithm reports risk of cancer.
0403U	Oncology (prostate), mRNA, gene expression profiling of 18 genes, first-catch post-digital rectal examination urine (or processed first-catch urine), algorithm reported as percentage of likelihood of detecting clinically significant prostate cancer
81313	PCA3/KLK3 (prostate cancer antigen 3 [non-protein coding]/kallikrein-related peptidase 3 [prostate specific antigen]) ratio (eg, prostate cancer)

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

Genetic Testing: PCA3 Testing for Prostate Cancer, **continued**

81539 Oncology (high-grade prostate cancer), biochemical assay of four proteins (Total PSA, Free PSA, Intact PSA, and Human Kallikrein-2 [HK2]), utilizing plasma or serum, prognostic algorithm reported as a probability score

81551 Oncology (prostate), promoter methylation profiling by real-time PCR of 3 genes (GSTP1, APC, RASSF1), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as a likelihood of prostate cancer detection on repeat biopsy

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Not covered: the following codes are considered experimental/investigational

0339U Oncology (prostate), mRNA expression profiling of HOXC6 and DLX1, reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), first-void urine following digital rectal examination, algorithm reported as probability of high-grade cancer

Key References

1. Abdellaoui, A. (2011). Imaging in Prostate Cancer. Medscape. Last Update: Available: http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/742986. Date Accessed: June 13, 2011.
2. American Cancer Society (ACS). (2012). Prostate Cancer. American Cancer Society (ACS). Last Update: February 27, 2012. Available: http://www.cancer.org/acs/groups/cid/documents/webcontent/003134-pdf.pdf. Date Accessed: February 20. 2012.
3. Aubin, SM, Reid, J, Sarno, MJ, et al. (2010). PCA3 molecular urine test for predicting repeat prostate biopsy outcome in populations at risk: validation in the placebo arm of the dutasteride REDUCE trial. J Urol. 184. 5:1947-52.
4. Auprich, M, Bjartell, A, Chun, FK, et al. (2011). Contemporary role of prostate cancer antigen 3 in the management of prostate cancer. Eur Urol. 60. 5:1045-54.
5. Auprich, M, Chun, FK, Ward, JF, et al. (2011). Critical assessment of preoperative urinary prostate cancer antigen 3 on the accuracy of prostate cancer staging. Eur Urol. 59. 1:96-105.
6. Auprich, M, Haese, A, Walz, J, et al. (2010). External validation of urinary PCA3-based nomograms to individually predict prostate biopsy outcome. Eur Urol. 58. 5:727-32.
7. Benway, BM. (2012). Prostate biopsy. Up to Date. Last Update: June 4, 2012. Available: http://www.uptodate.com/contents/prostate-biopsy?source=search_result&search=prostate+biopsy&selectedTitle=1~33. Date Accessed: July 31, 2012. 2012.
8. Brawer, MK, Chetner, MP, Beatie, J, et al. (1992). Screening for prostatic carcinoma with prostate specific antigen. J Urol. 147. 3 Pt 2:841-5.
9. Catalona, WJ, Richie, JP, Ahmann, FR, et al. (1994). Comparison of digital rectal examination and serum prostate specific antigen in the early detection of prostate cancer: results of a multicenter clinical trial of 6,630 men. J Urol. 151. 5:1283-90.
10. Chun, FK, de la Taille, A, van Poppel, H, et al. (2009). Prostate cancer gene 3 (PCA3): development and internal validation of a novel biopsy nomogram. Eur Urol. 56. 4:659-67.
11. Cirillo, S, Petracchini, M, Della Monica, P, et al. (2008). Value of endorectal MRI and MRS in patients with elevated prostate-specific antigen levels and previous negative biopsies to localize peripheral zone tumours. Clin Radiol. 63. 8:871-9.
12. Clements, R. (2001). Ultrasonography of prostate cancer. Eur Radiol. 11. 11:2119-25.
13. Dahnert, WF, Hamper, UM, Eggleston, JC, et al. (1986). Prostatic evaluation by transrectal sonography with histopathologic correlation: the echopenic appearance of early carcinoma. Radiology. 158. 1:97-102.
14. de la Taille, A, Irani, J, Graefen, M, et al. (2011). Clinical evaluation of the PCA3 assay in guiding initial biopsy decisions. J Urol. 185. 6:2119-25.
15. Deras, IL, Aubin, SM, Blase, A, et al. (2008). PCA3: a molecular urine assay for predicting prostate biopsy outcome. J Urol. 179. 4:1587-92.
16. Draisma, G, Boer, R, Otto, SJ, et al. (2003). Lead times and overdetection due to prostate-specific antigen screening: estimates from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst. 95. 12:868-78.
17. Draisma, G, Etzioni, R, Tsodikov, A, et al. (2009). Lead time and overdiagnosis in prostate-specific antigen screening: importance of methods and context. J Natl Cancer Inst. 101. 6:374-83.
18. Etzioni, R, Penson, DF, Legler, JM, et al. (2002). Overdiagnosis due to prostate-specific antigen screening: lessons from U.S. prostate cancer incidence trends. J Natl Cancer Inst. 94. 13:981-90.
19. EviCore. ConfirmMDX for Prostate Cancer Risk Assessment. V.1.0.2020.
20. Food and Drug Association (FDA). (2012). Premarket Approval (PMA) Approval Summary for PROGENSA PSA3 Assay. US Department of Health & Human Services. Last Update: July 16, 2012. Available: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf10/P100033A.pdf. Date Accessed: August 6. 2012.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

Genetic Testing: PCA3 Testing for Prostate Cancer, continued

21. Galasso, F, Giannella, R, Bruni, P, et al. (2010). PCA3: a new tool to diagnose prostate cancer (PCa) and a guidance in biopsy decisions. Preliminary report of the UrOP study. Arch Ital Urol Androl. 82. 1:5-9.
22. Gen-Probe. (2012). Progensa PCA3. Gen-Probe. Last Update: Available: http://www.gen-probe.com/products-services/progensa-pca3. Date Accessed: February 22. 2012.
23. Gulati, R, Wever, EM, Tsodikov, A, et al. (2011). What If I Don't Treat My PSA-Detected Prostate Cancer? Answers from Three Natural History Models. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 20. 5:740-50.
24. Haese, A, de la Taille, A, van Poppel, H, et al. (2008). Clinical utility of the PCA3 urine assay in European men scheduled for repeat biopsy. Eur Urol. 54. 5:1081-8.
25. Hamper, UM, Sheth, S, Walsh, PC, et al. (1990). Bright echogenic foci in early prostatic carcinoma: sonographic and pathologic correlation. Radiology. 176. 2:339-43.
26. Hayes GTE Report. (2009) PCA3 Detection Test for Prostate Cancer. Winifred S. Hayes Inc. August 9. Updated Search: July 15, 2011.
27. Henderson, J, Ghani, KR, Cook, J, et al. (2010). The role of PCA3 testing in patients with a raised prostate-specific antigen level after Greenlight photoselective vaporization of the prostate. J Endourol. 24. 11:1821-4.
28. Hessels, D, van Gils, MP, van Hooij, O, et al. (2010). Predictive value of PCA3 in urinary sediments in determining clinico-pathological characteristics of prostate cancer. Prostate. 70. 1:10-6.
29. Hoffman, RM. (2012). Screening for prostate cancer. Up to Date. Last Update: Available: http://www.uptodate.com/contents/screening-for-prostate-cancer?source=search_result&search=prostate+biopsy&selectedTitle=4~31#H988952102. Date Accessed: March 7. 2012.
30. Jones, JS. (2012). Prostate Biopsy. Medscape. Last Update: May 16, 2012. Available: http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/1949728-overview#aw2aab6b2b2. Date Accessed: August 1. 2012.
31. Klecka, J, Holubec, L, Pesta, M, et al. (2010). Differential display code 3 (DD3/PCA3) in prostate cancer diagnosis. Anticancer Res. 30. 2:665-70.
32. Lee, GL. (2011). Prostate Cancer: Diagnostic Performance of the PCA3 Urine Test. Medscape News. Last Update: Available: http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/738934. Date Accessed: February 22. 2012.
33. Liss, MA, Santos, R, Osann, K, et al. (2011). PCA3 molecular urine assay for prostate cancer: association with pathologic features and impact of collection protocols. World J Urol. 29. 5:683-8.
34. Marks, LS, Fradet, Y, Deras, IL, et al. (2007). PCA3 molecular urine assay for prostate cancer in men undergoing repeat biopsy. Urology. 69. 3:532-5.
35. Nakanishi, H, Groskopf, J, Fritsche, HA, et al. (2008). PCA3 molecular urine assay correlates with prostate cancer tumor volume: implication in selecting candidates for active surveillance. J Urol. 179. 5:1804-9; discussion 1809-10.
36. National Cancer Institute. (2011). Genetics of Prostate Cancer. National Cancer Institute. Last Update: May 13, 2011. Available: http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/pdq/genetics/prostate/HealthProfessional. Date Accessed: May 23, 2011.
37. National Cancer Institute. (2012). Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) Test. National Institutes of Health. Last Update: March 3, 2009. Available: http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/factsheet/detection/PSA. Date Accessed: February 22. 2012.
38. National Comprehensive Cancer Network Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guidelines). (2011). Prostate Cancer Early Detection. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). Last Update: June 6, 2011. Available: http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate_detection.pdf. Date Accessed: February 20. 2012.
39. National Horizon Scanning Centre (NHSC). (2006) Prostate cancer gene 3 (Progensa PCA3) assay in the diagnosis of prostate cancer. University of Bellingham (UK). December.
40. NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer Early Detection V.1.2022.
41. Norberg, M, Holmberg, L, Busch, C, et al. (1996). Multiple transrectal ultrasound-guided biopsies for the detection of prostate cancer and determination of tumor volume, grade, and seminal vesicle invasion. Eur Radiol. 6. 1:56-61.
42. Nyberg, M, Ulmert, D, Lindgren, A, et al. (2010). PCA3 as a diagnostic marker for prostate cancer: a validation study on a Swedish patient population. Scand J Urol Nephrol. 44. 6:378-83.
43. Ochiai, A, Okihara, K, Kamoi, K, et al. (2011). Prostate cancer gene 3 urine assay for prostate cancer in Japanese men undergoing prostate biopsy. Int J Urol. 18. 3:200-5.
44. Pashayan, N, Duffy, SW, Pharoah, P, et al. (2009). Mean sojourn time, overdiagnosis, and reduction in advanced stage prostate cancer due to screening with PSA: implications of sojourn time on screening. Br J Cancer. 100. 7:1198-204.
45. PCA3.org. (2010). PCA3 Materials & News. PCA3.org. Last Update: October 12, 2010. Available: http://www.pca3.org/pro/content/pca3-assay-indications-use-clinical-practice. Date Accessed: February 22. 2012.
46. Pepe, P, Aragona, F. (2011). PCA3 score vs PSA free/total accuracy in prostate cancer diagnosis at repeat saturation biopsy. Anticancer Res. 31. 12:4445-9.
47. Ploussard, G, Durand, X, Xylinas, E, et al. (2011). Prostate cancer antigen 3 score accurately predicts tumour volume and might help in selecting prostate cancer patients for active surveillance. Eur Urol. 59. 3:422-9.
48. Ploussard, G, Haese, A, Van Poppel, H, et al. (2010). The prostate cancer gene 3 (PCA3) urine test in men with previous negative biopsies: does free-to-total prostate-specific antigen ratio influence the performance of the PCA3 score in predicting positive biopsies? BJU Int. 106. 8:1143-7.
49. Prezelin, Y, Ronsin, C, Celhay, O, et al. (2011). [Variation of urinary PCA3 following transrectal ultrasound-guided prostate biopsy]. Prog Urol. 21. 6:412-6.
50. Prostate Cancer Foundation. (2011). Understanding the Prostate: About the Prostate. Prostate Cancer Foundation,. Last Update: 2011. Available: http://www.pcf.org/site/c.leJRIROrEpH/b.5802023/k.B322/About_the_Prostate.htm. Date Accessed: May 23. 2011.
51. Rigau, M, Morote, J, Mir, MC, et al. (2010). PSGR and PCA3 as biomarkers for the detection of prostate cancer in urine. Prostate. 70. 16:1760-7.
52. Rigau, M, Ortega, I, Mir, MC, et al. (2011). A three-gene panel on urine increases PSA specificity in the detection of prostate cancer. Prostate. 71. 16:1736-45.
53. Roobol, MJ, Schroder, FH, van Leeuwen, P, et al. (2010). Performance of the prostate cancer antigen 3 (PCA3) gene and prostate-specific antigen in prescreened men: exploring the value of PCA3 for a first-line diagnostic test. Eur Urol. 58. 4:475-81.
54. Ruiz-Aragon, J, Marquez-Pelaez, S. (2010). [Assessment of the PCA3 test for prostate cancer diagnosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis]. Actas Urol Esp. 34. 4:346-55.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: PCR FOR BCR-ABL IN CHRONIC MYELOGENOUS LEUKEMIA (CML)

Policy # 340

Implementation Date: 3/22/07

Review Dates: 2/21/08, 2/26/09, 2/17/11, 2/16/12, 4/25/13, 2/20/14, 2/11/16, 2/16/17, 2/15/18, 2/18/19, 2/14/23

Revision Dates: 7/16/13, 9/17/18, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Chronic myelogenous leukemia (CML) is a disorder characterized by uncontrolled production of immature granulocytes (white blood cells). The presence of a greater percentage of immature granulocytes over more mature granulocytes ("leukemic hiatus") is one of the classic findings in CML.

Chronic myelogenous leukemia is distinguished from other leukemias by the presence of a specific acquired cytogenetic abnormality; the Philadelphia chromosome (Ph[1).] Ph[1] is an abnormally short chromosome that results from a balanced translocation between the distal ends of chromosomes 9 and 22. The breakage on chromosome 22 involves a gene called "BCR" (for breakpoint cluster region), while the breakage on chromosome 9 mutates the Abelson (ABL) gene. This mutated gene is translocated to chromosome 22 and fused with the remaining part of the BCR gene. This fusion between BCR and ABL leads to an abnormal fused gene, called BCR-ABL.

In the past, the diagnosis of CML was based largely upon clinical and laboratory criteria. However, current diagnostic criteria from the National Comprehensive Network (NCCN) require detection of Ph[1] or its products. The BCR-ABL fusion mRNA or the BCR-ABL protein for a diagnosis of CML to be made. The NCCN guidelines also recommend testing for BCL-ABL in monitoring treatment for CML, follow-up during remission, and to monitor progress when recurrence is evident. Ph[1] and its products may be detected though several methods, including cytogenetic examination of bone marrow cells, fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH), and quantitative and qualitative reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). RY-PCR may also be used to detect specific ABL kinase domain (KD) mutations.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers BCR-ABL testing when the following criteria are met:

A. BCR-ABL kinase domain point mutation analysis is considered medically necessary in the monitoring of chronic myeloid leukemia (CML) in any of the following circumstances:

1) Evaluation of individuals with chronic myelogenous leukemia to evaluate treated individuals who manifest suboptimal response to tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy indicated by:

i. Lack of a partial hematologic or cytogenetic response at 3 months or greater after treatment onset
ii. Less than a complete hematologic and cytogenetic response at 12 months
iii. Disease progression to accelerated or blast phase

SelectHealth does NOT cover other BCR-ABL mutation analysis, as its clinical utility has not been established, and its use meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Chronic myelogenous leukemia results from a somatic mutation (i.e., not inherited) to DNA of a stem cell in the bone marrow. The mutation confers a growth and survival advantage on the malignant stem cell. The result of this injury is the uncontrolled growth of white cells leading, if unchecked, to a massive increase in their concentration in the blood. Unlike acute myelogenous leukemia (AML), CML allows some white blood cells to mature and function normally, which accounts for the less severe early course of the disease.

Chronic myelogenous leukemia has a triphasic clinical course. Approximately 85%–90% of patients present at the time of diagnosis with relatively indolent disease (chronic phase), which is easily controlled with oral chemotherapy. Untreated, however, CML progresses from a chronic phase to a rapidly fatal blast phase, generally over 3–5 years. Two-thirds of patients will also experience a transition period called the accelerated phase, during which time disease control is more difficult to achieve.

Genetic Testing: PCR for BCR-ABL in Chronic Myelogenous Leukemia (CML), **continued**

Overall, the literature suggests that BCR-ABL testing using quantitative and/or qualitative PCR is an accurate method of monitoring response to Gleevec therapy and for assessing remission in post-transplant patients. BCR-ABL transcript analysis appears to be more accurate than cytogenetic testing, resulting in fewer false negatives. These test results also impact management decisions regarding initiation or change in treatment modalities. Most of the available literature reports on PCR testing in the context of monitoring for recurrence after stem cell transplantation. Thus, conclusions about this testing in other pre-transplant patients are more limited. Moreover, whether early detection with BCR-ABL testing would prevent blast crises and/or future stem-cell transplantation is unknown. Nevertheless, The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines require BCR-ABL transcript analysis in diagnosis and monitoring of CML. Likewise, an extensive systematic review from the Medical Services Advisory Committee of Australia concluded that BCR-ABL transcript analysis is an accurate and cost-effective method of diagnosing and monitoring CML.

The clinical value of testing for specific BCR-ABL mutations is more controversial and less well-supported in the literature. The NCCN recommends ABL kinase domain (KD) mutation analysis in the event of inadequate treatment response. However, the literature is unclear as to the significance of specific ABL mutations, and whether identification of a particular mutation improves clinical outcomes or changes treatment decisions. The exception to this is the T315I mutation analysis. Both dasatinib and nilotinib are effective against most of the known BCR-ABL mutations. Their clinical effectiveness, along with that of imatinib and bosutinib is markedly diminished in the presence of the T315I mutation. Ponatinib, however, retains its clinical effectiveness in the presence of this mutation. Thus, for patients with this mutation, the choice of agent will alter clinical outcomes and thus clinical utility has been established. For the other BCR-ABL mutations, their clinical utility is not well-supported in the literature.

A phase II trial of 34 Ph-positive relapsed patients (Benjamini et al., 2014) showed high efficacy of treatment using a regimen that included Desatinib in imatinib resistant patients and depended on genotyping of BCR-ABL genotyping beyond just T315I.

More significantly, a multicenter study of TKI resistance (Zabriske et al., 2014) found that different mutations in BCR-ABL confer different resistance and that compound mutations in the fusion gene let to resistance even to Ponatinib (which had been effective in all single mutations) necessitating complete fusion gene genotyping for rational treatment TKI selection to optimize clinical outcome. These developments show that use of Ponatinib will not be effective against all mutations and mutational analysis will be needed to guide optimal TKI choice.

In the wake of these findings, the NCCN now includes complete mutation analysis in their latest (2015.1) guideline on diagnosis and treatment of CML.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0016U	Oncology (hematolymphoid neoplasia), RNA, BCR/ABL1 major and minor breakpoint fusion transcripts, quantitative PCR amplification, blood or bone marrow, report of fusion not detected or detected with quantitation
0040U	BCR/ABL1 (t (9;22)) (e.g., chronic myelogenous leukemia) translocation analysis, major breakpoint, quantitative
81170	ABL1 (ABL proto-oncogene 1, non-receptor tyrosine kinase) (eg, acquired imatinib tyrosine kinase inhibitor resistance), gene analysis, variants in the kinase domain
81206	BCR/ABL1 (t(9;22)) (e.g., chronic myelogenous leukemia) translocation analysis; major breakpoint, qualitative or quantitative
81207	; minor breakpoint, qualitative or quantitative
81208	; other breakpoint, qualitative or quantitative
81401	Molecular pathology procedure Level 2

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. American Cancer Society. Treatment of Chronic Myeloid Leukemia by Phase. 2006. American Cancer Society. Available: http://www.cancer.org/docroot/CRI/content/CRI_2_4_4x_Treatment_of_Chronic_Myeloid_Leukemia_by_Phase_CML.asp?site area=CRI&viewmode=print&. Date Accessed: January 17, 2007.
2. Benjamini, O., et al. (2014). "Phase II trial of hyper CVAD and dasatinib in patients with relapsed Philadelphia chromosome positive acute lymphoblastic leukemia or blast phase chronic myeloid leukemia." Am J Hematol 89(3): 282-287.
3. Branford S, Rudzki Z, Walsh S, et al. "Detection of BCR-ABL mutations in patients with CML treated with imatinib is virtually always accompanied by clinical resistance, and mutations in the ATP phosphate-binding loop (P-loop) are associated with a poor prognosis." Blood 102.1 (2003): 276-83.
4. Branford, S. and T. P. Hughes (2011). "Mutational analysis in chronic myeloid leukemia: when and what to do?" Curr Opin Hematol 18(2): 111-116.
5. Cortes J, Talpaz M, O'Brien S, et al. "Molecular responses in patients with chronic myelogenous leukemia in chronic phase treated with imatinib mesylate." Clin Cancer Res 11.9 (2005): 3425-32.
6. Cortes, J. E., et al. (2013). "A phase 2 trial of ponatinib in Philadelphia chromosome-positive leukemias." N Engl J Med 369(19): 1783-1796.
7. Drobyski WR, Endean DJ, Klein JP, Hessner MJ. "Detection of BCR/ABL RNA transcripts using the polymerase chain reaction is highly predictive for relapse in patients transplanted with unrelated marrow grafts for chronic myelogenous leukaemia." Br J Haematol 98.2 (1997): 458-66.
8. Druker, B. J. (2006). "Circumventing resistance to kinase-inhibitor therapy." N Engl J Med 354(24): 2594-2596.
9. Emig M, Saussele S, Wittor H, et al. "Accurate and rapid analysis of residual disease in patients with CML using specific fluorescent hybridization probes for real time quantitative RT-PCR." Leukemia 13.11 (1999): 1825-32.
10. Giles, F. J., J. Cortes, et al. (2007). "MK-0457, a novel kinase inhibitor, is active in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia or acute lymphocytic leukemia with the T315I BCR-ABL mutation." Blood 109(2): 500-502.
11. Gontarewicz, A., S. Balabanov, et al. (2008). "Simultaneous targeting of Aurora kinases and Bcr-Abl kinase by the small molecule inhibitor PHA-739358 is effective against imatinib-resistant BCR-ABL mutations including T315I." Blood, 111(8): 4355-4364.
12. Hughes T, Deininger M, Hochhaus A, et al. "Monitoring CML patients responding to treatment with tyrosine kinase inhibitors: review and recommendations for harmonizing current methodology for detecting BCR-ABL transcripts and kinase domain mutations and for expressing results." Blood 108.1 (2006): 28-37.
13. Jabbour E, Kantarjian H, Jones D, et al. "Frequency and clinical significance of BCR-ABL mutations in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia treated with imatinib mesylate." Leukemia 20.10 (2006): 1767-73.
14. Kantarjian HM, Talpaz M, Cortes J, et al. "Quantitative polymerase chain reaction monitoring of BCR-ABL during therapy with imatinib mesylate (STI571; gleevec) in chronic-phase chronic myelogenous leukemia." Clin Cancer Res 9.1 (2003): 160-6.
15. Khorashad JS, Anand M, Marin D, et al. "The presence of a BCR-ABL mutant allele in CML does not always explain clinical resistance to imatinib." Leukemia 20.4 (2006): 658-63.
16. Kim YJ, Kim DW, Lee S, et al. "Comprehensive comparison of FISH, RT-PCR, and RQ-PCR for monitoring the BCR-ABL gene after hematopoietic stem cell transplantation in CML." Eur J Haematol 68.5 (2002): 272-80.
17. Kim YJ, Kim DW, Lee S, et al. "Early prediction of molecular remission by monitoring BCR-ABL transcript levels in patients achieving a complete cytogenetic response after imatinib therapy for posttransplantation chronic myelogenous leukemia relapse." Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 10.10 (2004): 718-25.
18. Laboratory Corporation of America. BCR-ABL1 Kinase Domain Mutation Analysis. 2007. Available: http://www.labcorp.com/datasets/labcorp/html/chapter/mono/mo003100.htm.
19. Lee, T. S., S. J. Potts, et al. (2008). "Molecular basis explanation for imatinib resistance of BCR-ABL due to T315I and P-loop mutations from molecular dynamics simulations." Cancer 112(8): 1744-1753.
20. McKusick VA. Leukemia, Chronic Myeloid; CML. 2003. Online Mendelian Inheritance in Man (OMIM) Gene Records. Available: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/dispomim.cgi?id=608232. Date Accessed: January 27, 2007.
21. Medical Services Advisory Committee. Polymerase chain reaction in the diagnosis and monitoring of patients with BCR-ABL gene rearrangement in chronic myeloid leukaemia. 2003. Commonwealth of Australia. Available: http://www.msac.gov.au/internet/msac/publishing.nsf/Content/ref09ai-1/$FILE/msacref9ai.pdf. Date Accessed: January 17, 2007.
22. Merx K, Muller MC, Kreil S, et al. "Early reduction of BCR-ABL mRNA transcript levels predicts cytogenetic response in chronic phase CML patients treated with imatinib after failure of interferon alpha." Leukemia 16.9 (2002): 1579-83.
23. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. Chronic Myelogenous Leukemia. 2007. National Comprehensive Cancer Network, Inc. Available: http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/PDF/cml.pdf. Date Accessed: January 19, 2007.
24. Nicolini FE, Corm S, Le QH, et al. "Mutation status and clinical outcome of 89 imatinib mesylate-resistant chronic myelogenous leukemia patients: a retrospective analysis from the French intergroup of CML (Fi(phi)-LMC GROUP)." Leukemia 20.6 (2006): 1061-6.
25. Novartis Pharma AG. Gleevec Labeling. 2002. Available: http://www.fda.gov/cder/foi/label/2002/021335s004lbl.pdf. Date Accessed: January 17, 2007.
26. Novartis Pharma AG. (2006).
27. O'Hare, T., C. A. Eide, et al. (2008). "SGX393 inhibits the CML mutant Bcr-AblT315I and preempts in vitro resistance when combined with nilotinib or dasatinib." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 105(14): 5507-5512.
28. Olavarria E, Kanfer E, Szydlo R, et al. "Early detection of BCR-ABL transcripts by quantitative reverse transcriptase- polymerase chain reaction predicts outcome after allogeneic stem cell transplantation for chronic myeloid leukemia." Blood 97.6 (2001): 1560-5.
29. Paschka P, Muller MC, Merx K, et al. "Molecular monitoring of response to imatinib (Glivec) in CML patients pretreated with interferon alpha. Low levels of residual disease are associated with continuous remission." Leukemia 17.9 (2003): 1687-94.
30. Press RD, Love Z, Tronnes AA, et al. "BCR-ABL mRNA levels at and after the time of a complete cytogenetic response (CCR) predict the duration of CCR in imatinib mesylate-treated patients with CML." Blood 107.11 (2006): 4250-6.
31. Preudhomme C, Chams-Eddine L, Roumier C, et al. "Detection of BCR-ABL transcripts in chronic myeloid leukemia (CML) using an in situ RT-PCR assay." Leukemia 13.5 (1999): 818-23.
32. Preudhomme C, Revillion F, Merlat A, et al. "Detection of BCR-ABL transcripts in chronic myeloid leukemia (CML) using a 'real time' quantitative RT-PCR assay." Leukemia 13.6 (1999): 957-64.
33. Shi, X., Y. Jin, et al. (2009). "Triptolide inhibits Bcr-Abl transcription and induces apoptosis in STI571-resistant chronic

myelogenous leukemia cells harboring T315I mutation." Clin Cancer Res 15(5): 1686-1697.

34. Soverini S, Martinelli G, Rosti G, et al. "ABL mutations in late chronic phase chronic myeloid leukemia patients with up-front cytogenetic resistance to imatinib are associated with a greater likelihood of progression to blast crisis and shorter survival: a study by the GIMEMA Working Party on Chronic Myeloid Leukemia." J Clin Oncol 23.18 (2005): 4100-9.
35. Soverini, S., G. Martinelli, et al. (2006). "Presence or the emergence of a F317L BCR-ABL mutation may be associated with resistance to dasatinib in Philadelphia chromosome-positive leukemia." J Clin Oncol 24(33): e51-52.
36. Tbakhi A, Pettay J, Sreenan JJ, et al. "Comparative analysis of interphase FISH and RT-PCR to detect *bcr-abl* translocation in chronic myelogenous leukemia and related disorders." Am J Clin Pathol 109.1 (1998): 16-23.
37. The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society. Chronic Myelogenous Leukemia. 2006. The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society. Available: http://www.leukemia-lymphoma.org/all_page?item_id=8501. Date Accessed: January 17, 2007.
38. Van Etten RA. Clinical manifestations and diagnosis of chronic myelogenous leukemia. 2006. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=leukemia/9368&type=A&selectedTitle=1~33. Date Accessed: January 17, 2007.
39. Van Etten RA. Overview of the treatment of chronic myelogenous leukemia. 2006. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=leukemia/15171&type=A&selectedTitle=3~33. Date Accessed: January 17, 2007.
40. Van Etten RA. Molecular genetics of chronic myelogenous leukemia. 2006. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=leukemia/7803&type=A&selectedTitle=2~20. Date Accessed: January 17, 2007.
41. von Bubnoff, N., P. W. Manley, et al. (2006). "Bcr-Abl resistance screening predicts a limited spectrum of point mutations to be associated with clinical resistance to the Abl kinase inhibitor nilotinib (AMN107)." Blood 108(4): 1328-1333.
42. Willis SG, Lange T, Demehri S, et al. "High-sensitivity detection of BCR-ABL kinase domain mutations in imatinib-naive patients: correlation with clonal cytogenetic evolution but not response to therapy." Blood 106.6 (2005): 2128-37.
43. Zabriskie, M. S., et al. (2014). "BCR-ABL1 compound mutations combining key kinase domain positions confer clinical resistance to ponatinib in Ph chromosome-positive leukemia." Cancer Cell 26(3): 428-442.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: PTEN MUTATION ANALYSIS

Policy # 438
Implementation Date: 3/22/10
Review Dates: 4/21/11, 6/21/12, 6/20/13, 4/17/14, 5/7/15, 4/14/16, 4/27/17, 9/18/18, 8/8/19, 3/14/23
Revision Dates: 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Colorectal cancer (CRC) and breast cancer are 2 of the most common cancers in the United States. Although recent improvements in screening and increased understanding of the genetics involved with these cancers has reduced the incidence of these cancers, the morbidity and mortality associated with CRC and breast cancer remains significant. Surgery is the usual approach for tumors that have not metastasized and may be curative. However, chemotherapy, sometimes with radiotherapy, is given to patients with stage III or IV (metastatic) cancer.

Several single or multiagent chemotherapy regimens may be chosen to treat these conditions. Among these are cetuximab (Erbitux; Imclone Systems/Bristol-Myers Squibb) and panitumumab (Vectibix; Amgen), which are anti-epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) monoclonal antibodies. They are generally used for second- or third-line treatment in patients with metastatic disease following failure of first-line chemotherapy. Patients who cannot tolerate standard first-line chemotherapy regimens in colorectal cancer may also receive cetuximab monotherapy as first-line treatment.

These medications, however, are not as effective in some patients as they are in others. It has been demonstrated in patients with KRAS mutations who may not respond, but other mechanisms have been proposed for patients with wild type KRAS who still demonstrate a lack of efficacy responding to these medications; one proposed factor is mutation of the PTEN gene.

PTEN and PI3-kinase are major negative and positive regulators, respectively, of the PI3-kinase pathway, which regulates growth, survival, and proliferation. Since PTEN expression can be lost either by mutation, deletion, or promoter methylation, testing can be performed by sequencing (for mutations), deletion/duplication analysis (e.g., array CGH), or methylation analysis; PTEN mutation analysis for this purpose is analyzed through IHC of tumor cells.

One circumstance related to the PTEN gene presents a somewhat different scenario. PTEN mutations have also been identified in a subset of patients for the PTEN hermartoma tumor syndromes (PHTS). PHTS encompasses many several disorders including Cowden syndrome, Bannayan-Riley-Ruvalcaba syndrome, Lhermitte-Duclos disease, Proteus syndrome, Proteus-like syndrome, and autism spectrum disorder. Patients with Cowden syndrome are at increased risk for these assays, and at an increased risk for developing certain cancers—determined by the presence of germline mutations, indicating the presence of Cowden syndrome—a rare disorder characterized by multiple non-cancerous, tumor-like growths called hamartomas. Testing in this instance is performed through PCR analysis via a blood test.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the

time of the request.

1. SelectHealth orders genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers germline testing for PTEN gene mutations and deletions in *limited circumstances* as a diagnostic tool for ruling out Cowden's syndrome, Bannayan-Riley-Ruvalcaba syndrome (BRRS), or another PTEN-related harmartoma syndrome. PTEN gene testing may be considered in individuals with a suspected or known clinical diagnosis of Cowden syndrome, Bannayan-Riley-Ruvalcaba syndrome (BRRS), or another PTEN-related hamartoma syndrome; or who have a known family history* of a PTEN mutation.

SelectHealth does NOT cover PTEN gene testing on tumor tissue in breast or colorectal cancer when used for the purpose of guiding treatment decisions. There is a lack of direct evidence regarding the role of PTEN somatic testing in these clinical settings. This meets the plan's definition of experimental/investigational.

*Known deleterious family mutation in PTEN identified in 1st, 2nd, or 3rd degree biologic relative.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

No systematic reviews on the role of PTEN (somatic) testing of tumor tissue for any clinical question were identified for this report. There is limited published evidence concerning the clinical utility of PTEN somatic testing in colorectal or breast cancer.

In CRC, Perrone et al. evaluated, retrospectively, multiple molecular markers in patients who did not respond to cetuximab; 13% of patients showed a decreased PTEN gene copy number and none of these patients responded to cetuximab. Unfortunately, the study is small; uncontrolled (i.e., single-arm only), and PTEN gene status was evaluated for copy number (by FISH) rather than protein expression (by IHC). Reviews of PTEN testing in CRC state inconsistencies in IHC testing methodology are at least partially

responsible for the equivocal clinical results in CRC. While there is a substantial evidence base on PTEN gene/protein status, it is currently immature and extremely heterogeneous.

In breast cancer, a study by Capodanno et al. showed a 12.5% incidence of reduced PTEN expression (by IHC) in node negative breast carcinoma (n = 72). HER2 was expressed in 30% of the patients. Lack of PTEN expression was not associated with main clinicopathologic or biological parameters. A multivariate analysis showed that PTEN dysregulation was predictive of disease recurrence. This study was also uncontrolled so can only address prognostic value of measured markers. Studies comparing the PTEN mutation and other prognostic tests such as Onco*type* DX are not available. Studies evaluating the PTEN mutation status and chemotherapy in early-stage breast cancer with clinical outcomes are not available. The evidence base is even larger with PTEN and breast cancer, and even more diverse. Clinical questions and settings addressed in published studies are nearly as numerous as the studies themselves, often with conflicting results.

In both diseases, interpretation of evidence is complicated by the many ways PTEN status is being measured, and includes gene mutations, gene copy number, deletions and duplications, polymorphisms, DNA expression, protein expression, various esoteric RNA moieties, and “systems biology” approaches. Additionally, measurement can be performed either on primary tumor or secondary/metastatic tissue, with widely varying concordance depending on what is being measured and stage of disease.

As with BRAF and other molecular markers, determination of the predictive value of a biomarker requires, at minimum, retrospective validation (prospectively planned) on a well-designed and conducted RCT. Such a study, which has not yet been published, would then provide sufficient evidence, preferably duplicated in another quality study, to warrant performing a prospective RCT in a practical setting that includes the most appropriate patient-oriented outcome compared to current best practice.

The current published literature fails to answer key questions regarding the specific role of PTEN somatic (tumor) testing. Remaining questions include the role of the multiple additional molecular markers, the role of clinical markers (and their relationships with molecular markers), standardization and reliability of test assays, the value of testing the primary tumor versus or in addition to metastatic tumor tissue, the timing of biomarker measurement, and the most appropriate outcomes to assess the success and failure of decision-treatment protocols. As such, conclusions regarding the role of PTEN somatic testing in guiding colorectal or breast cancer treatment cannot be made.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0235U PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome), full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions

81321 PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome) gene analysis; full sequence analysis

81322 PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome) gene analysis; known familial variant

81323 PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (eg, Cowden syndrome, PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome) gene analysis; duplication/deletion variant

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. Bardelli A, Siena S. "Molecular Mechanisms of Resistance to Cetuximab and Panitumumab in Colorectal Cancer." J Clin Oncol.

Genetic Testing: PTEN Mutation Analysis, **continued**

2. Capodanno A, Camerini A, Orlandini C, et al. "Dysregulated PI3K/Akt/PTEN pathway is a marker of a short disease-free survival in node-negative breast carcinoma." Hum Pathol 40.10 (2009): 1408-17.
3. Christodoulou C, Kostopoulos I, Kalofonos HP, et al. "Trastuzumab combined with pegylated liposomal doxorubicin in patients with metastatic breast cancer. phase II Study of the Hellenic Cooperative Oncology Group (HeCOG) with biomarker evaluation." Oncology 76.4 (2009): 275-85.
4. Colakoglu T, Yildirim S, Kayaselcuk F, et al. "Clinicopathological significance of PTEN loss and the phosphoinositide 3-kinase/Akt pathway in sporadic colorectal neoplasms: is PTEN loss predictor of local recurrence?" Am J Surg 195.6 (2008): 719-25.
5. Evaluation of Genomic Applications in, P. and G. Prevention Working (2013). "Recommendations from the EGAPP Working Group: can testing of tumor tissue for mutations in EGFR pathway downstream effector genes in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer improve health outcomes by guiding decisions regarding anti-EGFR therapy?" Genet Med 15(7): 517-527.
6. Faratian D, Goltsov A, Lebedeva G, et al. "Systems biology reveals new strategies for personalizing cancer medicine and confirms the role of PTEN in resistance to trastuzumab." Cancer Res 69.16 (2009): 6713-20.
7. Frattini M, Saletti P, Romagnani E, et al. "PTEN loss of expression predicts cetuximab efficacy in metastatic colorectal cancer patients." Br J Cancer 97.8 (2007): 1139-45.
8. Garcia-Saenz JA, Sastre J, Diaz-Rubio Garcia E. "Biomarkers and anti-EGFR therapies for KRAS wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer." Clin Transl Oncol 11.11 (2009): 737-47.
9. Gori S, Sidoni A, Colozza M, et al. "EGFR, pMAPK, pAkt and PTEN status by immunohistochemistry: correlation with clinical outcome in HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer patients treated with trastuzumab." Ann Oncol 20.4 (2009): 648-54.
10. Jang KS, Song YS, Jang SH, et al. "Clinicopathological significance of nuclear PTEN expression in colorectal adenocarcinoma." Histopathology 56.2: 229-39.
11. Kendall A, Lord R, Maisey N. "Anti-Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor Antibodies in the Treatment of Metastatic Colorectal Cancer." Recent Pat Anticancer Drug Discov (2009).
12. Laurent-Puig P, Cayre A, Manceau G, et al. "Analysis of PTEN, BRAF, and EGFR status in determining benefit from cetuximab therapy in wild-type KRAS metastatic colon cancer." J Clin Oncol 27.35 (2009): 5924-30.
13. Li XH, Zheng HC, Takahashi H, Masuda S, Yang XH, Takano Y. "PTEN expression and mutation in colorectal carcinomas." Oncol Rep 22.4 (2009): 757-64.
14. Loupakis F, Pollina L, Stasi I, et al. "PTEN expression and KRAS mutations on primary tumors and metastases in the prediction of benefit from cetuximab plus irinotecan for patients with metastatic colorectal cancer." J Clin Oncol 27.16 (2009): 2622-9.
15. Mandrekar SJ, Sargent DJ. "Clinical trial designs for predictive biomarker validation: theoretical considerations and practical challenges." J Clin Oncol 27.24 (2009): 4027-34.
16. Molinari F, Martin V, Saletti P, et al. "Differing deregulation of EGFR and downstream proteins in primary colorectal cancer and related metastatic sites may be clinically relevant." Br J Cancer 100.7 (2009): 1087-94.
17. Negri FV, Bozzetti C, Lagrasta CA, et al. "PTEN status in advanced colorectal cancer treated with cetuximab." Br J Cancer 102.1: 162-4.
18. Perrone F, Lampis A, Orsenigo M, et al. "PI3KCA/PTEN deregulation contributes to impaired responses to cetuximab in metastatic colorectal cancer patients." Ann Oncol 20.1 (2009): 84-90.
19. Planchon SM, Waite KA, Eng C. "The nuclear affairs of PTEN." J Cell Sci 121.Pt 3 (2008): 249-53.
20. Razis E, Briasoulis E, Vrettou E, et al. "Potential value of PTEN in predicting cetuximab response in colorectal cancer: an exploratory study." BMC Cancer 8 (2008): 234.
21. Rychahou PG, Kang J, Gulhati P, et al. "Akt2 overexpression plays a critical role in the establishment of colorectal cancer metastasis." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 105.51 (2008): 20315-20.
22. Sartore-Bianchi A, Di Nicolantonio F, Nichelatti M, et al. "Multi-determinants analysis of molecular alterations for predicting clinical benefit to EGFR-targeted monoclonal antibodies in colorectal cancer." PLoS One 4.10 (2009): e7287.
23. Sartore-Bianchi A, Martini M, Molinari F, et al. "PIK3CA mutations in colorectal cancer are associated with clinical resistance to EGFR-targeted monoclonal antibodies." Cancer Res 69.5 (2009): 1851-7.
24. Sawai H, Yasuda A, Ochi N, et al. "Loss of PTEN expression is associated with colorectal cancer liver metastasis and poor patient survival." BMC Gastroenterol 8 (2008): 56.
25. Swart R, Downey L, Lang J, Thompson P, Livingston RB, Stopeck A. Breast Cancer. February 10, 2010. eMedicine. Available: http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/283561-overview. Date Accessed: February 3, 2010.
26. Therkildsen, C., et al. (2014). "The predictive value of KRAS, NRAS, BRAF, PIK3CA and PTEN for anti-EGFR treatment in metastatic colorectal cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis." Acta Oncol.
27. Wee S, Jagani Z, Xiang KX, et al. "PI3K pathway activation mediates resistance to MEK inhibitors in KRAS mutant cancers." Cancer Res 69.10 (2009): 4286-93.
28. Yonemori K, Tsuta K, Shimizu C, et al. "Immunohistochemical expression of PTEN and phosphorylated Akt are not correlated with clinical outcome in breast cancer patients treated with trastuzumab-containing neo-adjuvant chemotherapy." Med Oncol 26.3 (2009): 344-9.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Genetic Testing: PTEN Mutation Analysis, **continued**

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: RETT SYNDROME

Policy # 586

Implementation Date: 6/6/16
Review Dates: 8/17/17, 8/13/18, 10/13/19, 4/5/23
Revision Dates: 9/24/18, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

RTT is an X-linked dominant genetic neurodevelopmental disorder. Mutations in *MECP2*, which were thought to control expression of several genes, including some involved in brain development, were first reported in 1999. Subsequent screening has shown that over 80% of patients with classical RTT have pathogenic mutations in the *MECP2* gene. More than 200 mutations in *MECP2* have been associated with RTT. However, 8 of the most commonly occurring missense and nonsense mutations account for almost 70% of all cases. Small C-terminal deletions account for approximately 10%; and large deletions, 8% to 10%. *MECP2* mutation type is associated with disease severity. Whole duplications of the *MECP2* gene have been associated with severe X-linked intellectual disability with progressive spasticity, no or poor speech acquisition, and acquired microcephaly. In addition, the pattern of X-chromosome inactivation influences the severity of the clinical disease in females.

This disorder primarily affects girls with an incidence of 1:10,000 female births, making it one of the most common genetic causes of intellectual disability in girls. RTT is characterized by apparent normal development for the first 6–18 months of life, followed by the loss of intellectual functioning, loss of acquired fine and gross motor skills, and the ability to engage in social interaction. Purposeful use of the hands is replaced by repetitive stereotyped hand movements, sometimes described as hand-wringing. Other clinical manifestations include seizures, disturbed breathing patterns with hyperventilation and periodic apnea, scoliosis, growth retardation, and gait apraxia.

The diagnosis of RTT remains a clinical one, using diagnostic clinical criteria that have been established for the diagnosis of classic and variant Rett syndrome. Rett syndrome (RTT) is usually caused by mutations in the *MECP2* (methyl-CpG-binding protein 2) gene. Genetic testing is available to determine whether a pathogenic mutation exists in a patient with clinical features of Rett syndrome, or in a patient's family member.

There is wide variability in the rate of progression and severity of the disease. In addition to the classical form of RTT, there are a number of recognized atypical variants. Variants of RTT may appear with a severe or a milder form. The severe variant has no normal developmental period; individuals with a milder phenotype experience less dramatic regression and milder expression of the characteristics of classical RTT.

There are currently no specific treatments that halt or reverse the progression of the disease, and there are no known medical interventions that will change the outcome of patients with RTT. Management is mainly symptomatic and individualized, focusing on optimizing each patient's abilities. A multidisciplinary approach is usually used, with specialist input from dietitians, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, speech therapists, and music therapists. Regular monitoring for scoliosis (seen in about 87% of patients by age 25 years) and possible heart abnormalities may be recommended. Spasticity can have a major impact on mobility; physical therapy and hydrotherapy may prolong mobility. Occupational therapy can help children develop communication strategies and skills needed for performing self-directed activities (such as dressing, feeding, practicing arts, and crafts).

Genetic Testing: Rett Syndrome, **continued**

Pharmacologic approaches to managing problems associated with RTT include melatonin for sleep disturbances and several agents for the control of breathing disturbances; seizures; and stereotypic movements. RTT patients have an increased risk of life-threatening arrhythmias associated with a prolonged QT interval, and avoidance of a number of drugs is recommended, including prokinetic agents, antipsychotics, tricyclic antidepressants, antiarrhythmics, anesthetic agents, and certain antibiotics.

As the spectrum of clinical phenotypes is broad, to facilitate genotype-phenotype correlation analyses, the International Rett Syndrome Association has established a locus-specific *MECP2* variation database (RettBASE) and a phenotype database (InterRett).

Approximately 99.5% of cases of RTT are sporadic, resulting from a de novo mutation, which arise almost exclusively on the paternally derived X chromosome. The remaining 0.5% of cases are familial and usually explained by germline mosaicism or favorably skewed X-chromosome inactivation in the carrier mother that results in her being unaffected or only slightly affected (mild intellectual disability). In the case of a carrier mother, the recurrence risk of RTT is 50%. If a mutation is not identified in leukocytes of the mother, the risk to a sibling of the proband is below 0.5% (since germline mosaicism in either parent cannot be excluded).

The identification of a mutation in *MECP2* does not necessarily equate to a diagnosis of RTT. Rare cases of *MECP2* mutations have also been reported in other clinical phenotypes, including individuals with an Angelman-like picture, non-syndromic X-linked intellectual disability, PPM-X syndrome (an X-linked genetic disorder characterized by psychotic disorders [most commonly bipolar disorder], parkinsonism, and intellectual disability), autism, and neonatal encephalopathy.

A proportion of patients with a clinical diagnosis of RTT do not appear to have mutations in the *MECP2* gene. Two other genes, *CDKL5* and *FOXG1*, have been shown to be associated with atypical variants.

Clinical laboratories may develop and validate tests in-house and market them as a laboratory service; laboratory-developed tests (LDTs) must meet the general regulatory standards of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act (CLIA). Genetic testing for Rett syndrome is available under the auspices of CLIA. Laboratories that offer LDTs must be licensed by CLIA for high-complexity testing. To date, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has chosen not to require any regulatory review of this test.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children’s Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual’s benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic testing for potential carriers and patients suspected of having Rett syndrome.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date

Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

According to a large reference laboratory, MECP2 testing for RTT has an analytic sensitivity for sequencing of 99% and for MLPA, 90%; analytic specificity is 99% for sequencing and for MLPA, 98%.

Huppke et al (2000) analyzed the MECP2 gene in 31 female patients diagnosed clinically with RTT. (13) Sequencing revealed mutations in 24 of the 31 patients (77%). Of the 7 patients in whom no mutations were found, 5 fulfilled criteria for classical RTT. In this study, 17 different mutations were detected, 11 of which had not been previously described. Several females carrying the same mutation displayed different phenotypes, suggesting that factors other than the type or position of mutations influenced the severity of RTT.

Cheadle et al (2000) analyzed mutations in 48 females with classical sporadic RTT, 7 families with possible familial RTT, and 5 sporadic females with features suggestive, but not diagnostic, of RTT. (14) The entire MECP2 gene was sequenced in all cases. Mutations were identified in 44 (80%) of 55 unrelated classical sporadic and familial RTT patients. Only 1 (20%) of 5 sporadic cases with suggestive but nondiagnostic features of RTT had mutations identified. Twenty-one different mutations were identified (12 missense, 4 nonsense, and 5 frame-shift mutations); 14 of the mutations identified were novel. Significantly milder disease was noted in patients carrying missense mutations as compared with those with truncating mutations.

The 2 studies previously outlined were included in a summary of 6 articles by Lotan et al (2006) who attempted to disclose a genotype-phenotype correlation (3). The authors found that these studies have yielded inconsistent results and that further controlled studies are needed before valid conclusions can be drawn about the effect of mutation type on phenotypic expression. Two subsequent studies (15, 16) used the InterRett database to examine genotype and RTT severity. Of 357 girls with epilepsy who had MECP2 genotype recorded, those with large deletions were more likely than those with 10 other common mutations to have active epilepsy (odds ratio [OR], 3.71; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.13 to 12.17; p=0.03) and had the earliest median age at epilepsy onset (3 years, 5 months). Among all girls in the database, those with large deletions were more likely to have never walked (OR=0.42; 95% CI, 0.22 to 0.79; p=0.007). Of 260 girls with classic RTT enrolled in the multicenter RTT Natural History study (NCT00299312), those with the R133C substitution mutation had clinically less severe disease, assessed by the Clinical Severity, Motor Behavior Analysis, and Physician Summary scales. Fabio et al (2014) reported similar genotype-phenotype correlations among 144 patients with RTT in Italy.

Evidence from several small studies has indicated that the clinical sensitivity of genetic testing for classical RTT is reasonably high, in the range of 75% to 80%. However, sensitivity may be lower when classic RTT features are absent. Clinical specificity is unknown, but also is likely to be high, as only rare cases of MECP2 mutations have been reported in other clinical phenotypes, including individuals with an Angelman-like picture, non-syndromic X-linked intellectual disability, PPM-X syndrome, autism, and neonatal encephalopathy.

The clinical utility of genetic testing can be considered in the following clinical situations: (1) individuals with suspected RTT, (2) family members of individuals with RTT, and (3) prenatal testing for mothers with a previous RTT child. These situations will be discussed separately next.

The clinical utility for these patients depends on the ability of genetic testing to make a definitive diagnosis and for that diagnosis to lead to management changes that improve outcomes. No studies were identified

that described how a molecular diagnosis of RTT changed patient management. Therefore, there is no direct evidence for the clinical utility of genetic testing in these patients.

There is no specific treatment for RTT, so making a definitive diagnosis will not lead to treatment that alters the natural history of the disorder. There are several potential ways in which adjunctive management might be changed after genetic confirmation of the diagnosis:

- Further diagnostic testing may be avoided
- Referral to a specialist(s) may be made
- Heightened surveillance for Rett-associated clinical manifestations, such as scoliosis or cardiac arrhythmias may be performed
- More appropriate tailoring of ancillary treatments such as occupational therapy may be possible

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0234U	MECP2 (methyl CpG binding protein 2) (eg, Rett syndrome), full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions
81302	MECP2 (methyl CpG binding protein 2) (eg, Rett syndrome) gene analysis; full sequence analysis
81303	MECP2 (methyl CpG binding protein 2) (eg, Rett syndrome) gene analysis; known familial variant
81304	MECP2 (methyl CpG binding protein 2) (eg, Rett syndrome) gene analysis; duplication/deletion variants
81470	X-linked intellectual disability (XLID) (eg, syndromic and non-syndromic XLID); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 60 genes, including ARX, ATRX, CDKL5, FGD1, FMR1, HUWE1, IL1RAPL, KDM5C, L1CAM, MECP2, MED12, MID1, OCRL, RPS6KA3, and SLC16A2
81471	X-linked intellectual disability (XLID) (eg, syndromic and non-syndromic XLID); duplication/deletion gene analysis, must include analysis of at least 60 genes, including ARX, ATRX, CDKL5, FGD1, FMR1, HUWE1, IL1RAPL, KDM5C, L1CAM, MECP2, MED12, MID1, OCRL, RPS6KA3, and SLC16A2
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

HCPCS CODES

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. AAP publications retired and reaffirmed. Pediatrics. Dec 2007, reaffirmed in 2010 and 2014; 126: e1622. PMID
2. Amir RE, Sutton VR, Van den Veyver IB. Newborn screening and prenatal diagnosis for Rett syndrome: implications for therapy. J Child Neurol. Sep 2005; 20(9):779-783. PMID 16225835
3. Archer H, Evans J, Leonard H, et al. Correlation between clinical severity in patients with Rett syndrome with a pR168X or pT158M MECP2 mutation, and the direction and degree of skewing of X-chromosome inactivation. J Med Genet. Feb 2007;44(2):148-152. PMID 16905679
4. ARUP Laboratories. Rett Syndrome (MECP2): sequencing and deletion/duplication. http://ltd.aruplab.com/Tests/Pub/0051614. Accessed August 2014.
5. ARUP Laboratories. Rett Syndrome (MECP2): sequencing and deletion/duplication. http://ltd.aruplab.com/Tests/Pub/0051614.
6. Accessed November 2015
7. Bao X, Downs J, Wong K, et al. Using a large international sample to investigate epilepsy in Rett syndrome. Dev Med Child Neurol. Jun 2013; 55(6):553-558. PMID 23421866

8. Bebbington A, Downs J, Percy A, et al. The phenotype associated with a large deletion on MECP2. Eur J Hum Genet. Sep 2012; 20(9):921-927. PMID 22473088
9. Cheadle JP, Gill H, Fleming N, et al. Long-read sequence analysis of the MECP2 gene in Rett syndrome patients: correlation of disease severity with mutation type and location. Hum Mol Genet. Apr 12, 2000; 9(7):1119-1129. PMID 10767337
10. Cuddapah VA, Pillai RB, Shekar KV, et al. Methyl-CpG-binding protein 2 (MECP2) mutation type is associated with disease severity in Rett syndrome. J Med Genet. Mar 2014;51(3):152-158. PMID 24399845
11. Fabio RA, Colombo B, Russo S, et al. Recent insights into genotype-phenotype relationships in patients with Rett syndrome using a fine grain scale. Res Dev Disabil. Aug 11, 2014;35(11):2976-2986. PMID 25124696
12. Guy J, Gan J, Selfridge J, et al. Reversal of neurological defects in a mouse model of Rett syndrome. Science. Feb 23, 2007; 315(5815):1143-1147. PMID 17289941
13. Huppke P, Laccone F, Kramer N, et al. Rett syndrome: analysis of MECP2 and clinical characterization of 31 patients. Hum Mol Genet. May 22, 2000; 9(9):1369-1375. PMID 10814718
14. Johnson CP, Myers SM. Identification and evaluation of children with autism spectrum disorders. Pediatrics. Nov 2007;120(5):1183-1215. PMID 17967920
15. Lane JB, Lee HS, Smith LW, et al. Clinical severity and quality of life in children and adolescents with Rett syndrome. Neurology. Nov 15, 2011; 77(20):1812-1818. PMID 22013176
16. Liyanage VR, Rastegar M. Rett syndrome and MeCP2. Neuromolecular Med. Jun 2014;16(2):231-264. PMID 24615633
17. Lotan M, Ben-Zeev B. Rett syndrome. A review with emphasis on clinical characteristics and intervention. ScientificWorldJournal. 2006; 6:1517-1541. PMID 17160339
18. Michelson DJ, Shevell MI, Sherr EH, et al. Evidence report: Genetic and metabolic testing on children with global developmental delay: report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology and the Practice Committee of the Child Neurology Society. Neurology. Oct 25, 2011; 77(17):1629-1635. PMID 21956720
19. Neul JL, Kaufmann WE, Glaze DG, et al. Rett syndrome: revised diagnostic criteria and nomenclature. Ann Neurol. Dec 2010;68(6):944-950. PMID 21154482
20. Robinson L, Guy J, McKay L, et al. Morphological and functional reversal of phenotypes in a mouse model of Rett syndrome. Brain. Sep 2012; 135(Pt 9):2699-2710. PMID 22525157
21. Schaefer GB, Mendelsohn NJ. Clinical genetics evaluation in identifying the etiology of autism spectrum disorders: 2013 guideline revisions. Genet Med. May 2013;15(5):399-407. PMID 23519317
22. Suter B, Treadwell-Deering D, Zoghbi HY, et al. Brief report: MECP2 mutations in people without Rett syndrome. J Autism Dev Disord. Mar 2014;44(3):703-711. PMID 23921973
23. Weaving LS, Williamson SL, Bennetts B, et al. Effects of MECP2 mutation type, location and X-inactivation in modulating Rett syndrome phenotype. Am J Med Genet A. Apr 15, 2003;118A(2):103-114. PMID 12655490
24. Williamson SL, Christodoulou J. Rett syndrome: new clinical and molecular insights. Eur J Hum Genet. Aug 2006; 14(8):896-903. PMID 16865103

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: SEPTIN 9 (SEPT9) METHYLATED DNA DETECTION FOR COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING

Policy # 521

Implementation Date:	1/28/13
Review Dates:	2/20/14, 3/19/15, 2/11/16, 2/16/17, 2/15/18, 2/10/19, 3/14/23
Revision Dates:	7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is a common and lethal disease. Approximately 15%–20% of patients have distant metastatic disease at the time of presentation. Colon and rectal cancers (CRC) can spread by lymphatic and hematogenous dissemination, as well as by contiguous and transperitoneal routes. Although CRC mortality has been progressively declining since 1990 at a rate of about 3% per year, it remains the second most common cause of cancer death in the US.

Age is a major risk factor for sporadic CRC. It is a rare diagnosis before the age of 40; the incidence begins to increase significantly between the ages of 40 and 50, and age-specific incidence rates increase in each succeeding decade thereafter. The lifetime incidence of CRC in patients at average risk is about 5%, with 90% of cases occurring after age 50. The incidence is higher in patients with specific inherited conditions that predispose them to the development of CRC.

Colorectal cancer in the early stages is largely asymptomatic and frequently can be cured by surgery alone. Survival rates are much better when diagnosed and treated at an early stage. Thus, screening for early colorectal cancer is recommended beginning at age 50 for those with no risk factors other than age. The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommends screening for colorectal cancer using high-sensitivity fecal occult blood testing, iFOBT, sigmoidoscopy, or colonoscopy beginning at age 50 years and continuing until age 75 years. People at higher risk of developing colorectal cancer should begin screening at a younger age and may need to be tested more frequently. The decision to be screened after age 75 should be made on an individual basis.

Recently, another test has been suggested as a screening test for colorectal cancer. The Septin 9 (SEPT9) test is a blood-based test that can be performed as a step-in early detection of colorectal cancer. The assay is able to detect a marker in blood plasma specific to colorectal cancer. If the marker is detected in the sample, there is an increased likelihood of having colorectal cancer. In this case, the patient should undergo a colonoscopy to confirm the diagnosis or as a first step in therapeutic treatment.

ARUP laboratories, who performs the SEPT9 test, notes that the overall performance of the assay based on case-control studies performed in other laboratories has been determined to be 60% to 70% sensitivity and 89% specificity. Quest Diagnostics' estimates for ColoVantage (their methylated Septin 9 test) are also 70% sensitivity and 89% specificity. This test, however, has a low sensitivity for identifying precancerous polyps.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

SelectHealth does NOT cover Septin 9 DNA methylation testing as a screening test for colon cancer; it is considered experimental/investigational, and therefore, not medically necessary.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

A technology assessment of the Septin 9 test completed in December 2012 identified no systematic reviews of Septin 9 DNA methylation testing for colon cancer screening. There are several reviews on this topic regarding the role of methylation in cancers, and the enhanced capability of detecting methylated DNA, which improves the sensitivity for Septin 9 in colon cancer screening.

The primary literature, as listed in the table below, evaluated Septin 9 in control patients and those with known colon cancer. These validation studies found a range of 73–90% sensitivity and 90% specificity for colon cancer detection, depending on the stage of colon cancer and if “newer technology” was utilized. Similarly, Ahlquist et al. evaluated a new stool DNA test comparing this method of screening to Septin 9 methylation testing. In this comparative trial, the results showed 87% sensitivity and 93% specificity for stool DNA testing, and 60% sensitivity and 73% specificity for Septin 9 for all colon cancers.

Septin 9 Study Results Findings

Author	N	Sensitivity-SEPT9-Adenomas (%)	Specificity-SEPT9-Adenomas (%)	Sensitivity-SEPT9-Cancers (%)	Specificity SEPT9-Cancers (%)
Ahlquist et al.	30	14	NR*	60	
deVos et al.	269	NR	NR	72	68
Grutzmann et al.	354	NR	NR	72	90
Lofton-Day et al.	312	NR	NR	52	95
Tanzer et al.	128	NR	NR	70	90
Toth et al.	184	NR	NR	79.3	98.9
Warren et al.	144	NR	NR	90	88
Sum	1424				

*NR=not reported

However, as the table demonstrates, the studies evaluating benign adenomatous polyps were limited. The article by Tanzer et al. stated that the detection rate was 19% for adenomatous or villous polyps > 10 mm if Septin 9 testing was performed. Ahlquist's results comparing stool DNA (sDNA) testing and Septin 9 showed a sensitivity of 82% for sDNA and 14% for Septin 9. The authors speculated that Septin 9 DNA did not migrate thru the basement membrane and into the bloodstream until vascular invasion had occurred. This theory could explain the low sensitivity for adenomatous polyp detection by Septin 9.

Only one article compared other non-invasive tests with Septin 9. Toth et al. evaluated 92 patients with CRC utilizing gFOBT, CEA, or Septin 9. The sensitivity was 68%, 52%, and 73% respectively. Specificity for Septin 9 was 85%, 71% for gFOBT, and 85% for CEA. No comparative data for adenomatous polyps was found utilizing CEA or gFOBT.

One prospective trial, PRESEPT reported in 2010 evaluated 8000 asymptomatic patients. This trial found a 67% detection rate and a false positive rate of 11% for colon-rectal cancers. Since this trial, "newer methods" for detecting DNA methylation are utilized.

Current evidence is primarily focused on Septin 9 testing in the assessment of colon cancer. However, the intention of colon cancer is to detect pre-malignant polypoid disease and thus prevent colon cancer from developing. Current evidence suggests Septin 9 to have low sensitivity/specificity for this purpose. In addition, there is a lack of large randomized prospective studies comparing approved screening methods with Septin 9 testing and prospective data evaluating potential reductions in colon cancer and colon cancer mortality, with Septin 9 testing limits being the support of this testing method.

A 2016 literature search found limited new literature since the last review related to the utility of Septin 9 versus current methods of colorectal cancer (CRC) screening.

Jin et al. (2015) describe the performance of a newer iteration of the Septin 9 screening test that has better sensitivity and specificity for CRC of 74.8% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 67.0–81.6%) and 87.4% (vs non-CRC, 95% CI: 83.5–90.6%), respectively, and suggest that it may play a role in CRC screening/early detection. This is compared to sensitivity of 68% and specificity of 80% for all stages of CRC (Potter et al., 2014). However, no study to demonstrate utility screening has yet been published.

Previously, Ladabaum et al. (2014) compared the cost-effectiveness of current colon cancer screening strategies in Germany (stool occult blood and colonoscopy) and found the standard strategies superior to Septin 9. They did find Septin 9 more cost effective than no screening, but state that it remains to be proven whether colorectal cancer screening with a blood test would improve screening uptake or long-term adherence compared with established strategies.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT Codes

81327 SEPT9 (Septin9) (eg, colorectal cancer) methylation analysis

HCPCS Codes

No specific codes identified

Key References

1. Ahlquist, DA, Taylor, WR, Mahoney, DW, et al. (2012). The stool DNA test is more accurate than the plasma septin 9 test in detecting colorectal neoplasia. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 10.3: 272-7 e1.
2. Ahnen, DJ. (2012) Clinical manifestations, diagnosis, and staging of colorectal cancer. July 16, 2012. Up to Date. Available: http://www.uptodate.com/contents/clinical-manifestations-diagnosis-and-staging-of-colorectal-cancer?source=search_result&search=colon+cancer&selectedTitle=1~150. Date Accessed: October 30, 2012.
3. American Cancer Society. (2012) American Cancer Society Guidelines for the Early Detection of Cancer. June 15, 2012. American Cancer Society. Available: http://www.cancer.org/healthy/findcancerearly/cancerscreeningguidelines/american-cancer-society-guidelines-for-the-early-detection-of-cancer. Date Accessed: October 30, 2012.
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2012) Colorectal (Colon) Cancer. January 27, 2011. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available: http://www.cdc.gov/cancer/colorectal/basic_info/screening/guidelines.htm#1. Date Accessed: October 31, 2012.
5. Epigenomics. (2009) The Septin 9 Test. Available: http://www.epiprocolon.com/fileadmin/site_files/02_epi_procolon/01_patients/en-septin9-test-patient-brochure-pdf.pdf. Date Accessed: October 31, 2012.
6. Epigenomics. (2010) PRESEPT Study Results Sponsored by Epigenomics AG Presented at Digestive Disease Week. Available: http://www.epigenomics.com/en/news-investors/news-media/press-releases/2010/article/ergebnisse-der-von-epigenomics-gesponserten-presept-studie-auf-digestive-disease-week-vorgestellt.html. Date Accessed: December 5, 2012.

7. Fletcher, RH. (2012) Tests for screening for colorectal cancer: Stool tests, radiologic imaging and endoscopy. October 8. Up to Date. Available: http://www.uptodate.com/contents/tests-for-screening-for-colorectal-cancer-stool-tests-radiologic-imaging-and-endoscopy?source=search_result&search=fecal+immunochemical+test&selectedTitle=1~150#PATIENT_INFORMATION. Date Accessed: October 31, 2012.
8. Grutzmann, R, Molnar, B, Pilarsky, C, et al. (2008). Sensitive detection of colorectal cancer in peripheral blood by septin 9 DNA methylation assay. PLoS One 3.11: e3759.
9. Hayes Directory. (2003) Immunochemical Fecal Occult Blood Testing. Winifred S. Hayes, Inc. Available: https://www.hayesinc.com/subscribers/displaySubscriberArticle.do?articleId=1962&targetList=searchArticles.do&query=%22fecal+immunochemical+test%22&icdQuery=&sd1=asearchRelevance&sd2=dtransformdatesort&sd3=atransformdoctype&sd4=atransformsort. Date Accessed: November 6, 2006.
10. Heichman, KA. (2012) Septin 9 (SEPT9) Methylated DNA Detection by Real-Time PCR. ARUP Laboratories. Available: http://www.aruplab.com/Testing-Information/resources/TechnicalBulletins/Septin%209%20%28SEPT9%29%20Methylated%20DNA%20Detection%20by%20Real-Time%20PCR.pdf. Date Accessed: October 31, 2012.
11. Jin, P., et al. (2015). "Performance of a second-generation methylated SEPT9 test in detecting colorectal neoplasm." J Gastroenterol Hepatol 30(5): 830-833.
12. Ladabaum, U., et al. (2014). "Cost-effectiveness of colorectal cancer screening in Germany: current endoscopic and fecal testing strategies versus plasma methylated Septin 9 DNA." Endosc Int Open 2(2): E96-E104.
13. Lawrence, S, Ahnen, D. (2005). Clinical manifestations, diagnosis, and staging of colorectal cancer. UpToDate http://www.utdol.com/.
14. Levin, B, Lieberman, DA, McFarland, B, et al. (2008). Screening and Surveillance for the Early Detection of Colorectal Cancer and Adenomatous Polyps, 2008: A Joint Guideline From the American Cancer Society, the US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer, and the American College of Radiology. Gastroenterology 134.5: 1570-1595.
15. Li, H, Du, Y, Zhang, D, et al. (2012). Identification of novel DNA methylation markers in colorectal cancer using MIRA-based microarrays. Oncol Rep 28.1: 99-104.
16. Lin, K. W. (2019). mSEPT9 Blood Test (Epi proColon) for Colorectal Cancer Screening. *American Family Physician*, 100(1): 10−11.
17. Lofton-Day, C, Model, F, Devos, T, et al. (2008). DNA methylation biomarkers for blood-based colorectal cancer screening. Clin Chem 54.2: 414-23.
18. Matzakos, T, Lawrence, S, Ahnen, D. (2005). Epidemiology and risk factors for colorectal cancer. UpToDate http://www.utdol.com/.
19. Mikeska, T, Bock, C, Do, H, et al. (2012). DNA methylation biomarkers in cancer: progress towards clinical implementation.
20. Potter, N. T., et al. (2014). "Validation of a real-time PCR-based qualitative assay for the detection of methylated SEPT9 DNA in human plasma." Clin Chem 60(9): 1183-1191.
21. Quest Diagnostics. (2012) ColoVantage (methylated Septin 9). Quest Diagnostics. Available: http://www.questdiagnostics.com/testcenter/testguide.action?dc=TH_Sept9_ColoVantage. Date Accessed: October 31, 2012.
22. Tanzer, M, Balluff, B, Distler, J, et al. (2010). Performance of epigenetic markers SEPT9 and ALX4 in plasma for detection of colorectal precancerous lesions. PLoS One 5.2: e9061.
23. Toth, K, Sipos, F, Kalmar, A, et al. (2012). Detection of Methylated SEPT9 in Plasma Is a Reliable Screening Method for Both Left- and Right-Sided Colon Cancers. PLoS One 7.9: e46000.
24. Warren, JD, Xiong, W, Bunker, AM, et al. (2011). Septin 9 methylated DNA is a sensitive and specific blood test for colorectal cancer. BMC Med 9: 133.
25. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. (2008) Screening for Colorectal Cancer. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Available: http://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf08/colocancer/colors.htm. Date Accessed: October 31, 2012.
26. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. (2012) Test Characteristics Used in the Microsimulation Screening Analysis and Simulation Model of Colorectal Cancer Models. USPSTF. Available: http://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf08/colocancer/cartzaubtab2.htm. Date Accessed: December 10, 2012.
27. Zauber, AG, Winawer, SJ, O'Brien, MJ, et al. (2012). Colonoscopic polypectomy and long-term prevention of colorectal-cancer deaths. N Engl J Med 366.8: 687-96.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

Genetic Testing: Septin9 (SEP9) Methylated DNA Detection for Colorectal Cancer Screening, **continued**

”Intermountain Healthcare” and its accompanying logo, the marks of “SelectHealth” and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: SPINAL MUSCULAR ATROPHY

Policy # 600
Implementation Date: 11/14/16
Review Dates: 12/21/17, 12/11/18, 4/5/23
Revision Dates: 9/17/18, 7/1/23

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for SelectHealth Commercial, SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Spinal Muscular Atrophy (SMA) disorders are characterized by degeneration of the anterior horn cells in the spinal cord and motor nuclei in the lower brainstem. These diseases are classified as types 1 through 4 depending upon the age of onset and clinical course.

SMA type 1, also known as infantile spinal muscular atrophy or Werdnig-Hoffmann disease, is the most common and severe type of SMA. It typically presents in the neonatal period. In these neonatal forms, symptoms progress rapidly, and most infants die before one year of age from respiratory failure. SMA 2 and SMA 3 (Kugelberg-Welander disease) have a later onset and a less severe course. SMA 2 presents between 3 and 15 months of age, whereas SMA 3, the least severe, typically presents with signs of weakness at or after one year of age and progresses to a chronic course. In a study of children and adolescents with SMA 2 and SMA 3, muscle strength was reduced to a variable extent. Although the muscle weakness affected motor function, walking, transfer from lying or sitting to the standing position, and stair-climbing were possible in some children. The outcome depends primarily upon the severity of muscle weakness at presentation rather than the age of onset, but earlier onset tends to correlate with greater weakness. Adult onset of SMA (type 4) usually presents in the second or third decade of life and is otherwise similar to SMA type 3. Though manifesting with some muscular weakness and gait dysfunction, these individuals tend to have a normal life span.

The inheritance pattern of SMAs is autosomal recessive. The different forms of SMA are caused by biallelic deletions or mutations in the survival motor neuron 1 (SMN1) gene on chromosome 5q13.2. The most common mutation of the SMN1 gene is a deletion of exon 7. Approximately 94 percent of patients with clinically typical SMA carry homozygous deletions of exon 7. SMN protein appears to play a role in mRNA synthesis in motor neurons and may also inhibit apoptosis. The level of SMN protein tends to correlate with the severity of the clinical manifestations.

The differences in SMN protein and phenotypic expression appear to be related in part to a modifying gene, called SMN2. The SMN1 and SMN2 genes are more than 99 percent identical and lie within an inverted duplication on chromosome 5q13.2. The SMN1 gene lies telomeric of the SMN2 gene. Loss of the SMN1 protein is partially compensated by SMN2 protein synthesis, a mechanism that may explain some, but not all, of the phenotypic variability in patients with SMA. The presence of three or more copies of SMN2 is associated with milder phenotypes, though, milder forms have also been found with only 2 copies of SMN2 gene.

The differential diagnosis of infantile SMA1 includes other causes of floppy infants. Of particular importance are the following conditions: arthrogryposis multiplex congenital, X-linked infantile spinal muscular atrophy, congenital myasthenic syndromes, congenital myopathies, hypoxic-ischemic myelopathy, lysosomal acid maltase deficiency, Prader-Willi syndrome, traumatic myelopathy, Zellweger syndrome, and conditions that affect the anterior horn cells of the spinal cord.

Genetic Testing: Spinal Muscularatrophy, **continued**

Genetic testing is performed to exclude this condition as some of the other conditions noted in the differential diagnosis have specific treatments, and exclusion of this condition may allow for more appropriate therapy beyond supportive care, especially for the SMA1 and SMA2 individuals.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. SelectHealth covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

SelectHealth covers genetic testing and carrier testing for spinal muscular atrophy (SMN1 and SMN2) to diagnose infants suspected of having spinal muscular atrophy who have manifested symptoms suggestive of the disorder.

SelectHealth Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SelectHealth Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the SelectHealth Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Spinal muscular atrophy (SMA) is the second most common fatal autosomal recessive disorder after cystic fibrosis, with an estimated carrier frequency of 1/40 to 1/60 in the general population. SMA affects alpha motor neurons in the spinal cord; degeneration of these neurons leads to severe, progressive proximal muscle weakness. Based on age of onset and clinical course, 4 phenotypes are observed: In type 1 SMA (Werdnig-Hoffmann), severe, generalized muscle weakness and hypotonia are present at birth or within 3 months, and death from respiratory failure usually occurs before age 2 years. In type 2 SMA, children can sit, although they are unable to stand or walk unaided; survival is typically beyond age 4 years. Type 3 SMA (Kugelberg-Welander) is a milder form—patients can walk unaided—with onset during infancy or youth. There is no effective treatment for SMA. Type 4 SMA manifests in the third or fourth decade and may result in increased muscular weakness but has no impact on life span.

Genetic Testing: Spinal Muscularatrophy, **continued**

ACMG's 2008 guideline, reaffirmed in 2013, recommends carrier testing for SMA in all couples regardless of race or ethnicity. ACOG's 2017 Committee Opinion states: "Screening for spinal muscular atrophy should be offered to all women who are considering pregnancy or are currently pregnant."

The evidence for carrier testing in individuals who are asymptomatic but at risk for having an offspring with a genetic disease includes mutation prevalence studies, general principles of carrier testing, and accepted practice guidelines from major medical societies; the evidence provides a framework for evaluating these tests because direct evidence on outcomes with carrier testing is lacking. Relevant outcomes are test accuracy, test validity, and changes in reproductive decision making. Reported analytic validity (technical accuracy) of targeted carrier screening tests is high. Changes in management involve family planning. Results of genetic testing can be used to assist individuals with reproductive decisions such as avoidance of pregnancy, preimplantation genetic testing, and adoption. Therefore, the evidence is sufficient to determine qualitatively that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

The evidence for expanded carrier testing in individuals who are asymptomatic but at risk for having offspring with a genetic disease includes mutation prevalence studies—direct evidence is lacking. Relevant outcomes are test accuracy, test validity, and changes in reproductive decision making. Analytic validity of expanded carrier screening panels is unknown. These panels have significant limitations, including increased false positives and variants of uncertain significance due to testing for many mutations, false negatives due to rare mutations not included in panel testing, the inclusion of diseases with decreased penetrance and variable expressivity, and difficulties with communicating residual risk and action ability of information obtained. Therefore, the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0236U	SMN1 (survival of motor neuron 1, telomeric) and SMN2 (survival of motor neuron 2, centromeric) (eg, spinal muscular atrophy) full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, duplications, deletions, and mobile element
81173	AR (androgen receptor) (eg, spinal and bulbar muscular atrophy, Kennedy disease, X chromosome inactivation) gene analysis; full gene sequence
81174	AR (androgen receptor) (eg, spinal and bulbar muscular atrophy, Kennedy disease, X chromosome inactivation) gene analysis; known familial variant insertions
81336	SMN1 (survival of motor neuron 1, telomeric) (eg, spinal muscular atrophy) gene analysis; full gene sequence
81337	SMN1 (survival of motor neuron 1, telomeric) (eg, spinal muscular atrophy) gene analysis; known familial sequence variant(s)
81329	SMN1 (survival of motor neuron 1, telomeric) (eg, spinal muscular atrophy) gene analysis; dosage/deletion analysis (eg, carrier testing), includes SMN2 (survival of motor neuron 2, centromeric) analysis, if performed

HCPCS CODES

G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Carrier screening for genetic conditions. Committee Opinion No. 691. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Obstet Gynecol 2017; 129:341–55.
2. UpToDate – Spinal Muscular Atrophy; accessed on 11/4/16

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract.

Genetic Testing: Spinal Muscularatrophy, **continued**

Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

SelectHealth® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. SelectHealth updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or SelectHealth members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call SelectHealth Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from SelectHealth.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "SelectHealth" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and SelectHealth, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

GENETIC TESTING: TP53 MUTATION ANALYSIS FOR B-CELL CHRONIC LYMPHOCYTIC LEUKEMIA (B-CLL)

Policy # 328

Implementation Date: 12/12/06

Review Dates: 12/20/07, 12/18/08, 12/19/09, 8/16/11, 8/16/12, 8/15/13, 6/19/14, 6/11/15, 6/16/16, 6/15/17, 9/18/18, 8/8/19, 2/14/23

Revision Dates: 6/11/10, 7/1/23, 2/9/24

Related Medical Policies:

#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the “Policy” section for more information.

Description

Chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL) is a disorder characterized by a progressive accumulation of functionally incompetent lymphocytes. It is the most common form of leukemia found in adults in Western countries. From 1973 to 1987, CLL accounted for 31% of all leukemias in the United States, with most cases reported in individuals older than 55 years. Most patients live 5–10 years, with an initial course that is relatively benign, followed by a terminal progressive and resistant phase, lasting 1–2 years. During the later phase, morbidity is considerable, both from the disease and from complications of therapy.

Minimum requirements for the diagnosis of CLL include an absolute lymphocyte count in the peripheral blood > 10,000/µL, with a preponderant population of morphologically mature-appearing small lymphocytes, and a normocellular to hypercellular bone marrow with lymphocytes accounting for > 30% of all nucleated cells. Depending on the place in lymphocytic cell development in which the malignant transformation occurs, the leukemic cells may be principally B cells, T cells, or NK cells; most patients have a B cell type of leukemia.

Many patients with CLL may have lymphocytosis that remains stable for many years, without evidence of disease progression. Survival in this population may be similar to age and sex-matched normal individuals. For these patients, a period of observation is recommended. Immediate treatment is indicated in patients developing anemia and/or thrombocytopenia, disease-related symptoms such as weakness, night sweats, weight loss, painful lymphadenopathy and fever, progressive disease (as demonstrated by increasing lymphocytosis with a lymphocyte doubling time less than 6 months), and/or rapidly enlarging lymph nodes, spleen, and liver, or autoimmune hemolytic anemia and/or thrombocytopenia that are poorly responsive to corticosteroid therapy or repeated episodes of infection secondary to hypogammaglobulinemia.

The goals and duration of therapy for CLL are poorly defined, and there is no evidence that intensification or maintenance therapy is of benefit. If patients are tolerating and responding to treatment, it appears reasonable to continue therapy until either complete remission has been reached, continued improvement is no longer noted, or an unacceptable degree of toxicity develops.

Genomic aberrations occur in over 80% of B-CLL cases and can be correlated with disease outcome. The p53 gene is a tumor suppressor gene. Mutations in p53 are found in most tumor types, and so contribute to the complex network of molecular events leading to tumor formation. The p53 gene stops the formation of tumors by inducing apoptosis in mutated cells.

Approximately 10%–15% of CLL patients can have p53 mutations, and another 7%–10% of CLL patients can have a p53 deletion (17p-). Patients may have p53 mutations, a p53 deletion, or both. Among CLL

patients with p53 mutations or deletions, survival is generally shorter. The median survival of patients with abnormal p53 is estimated at 6–31 months versus those patients without p53 abnormalities exceeds 100 months. Moreover, response to standard chemotherapies is often less effective in CLL patients with p53 mutations and/or deletions. Finally, chemotherapy itself can cause p53 gene alterations, such that even if not present at initial diagnosis, refractory CLL can exhibit new alterations of p53.

The current method for testing for p53 abnormalities uses fluorescent in-situ hybridization (FISH), which utilizes probes targeted at specific p53 loci to detect gene deletions. FISH is relatively insensitive to mutations; however, these may also be present in some B-CLL patients. In August 2006, Genzyme Corporation introduced p53 Mutation Analysis; FISH analysis would still be required to detect a deletion of the 17p chromosome.

Additional evidence has shown that patients with CLL and the p53 deletion will not respond as well to fludarabine, an alkylator, and possibly rituximab.

Other laboratories such as ARUP also offer a FISH analysis which combines p53, ATM (11q) deletion, Trisomy 12, and 13q14 deletion; P53, 11q deletions are unfavorable mutations for prolonged survival. Trisomy 12 is a neutral prognostic marker and patients with 13q14 deletion have a favorable prognosis.

Local physicians have endorsed use of these tests to assist in clinical decision-making. Patients lacking the deleterious mutations would have chemotherapy delayed, avoiding cost and toxicity. Similarly, patients with markers toward aggressive CLL, and especially of young age, would have treatment initiated earlier.

Since the p53 deletion has created resistance to certain chemotherapeutic agents, this test would be a clinical predictor towards treatment. NCCN endorses use of these markers in patients with CLL.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

Select Health covers TP53 mutation testing, or a full NGS panel for prognostic purposes at the time of diagnosis, in patients with B-cell chronic lymphocytic leukemia (B-CLL).

Select Health considers a full NGS panel for evaluation of MRD (minimal residual disease) assessment to be NOT medically necessary.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

The 13 studies that were identified for this review generally support the association between p53 aberrations and B-CLL prognosis and treatment response. Döhner et al., for example, found that B-CLL patients with p53 deletions had a significantly shorter interval between treatments (59 vs. 396 days) and shorter median survival (2.1 years vs. 10.3 years) than unaffected patients. In Shaw et al., patients with p53 deletions were more likely to have advanced disease at the time of specimen collection and to have poorer treatment response. Clinical stage and p53 status were the only independent predictors of all-cause and disease-related mortality. El Rouby et al. found that 87% of B-CLL patients with p53 mutations required therapy at the time of diagnosis with 14% achieving partial remission whereas only 64% of patients without p53 mutations required initial therapy with 93% achieving partial remission (p = 0.00009). Patients with p53 mutations also had a 13-fold higher risk of death than patients without mutations matched for age, sex, race, and Rai stage. Finally, Cordone et al. found that 70% of patients with p53 mutations required therapy while 47% of mutation-negative patients required initial therapy. Mutation-positive patients experienced poorer response to chemotherapy and steroids than did the mutation-negative patients. Patients with p53 mutations had significantly shorter survival times than did those with mutations. The relative risk of dying was 4.4 times higher in patients with p53 mutations compared to those with normal p53 functioning.

In contrast, Sturm et al. found that p53 polymorphisms at codon 72 did not predict treatment resistance or overall survival. Similarly, Barnabas et al. found that p53 mutations did not predict stage of disease or treatment response. Finally, Lazaridou et al. found that survival did not differ between B-CLL patients with p53 mutations and those without.

One study examined the impact of various therapeutic agents on B-CLL remission rates in patients with and without p53 mutations and deletions. Lozanski et al. treated both groups with the humanized anti-CD52 antibody alemtuzumab and reported that 6 of 15 patients (40%) with p53 mutations or deletions vs. 4 of 21 of patients without (19%) attained complete response to therapy. The small sample size prevented statistical comparisons, but this study does suggest that targeted drug therapies may improve the prognosis for patients with p53 mutations or deletions. Additional research, including randomized studies, is needed, however, to determine whether such targeted treatments are indeed effective for persons with p53 mutations and deletions and whether identification of such patients in routine clinical practice produces any practical changes to clinical decision-making or treatment outcomes.

A literature review performed in June 2010 identified additional evidence which has shown that patients with CLL and the p53 deletion will not respond as well to fludarabine, an alkylator, and possibly rituximab. Byrd et al. identified the differential protein binding of flavopiridol in human and bovine serum contributed to an effective pharmacokinetic-derived schedule of administration of this agent. On the basis of pharmacokinetic modeling, using our in vitro results and data from a previous trial, we initiated a phase 1 study using a 30-minute loading dose followed by 4 hours of infusion administered weekly for 4 of 6 weeks in patients with refractory CLL. A group of 42 patients were enrolled on 3 cohorts (cohort 1, 30 mg/m^2 loading dose followed by 30 mg/m^2 4-hour infusion; cohort 2, 40 mg/m^2 loading dose followed by 40 mg/m^2 4-hour infusion; and cohort 3, cohort 1 dose for treatments 1 to 4, then a 30 mg/m^2 loading dose followed by a 50 mg/m^2 4-hour infusion). The dose-limiting toxicity using this novel schedule was hyperacute tumor lysis syndrome. Aggressive prophylaxis and exclusion of patients with leukocyte counts greater than 200x10(9)/L have made this drug safe to administer at the cohort 3 dose. Of the 42 patients treated, 19 (45%) achieved a partial response with a median response duration that exceeds 12 months. Responses were noted in patients with genetically high-risk disease, including 5 (42%) of 12 patients with del(17p13.1) and 13 (72%) of 18 patients with del(11q22.3). Flavopiridol administered using this novel schedule has significant clinical activity in refractory CLL. Patients with bulky disease and high-risk genetic features have achieved durable responses, thereby justifying further study of flavopiridol in CLL and other diseases.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: TP53 Mutation Analysis for B-Cell Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia (B-CLL), continued

Lin et al. conducted a phase I study of flavopiridol, fludarabine, and rituximab (FFR) in patients with mantle-cell lymphoma (MCL), indolent B-cell non-Hodgkin's lymphomas (B-NHL), and CLL to determine the activity of FFR. Therapy included fludarabine 25 mg/m^2 intravenously (IV) days 1 to 5 and rituximab 375 mg/m^2 day 1 every 28 days for 6 cycles. We administered flavopiridol 50 mg/m^2 by 1-hour IV bolus (IVB) day 1 (n = 15); day 1 to 2 (n = 6); 20 mg/m^2 30-minute IVB + 20 mg/m^2 4-hour IV infusion (n = 3); or 30 mg/m^2 + 30 mg/m^2 (n = 14). Thirty-eight patients (median age, 62 years) with MCL (n = 10); indolent B-NHL including follicular (n = 9), marginal zone (n = 4), lymphoplasmacytic (n = 1), or small lymphocytic lymphoma (n = 3); and CLL (n = 11), were enrolled. Twenty-two patients were previously untreated; 16 had received one to two prior therapies. Two patients in cohort 2 developed grade 3 dose-limiting toxicity (seizures, renal insufficiency). The median number of treatment cycles was 4, with cytopenias (n = 10) and fatigue (n = 3) the most common reasons for early discontinuation. Overall response rate was 82% (complete response, 50%; unconfirmed complete response, 5%; partial response, 26%), including 80% of patients with MCL (median age, 68; seven complete responses, one partial response). Median progression-free survival (PFS) was 25.6 months. Median PFS of patients with nonblastoid variant MCL (n = 8) was 35.9 months. They concluded that FFR was active in MCL, indolent B-NHL, and CLL, and should be studied for older patients with MCL, who are not candidates for aggressive chemotherapy.

Laboratories such as ARUP also offer a FISH analysis which combines p53, ATM (11q) deletion, Trisomy 12, and 13q14 deletion. P53(11q) deletion are unfavorable mutations for prolonged survival. Trisomy 12 is a neutral prognostic marker and patients with 13q14 deletion have a favorable prognosis.

Patients lacking the deleterious mutations would have chemotherapy delayed, avoiding cost and toxicity. Similarly, patients with markers toward aggressive CLL and especially of young age would have treatment initiated earlier. Since the p53 deletion has created resistance to certain chemotherapeutic agents, this test would be a clinical predictor towards treatment.

Further, a study by Rossi et al. (2013) of 1274 CLL samples continues to support the utility of p53 mutation status as a prognostic marker for CLL. Another study by these authors (Rossi et al., 2014) showed that even small populations of p53 mutated clones (< 20) confer the same poor prognosis as homogeneous p53 mutated CLL, suggesting consideration of these smaller subclones in clinical care.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

81351 TP53 (tumor protein 53) (eg, Li-Fraumeni syndrome) gene analysis; full gene sequence

81352 TP53 (tumor protein 53) (eg, Li-Fraumeni syndrome) gene analysis; targeted sequence analysis (eg, 4 oncology)

81353 TP53 (tumor protein 53) (eg, Li-Fraumeni syndrome) gene analysis; known familial variant

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

HCPCS CODES

G0452 Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. 1. Alvi AJ, Austen B, Weston VJ, et al. (2005). A novel CDK inhibitor, CYC202 (R-roscovitine), overcomes the defect in p53-dependent apoptosis in B-CLL by down-regulation of genes involved in transcription regulation and survival. Blood 105.11: 4484-91.
2. Amiel A, Arbov L, Manor Y, et al. (1997). Monoallelic p53 deletion in chronic lymphocytic leukemia detected by interphase cytogenetics. Cancer Genet Cytogenet 97.2: 97-100.
3. Barnabas N, Shurafa M, Van Dyke DL, et al. (2001). Significance of p53 mutations in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia: a sequential study of 30 patients. Cancer 91.2: 285-93.
4. Bouley J, Deriano L, Delic J, Merle-Beral H. (2006). New molecular markers in resistant B-CLL. Leuk Lymphoma 47.5: 791-801.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

5. Byrd JC, Lin TS, Dalton JT, et al. (2007). Flavopiridol administered using a pharmacologically derived schedule is associated with marked clinical efficacy in refractory, genetically high-risk chronic lymphocytic leukemia. Blood; 109:399.
6. Cordone I, Masi S, Mauro FR, et al. (1998). p53 expression in B-cell chronic lymphocytic leukemia: a marker of disease progression and poor prognosis. Blood 91.11:4342-9.
7. Dohner H, Fischer K, Bentz M, et al. (1995). p53 gene deletion predicts for poor survival and non-response to therapy with purine analogs in chronic B-cell leukemias. Blood 85.6: 1580-9.
8. el Rouby S, Thomas A, Costin D, et al. (1993). p53 gene mutation in B-cell chronic lymphocytic leukemia is associated with drug resistance and is independent of MDR1/MDR3 gene expression. Blood 82.11: 3452-9.
9. Fenaux P, Preudhomme C, Lai JL, et al. (1992). Mutations of the p53 gene in B-cell chronic lymphocytic leukemia: a report on 39 cases with cytogenetic analysis. Leukemia 6.4: 246-50.
10. Gaidano G, Ballerini P, Gong JZ, et al. (1991). p53 mutations in human lymphoid malignancies: association with Burkitt lymphoma and chronic lymphocytic leukemia. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 88.12: 5413-7.
11. Genzyme Corporation. (2006). p53 Mutation Analysis in B-Cell Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia (B-CLL).. Available: http://www.genzymegenetics.com/testmenu/tests/cancer/gene_p_testmenu_can_test_p53.asp. Date Accessed: September 27, 2006.
12. Gribben, JG. (2010). How I treat CLL up front. Blood 2010; 115:187.
13. Lazaridou A, Miraxtsi C, Korantzis J, et al. (2000). Simultaneous detection of BCL-2 protein, trisomy 12, retinoblastoma and P53 monoallelic gene deletions in B-cell chronic lymphocytic leukemia by fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH): relation to disease status. Leuk Lymphoma 36.5-6: 503-12.
14. Lin TS, Fischer B, Moran ME, et al. (2006). Flavopiridol, fludarabine and rituximab (FFR) is an active regimen in indolent B-cell lymphoproliferative disorders and mantle cell lymphoma (MCL). J Clin Oncol; 24:446s.
15. Lozanski G, Heerema NA, Flinn IW, et al. (2004). Alemtuzumab is an effective therapy for chronic lymphocytic leukemia with p53 mutations and deletions. Blood 103.9: 3278-81.
16. National Center for Biotechnology Information. (2006). The p53 tumor suppressor protein. National Institutes of Health. Available: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/bv.fcgi?call=bv.View.ShowSection&rid=gnd.section.107. Date Accessed: October 23, 2006.
17. Perry M, Rasool H. (2006). Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia. EMedicine Website. Available: http://www.emedicine.com/med/topic370.htm. Date Accessed: September 27, 2006.
18. Pettitt AR, Sherrington PD, Cawley JC. (1999). The effect of p53 dysfunction on purine analogue cytotoxicity in chronic lymphocytic leukaemia. Br J Haematol 106.4: 1049-51.
19. Rai KR, Keating MJ. (2006). Clinical manifestations and diagnosis of chronic lymphocytic leukemia. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=leukemia/12356&type=A&selectedTitle=1~43. Date Accessed: September 27, 2006.
20. Rai KR, Keating MJ. (2006). Pathophysiology and cytogenetics of chronic lymphocytic leukemia. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=leukemia/8301. Date Accessed: September 27, 2006.
21. Rai KR, Keating MJ. (2006). Treatment of chronic lymphocytic leukemia. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/utd/content/topic.do?topicKey=leukemia/9948. Date Accessed: September 27, 2006.
22. Rai KR, Keating MJ. (2009). Staging and prognosis of chronic lymphocytic leukemia. UpToDate. Available: http://www.utdol.com/online/content/topic.do?topicKey=leukemia/12607&selectedTitle=1%7E148&source=search_result. Date Accessed: June 1, 2010.
23. Rosenwald A, Chuang EY, Davis RE, et al. (2004). Fludarabine treatment of patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia induces a p53-dependent gene expression response." Blood 104.5: 1428-34.
24. Shaw GR, Kronberger DL. (2000). TP53 deletions but not trisomy 12 are adverse in B-cell lymphoproliferative disorders. Cancer Genet Cytogenet 119.2: 146-54.
25. Sturm I, Bosanquet AG, Hummel M, et al. (2005). In B-CLL, the codon 72 polymorphic variants of p53 are not related to drug resistance and disease prognosis. BMC Cancer 5: 105.
26. Rossi, D., et al. (2013). "Integrated mutational and cytogenetic analysis identifies new prognostic subgroups in chronic lymphocytic leukemia." Blood 121(8): 1403-1412.
27. Rossi, D., et al. (2014). "Clinical impact of small TP53 mutated subclones in chronic lymphocytic leukemia." Blood 123(14): 2139-2147.
28. Wierda, WG. (2006). Current and Investigational Therapies for Patients with CLL. Hematology Am Soc Hematol Educ Program :285.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Genetic Testing: TP53 Mutation Analysis for B-Cell Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia (B-CLL), **continued**

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

PHARMACOGENOMIC TESTING FOR DRUG METABOLISM

Policy # 590
Implementation Date: 1/16/17
Review Dates: 12/21/17, 12/13/18, 4/26/23
Revision Dates: 9/17/18, 7/1/23, 1/24/24

Related Medical Policies:
#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling
#426 Genetic Testing: (MTHFR) Polymorphisms in Cancer, Cardiovascular Disease, and Neural Tube Defects
#594 Genetic Testing: 5-Fluorouracil Testing in Cancer Patients

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Pharmacogenomics is a science that examines the inherited variations in genes that dictate drug response and explores the ways these variations can be used to predict whether a patient will have a good response to a drug, a bad response to a drug, or no response at all. The term comes from the words pharmacology and genomics and is thus the intersection of pharmaceuticals and genetics.

Various factors may influence the variability of drug effects, including age, liver function, concomitant diseases, nutrition, smoking, ethnicity and drug-drug interactions. Inherited (germline) DNA sequence variation (polymorphisms) in genes coding for drug metabolizing enzymes, drug receptors, drug transporters, and molecules involved in signal transduction pathways also may have major effects on the activity of those molecules and thus on the efficacy or toxicity of a drug. Potentially, test results could be used to optimize drug choice and/or dose for more effective therapy, avoid serious adverse effects, and decrease medical costs.

The cytochrome P450 family is a major subset of all drug-metabolizing enzymes; several CYP450 enzymes are involved in the metabolism of a significant portion of currently administered drugs. CYP2D6 metabolizes approximately 25% of all clinically used medications (e.g., dextromethorphan, beta blockers, anti-arrhythmics, antidepressants, and morphine derivatives), including many of the most prescribed drugs. CYP2C19 metabolizes several important drugs, including proton pump inhibitors, diazepam, propranolol, imipramine, and amitriptyline.

Many drugs are metabolized to varying degrees by more than one enzyme, either within or outside of the CYP450 superfamily. In addition, interaction between different metabolizing genes, interaction of genes and environment, and interactions among different non-genetic factors also influence gene metabolizing functions. Thus, identification of a variant in a single gene in the metabolic pathway may be insufficient in all but a small proportion of drugs to explain inter individual differences in metabolism and consequent efficacy or toxicity.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

Pharmacogenomic Testing for Drug Metabolism, **continued**

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a medical geneticist, a genetic counselor, or a provider with recognized expertise in the area being assessed; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

The following pharmacogenomic tests and indications are covered when the member meets the applicable criteria below**.**

Gene	Indication	Criteria
CYP2C19	**Clopidogrel use**	**Currently on clopidogrel therapy or use of clopidogrel therapy is being proposed for a patient at moderate to high risk for a poor outcome, such as:** • **Experiencing symptoms consistent with ACS when percutaneous coronary intervention is an option,** **and/or** • **Considering a drug-eluting stent**
CYP2D6	**Tetrabenazine response**	**Member has a diagnosis of Huntington's disease, AND** **Treatment with tetrabenazine is being considered in a dosage greater than 50mg per day.** **Note: CYP2D6 tests denoted by CPT codes 0071U–0076U, are typically not medically necessary. Requests for these tests will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis**
CYP2D6	**Deutetrabenazine response**	**Member has a diagnosis of Huntington's disease, AND** **Treatment with deutetrabenazine is being**

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

		considered in a dosage greater than 36mg per day. Note: CYP2D6 tests denoted by CPT codes 0071U–0076U, are typically not medically necessary. Requests for these tests will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
CYP2D6	Eliglustat response	Member has a diagnosis of Gaucher disease, AND Treatment with eliglustat is being considered. Note: CYP2D6 tests denoted by CPT codes 0071U–0076U, are typically not medically necessary. Requests for these tests will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
DPYD	5-FU Toxicity	DPD testing for genetic variants DPYD*2A (rs3918290), DPYD*13 (rs55886062), and rs67376798 A (on the positive chromosomal strand) is indicated in individuals considering or currently on therapy with any 5-FU containing drug including, but not limited to: • 5-fluorouracil (Fluorouracil®, Adrucil®) • capecitabine (Xeloda®) • fluorouracil topical formulations (Carac, Efudex, Fluoroplex)
HLA-B*1502	Carbamazepine response	HLA-B*1502 variant testing is indicated in individuals with Asian ancestry prior to initiation of or during the first nine months of treatment with carbamazepine therapy.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

HLA-B*1502	**Oxcarbazepine response**	**HLA-B*1502 variant testing is indicated in individuals with Asian ancestry prior to initiation of or during the first nine months of treatment with oxcarbazepine therapy.**
HLA-B*5701	**Abacavir hypersensitivity**	**HLA-B*5701 testing is indicated in individuals with HIV-1 prior to the initiation of any abacavir-containing therapy.**
TPMT/NUDT15 are covered without restriction	**Thiopurine response**	**TPMT testing by phenotyping or genotyping is indicated in individuals considering treatment with any thiopurine drug:** • **azathioprine (AZA, Imuran, Azasan)** • **6-mercaptopurine (6- MP, Mercaptopurinum, Purinethol)** • **thioguanine (6-TG, Tabloid, Thioguanine)**
UGT1A1	**Irinotecan response**	**UGT1A1 variant analysis is indicated in individuals with metastatic and/or recurrent colorectal** **cancer prior to the initiation of irinotecan therapy.**

Single Gene Tests: The following pharmacogenomic tests and indications are considered investigational and/or experimental and, therefore, not eligible for reimbursement. This list is not intended to be all inclusive.*

- 5HT2C (Serotonin Receptor) gene variants CPT: 81479
- Ankyrin G gene variants CPT: 81479
- COMT (Catechol Methyl Transferase) gene variants CPT: 81479
- Catechol-O-Methyltransferase (COMT) Genotype from Mayo Clinic CPT: 0032U
- CYP450 gene variants (including, but not limited to CYP1A2, CYP2D6, CYP2C9, CYP2C19, CYP3A4, CYP3A5) for psychotherapeutic, cardiovascular, or general drug response CPT: 81225, 81226, 81227, 81230, 81231, 81479

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Pharmacogenomic Testing for Drug Metabolism, **continued**

- Cytochrome P450 1A2 Genotype from Mayo Clinic CPT: 0031U
- CYP2C19 testing for the management of H. pylori CPT: 81225
- CYP2D6 testing for tamoxifen response CPT: 81226
- DRD2 (Dopamine Receptor) gene variants CPT: 81479
- DRD4 dopamine D4 receptor p450 CPT: 81479
- IFNL3 rs12979860 gene variant CPT: 81283
- KIF6 gene variants CPT: 81479
- MTHFR gene variants CPT: 81291
- NAT2 gene variants CPT: 81479
- OPRM1 gene variants CPT: 81479
- Serotonin Receptor Genotype (HTR2A and HTR2C) from Mayo Clinic CPT: 0033U
- SLC6A4 (5-HTTLPR) serotonin transporter variants CPT: 81479

Pharmacogenomic panels, regardless of how they are billed, are considered investigational and/or experimental and, therefore, are not eligible for reimbursement. The following are examples of panels that are considered investigational and/or experimental. This list is not intended to be all-inclusive:

- 5-Fluorouracil (5-FU) Toxicity and Chemotherapeutic Response [Proprietary panel of DPYD and TYMS gene variants to assess risk of 5-fluorouracil toxicity from ARUP Laboratory] CPT: 81232 and 81346
- Focused Pharmacogenomics Panel from Mayo Clinic CPT: 0029U
- Genecept Assay [Proprietary panel of biomarker tests to predict response to different psychiatric treatments from Genomind] CPT: 81479
- Genomind Professional PGx Express CPT: 0175U
- Mental Health DNA Insight [Proprietary test from Pathway Genomics] CPT: 81225, 81226, 81479
- INFINITI Neural Response Panel [Pain management (opioid-use disorder) genotyping panel, 16 common variants (ie, ABCB1, COMT, DAT1, DBH, DOR, DRD1, DRD2, DRD4, GABA, GAL, HTR2A, HTTLPR, MTHFR, MUOR, OPRK1, OPRM1), buccal swab or other germline tissue sample, algorithm reported as positive or negative risk of opioid-use disorder from PersonalizeDx Labs, AutoGenomics Inc] CPT: 0078U

<u>Other Considerations</u>

Testing will be covered only for the number of genes or tests necessary to establish drug response. When available and cost-efficient, a tiered approach to testing, with reflex to more detailed testing and/or different genes, is recommended.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

For pharmacogenomic tests that look for changes in germline DNA (i.e., not tumor DNA or viral DNA), testing will be allowed once per lifetime per gene. Exceptions may be considered if technical advances in testing or the discovery of novel genetic variants demonstrate significant advantages that would support a medical need to retest.

Testing performed in a CLIA-certified laboratory will be considered for coverage. The use of a specific FDA approved companion diagnostic is not necessary for coverage to be considered.

SELECT HEALTH ADVANTAGE (MEDICARE/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

SELECT HEALTH COMMUNITY CARE (MEDICAID)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Summary of Medical Information

Current evidence regarding the use of genotyping tests for the determination of drug metabolizer status indicates that while available testing methods may accurately identify genetic variations in an individual, there is insufficient data to demonstrate that such testing, and the clinical decisions made based on the testing, results in a significant impact on health outcomes. Specifically, clinical trials have not yet adequately demonstrated that such testing results in either enhanced clinical effectiveness, or in decreased short-term or long-term serious adverse events.

A particular variant is not always phenotype specific in that it may have a different impact depending on the drug in question (National Academy of Clinical Biochemistry [NACB], 2010). Racial and ethnic differences in the frequency and nature of genetic variants are also possible and should be recognized in translating outcomes from one population to another. The relation of a gene or gene biomarker and a drug target must be validated for each therapeutic indication in different racial and ethnic groups, as well as in different treatment and disease contexts (Kager and Evans, 2012). Pharmacogenetic testing is not currently recommended for general population screening (National Academy for Clinical Biochemistry [NACB], 2010).

Recently, the FDA has added language to the labels of many approved drugs to include pharmacogenomic information. Wang and colleagues published a study evaluating the evidence that supports pharmacogenomic biomarker testing in drug labels and how frequently testing is recommended (2014). Their analysis found that of the 119 drug-biomarker combinations identified, only 43 (36.1%) had labels that provided convincing clinical validity evidence supporting pharmacogenomic testing related to a specific drug. Furthermore, only 18 (15.1%) provided convincing evidence of clinical utility.

Recommendations on the manner of clinical decisions based on the results of a biomarker test were made on 61 labels (51.3%); but only 36 (30.3%) of these contained convincing clinical utility data. A full description of the supporting studies for these recommendations was included in 13 labels (10.9%). The authors found that less than one-sixth of drug labels contained or referenced convincing evidence of clinical utility of biomarker testing, whereas more than half made recommendations based on biomarker test results. They concluded that it may be premature to include biomarker testing recommendations in drug labels when convincing data that link testing to health outcomes do not exist.

Critical elements of assessing the effectiveness of such genetic tests include: (1) analytic (diagnostic) validity; (2) clinical validity; and (3) clinical utility. Analytic validity measures the technical performance of

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

selecthealth.

the test, in terms of accurately identifying the genetic markers to be measured. Clinical validity measures the strength of association between genetic test results and clinical parameters such as dose, therapeutic efficacy, or adverse events. Clinical utility, the ultimate goal of genetic testing, measures the ability of the test to improve clinical outcomes, such as whether prescribing or dosing based on information from genetic testing improves therapeutic efficacy or adverse event rate as compared with treatment without genetic testing.

Testing for genetic polymorphisms has also been proposed for a wide array of drugs, involving many different conditions and enzymes. At this time, the available literature addressing such testing is limited and insufficient to allow any assessment of clinical utility in the treatment of individuals. The outcomes that require further research attention include major adverse events, utilization of health resources, and time to clinically significant changes in condition using appropriate and validated measures.

While the potential of pharmacogenomics is intriguing for many clinical applications, it is not yet clear which are most likely to yield clinical benefit in the near future. As this field evolves and matures, and if pre-prescription testing can be shown to be of clinical utility for specific drugs and individuals, it will be imperative to establish evidence-based guidelines for health care professionals delineating the most effective courses of action based on such genotype testing results.

Several commercial laboratories market multi-test panels for genetic polymorphisms related to drug metabolizer status. While the use of some individual tests included in these test panels may be reasonable under specific circumstances, the use of all the tests within a panel is rarely justified unless there is clinical evidence that the panel provides information that leads to meaningful impact on treatment. At this time, the available published evidence addressing the use of such test panels is limited to a few panel- and condition-specific studies (Altar, 2015; Hall-Flavin 2012, 2013; Winner, 2013a, 2013b). The results of these studies are limited by the study designs utilized by the investigators, with each having some combination of no blinding, small study population, retrospective methodology, selection bias, short follow-up periods, and subjective study outcomes. The data from these studies is weak, and further investigation is warranted using better designed, larger study samples and double-blind randomized controlled methodology.

Billing/Coding Information

CPT CODES

0029U	Drug metabolism (adverse drug reactions and drug response), targeted sequence analysis (i.e., CYP1A2, CYP2C19, CYP2C9, CYP2D6, CYP3A4, CYP3A5, CYP4F2, SLCO1B1, VKORC1 and rs12777823)
0078U	Pain management (opioid-use disorder) genotyping panel, 16 common variants (i.e., ABCB1, COMT, DAT1, DBH, DOR, DRD1, DRD2, DRD4, GABA, GAL, HTR2A, HTTLPR, MTHFR, MUOR, OPRK1, OPRM1), buccal swab or other germline tissue sample, algorithm reported as positive or negative risk of opioid-use disorder
0173U	Psychiatry (i.e., depression, anxiety), genomic analysis panel, includes variant analysis of 14 genes
0175U	Psychiatry (e.g., depression, anxiety), genomic analysis panel, variant analysis of 15 genes
0286U	CEP72 (centrosomal protein, 72-KDa), NUDT15 (nudix hydrolase 15) and TPMT (thiopurine Smethyltransferase) (e.g., drug metabolism) gene analysis, common variants
0290U	Pain management, mRNA, gene expression profiling by RNA sequencing of 36 genes, whole blood, algorithm reported as predictive risk score
0291U	Psychiatry (mood disorders), mRNA, gene expression profiling by RNA sequencing of 144 genes, whole blood, algorithm reported as predictive risk score
0292U	Psychiatry (stress disorders), mRNA, gene expression profiling by RNA sequencing of 72 genes, whole blood, algorithm reported as predictive risk score
0293U	Psychiatry (suicidal ideation), mRNA, gene expression profiling by RNA sequencing of 54 genes, whole blood, algorithm reported as predictive risk score

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

Pharmacogenomic Testing for Drug Metabolism, **continued**

0345U	Psychiatry (e.g., depression, anxiety, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder [ADHD]), genomic analysis panel, variant analysis of 15 genes, including deletion/duplication analysis of CYP2D6
0347U	Drug metabolism or processing (multiple conditions), whole blood or buccal specimen, DNA analysis, 16 gene report, with variant analysis and reported phenotypes
0348U	Drug metabolism or processing (multiple conditions), whole blood or buccal specimen, DNA analysis, 25 gene report, with variant analysis and reported phenotypes
0349U	Drug metabolism or processing (multiple conditions), whole blood or buccal specimen, DNA analysis, 27 gene report, with variant analysis, including reported phenotypes and impacted gene-drug interactions
0350U	Drug metabolism or processing (multiple conditions), whole blood or buccal specimen, DNA analysis, 27 gene report, with variant analysis and reported phenotypes
0380U	Drug metabolism (adverse drug reactions and drug response), targeted sequence analysis, 20 gene variants and CYP2D6 deletion or duplication analysis with reported genotype and phenotype
81418	Drug metabolism (eg, pharmacogenomics) genomic sequence analysis panel, must include testing of at least 6 genes, including CYP2C19, CYP2D6, and CYP2D6 duplication/deletion analysis
0031U	CYP1A2 (cytochrome P450 family 1, subfamily A, member 2)(eg, drug metabolism) gene analysis, common variants (ie, *1F, *1K, *6, *7)
0070U	CYP2D6 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily D, polypeptide 6) (eg, drug metabolism) gene analysis, common and select rare variants (ie, *2, *3, *4, *4N, *5, *6, *7, *8, *9, *10, *11, *12, *13, *14A, *14B, *15, *17, *29, *35, *36, *41, *57, *61, *63, *68, *83, *xN)
0071U	CYP2D6 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily D, polypeptide 6) (eg, drug metabolism) gene analysis, full gene sequence (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0072U	CYP2D6 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily D, polypeptide 6) (eg, drug metabolism) gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (ie, CYP2D6-2D7 hybrid gene) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0073U	CYP2D6 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily D, polypeptide 6) (eg, drug metabolism) gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (ie, CYP2D7-2D6 hybrid gene) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0074U	CYP2D6 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily D, polypeptide 6) (eg, drug metabolism) gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (ie, non-duplicated gene when duplication/multiplication is trans) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0075U	CYP2D6 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily D, polypeptide 6) (eg, drug metabolism) gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (ie, 5' gene duplication/multiplication) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0076U	CYP2D6 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily D, polypeptide 6) (eg, drug metabolism) gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (ie, 3' gene duplication/ multiplication) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
0030U	Drug metabolism (warfarin drug response), targeted sequence analysis (ie, CYP2C9, CYP4F2, VKORC1, rs12777823)
81225	CYP2C19 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily C, polypeptide 19) (eg, drug metabolism), gene analysis, common variants (eg, *2, *3, *4, *8, *17)

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

81226	CYP2D6 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily D, polypeptide 6) (eg, drug metabolism), gene analysis, common variants (eg, *2, *3, *4, *5, *6, *9, *10, *17, *19, *29, *35, *41, *1XN, *2XN, *4XN)
81227	CYP2C9 (cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily C, polypeptide 9) (eg, drug metabolism), gene analysis, common variants (eg, *2, *3, *5, *6)
81291	MTHFR (5, 10-methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase) (eg, hereditary hypercoagulability) gene analysis, common variants (eg, 677T, 1298C)
81350	UGT1A1 (UDP glucuronosyltransferase 1 family, polypeptide A1) (eg, irinotecan metabolism), gene analysis, common variants (eg, *28, *36, *37)
81355	VKORC1 (vitamin K epoxide reductase complex, subunit 1) (eg, warfarin metabolism), gene analysis, common variants (eg, -1639G>A, c.173+1000C>T)
81381	HLA Class I typing, high resolution (ie, alleles or allele groups); one allele or allele group (eg, B*57:01P), each
81400	Molecular pathology procedure level 1
81401	Molecular pathology procedure level 2
81404	Molecular pathology procedure level 5
81405	Molecular pathology procedure level 6
81406	Molecular pathology procedure level 7
81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure
81599	Unlisted multianalyte assay with algorithmic analysis

HCPCS CODES

G9143	Warfarin responsiveness testing by genetic technique using any method, any number of specimen(s)
G0452	Molecular pathology procedure; physician interpretation and report

Key References

1. Hall-Flavin DK, Winner JG, Allen JD, Carhart JM, Proctor B, Snyder KA, Drews MS, Eisterhold LL, Geske J, Mrazek DA. Utility of integrated pharmacogenomics testing to support the treatment of major depressive disorder in a psychiatric outpatient setting. Pharmacogenet Genomics. 2013 Oct;23(10):535-48.
2. Hall-Flavin DK, Winner JG, Allen JD, Jordan JJ, Nesheim RS, Snyder KA, Drews MS, Eisterhold LL, Biernacka JM, Mrazek DA. Using a pharmacogenomic algorithm to guide the treatment of depression. Transl Psychiatry. 2012 Oct 16;2: e172.
3. National Academy for Clinical Biochemistry. Laboratory medicine practice guidelines: laboratory analysis and application of pharmacogenetics to clinical practice. Valdes R, Payne D, Linder MW, ed. 2010; American Association for Clinical Chemistry. Washington, DC. Accessed Apr 7, 2015. Available at URL address: http://www.guideline.gov/content.aspx?id=15662
4. National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of testing for cytochrome P450 polymorphisms in patients with schizophrenia treated with antipsychotics: a systematic review and economic evaluation. Health Technol Assess. 2010 Jan;14(3):1-157, iii. Accessed Mar 15, 2015. Available at URL address: http://www.hta.ac.uk/execsumm/summ1403.shtml
5. Tansey KE, Guipponi M, Perroud N, Bondolfi G, Domenici E, Evans D, et al. Genetic predictors of response to serotonergic and noradrenergic antidepressants in major depressive disorder: a genome-wide analysis of individual-level data and a meta-analysis. PLoS Med. 2012;9(10):e1001326. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1001326. Epub 2012 Oct 16.
6. U. S. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) premarket notification database. Drug metabolizing enzyme genotyping systems. Roche AmpliChip Cytochrome P450 P450 2C19- K043576. Oct 10, 2012. Accessed Mar 15, 2015. Available at URL address: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/reviews/K043576.pdf
7. U.S. Department of Health and Human Service. Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; Technology Assessment: Systematic reviews on selected pharmacogenetic tests for cancer treatment: CYP2D6 for Tamoxifen in breast cancer, KRAS for anti-EGFR antibodies in colorectal cancer, and BCR-ABL1 for tyrosine kinase inhibitors in chronic myeloid leukemia. 2010 Jun 7. Accessed Mar 15, 2015. Available at URL address: http://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Coverage/DeterminationProcess/downloads/id76TA.pdf
8. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; Technology Assessment: Update on genetic tests for non-cancer diseases/conditions: a Horizon scan. 2010 Mar 18. Accessed Mar 15, 2015. Available at URL address: http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/technology-assessments-details.aspx?TAId=49&bc=BAAgAAAAAAAA&

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

9. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Safety information. Safety labeling changes approved by FDA Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER): Coumadin (warfarin sodium) tablet and injection. 2010 Feb 19. Accessed Mar 15, 2015. Available at URL address: http://www.fda.gov/Safety/MedWatch/SafetyInformation/ucm201100.htm
10. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Clinical Pharmacology and Biopharmaceuticals Review. June 24, 2014. Available at: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2014/205494Orig1s000ClinPharmR.pdf. Accessed on January 5, 2016.
11. Wang B, Canestaro WJ, Choudhry NK. Clinical evidence supporting pharmacogenomic biomarker testing provided in US Food and Drug Administration drug labels. JAMA Intern Med. 2014 Dec;174(12):1938-44.
12. Winner JG, Carhart JM, Altar CA, Allen JD, Dechairo BM. A prospective, randomized, double-blind study assessing the clinical impact of integrated pharmacogenomic testing for major depressive disorder. Discov Med. 2013 Nov;16(89):219-27. Accessed March 15, 2015. Available at URL address: http://www.discoverymedicine.com/Joel-G-Winner/2013/11/08/a-prospective-randomized-double-blind-study-assessing-the-clinical-impact-of-integrated-pharmacogenomic-testing-for-major-depressive-disorder/
13. Winner JG, Carhart JM, Altar CA, Allen JD, Dechairo BM. A prospective, randomized, double-blind study assessing the clinical impact of integrated pharmacogenomic testing for major depressive disorder. Discov Med. 2013 Nov;16(89):219-27. Accessed March 15, 2015. Available at URL address: http://www.discoverymedicine.com/Joel-G-Winner/2013/11/08/a-prospective-randomized-double-blind-study-assessing-the-clinical-impact-of-integrated-pharmacogenomic-testing-for-major-depressive-disorder/

Disclaimer
This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

MEDICAL POLICY

PHARMACOGENOMIC TESTING FOR DRUG METABOLISM

Policy # 590

Implementation Date: 1/16/17

Review Dates: 12/21/17, 12/13/18, 4/26/23

Revision Dates: 9/17/18, 7/1/23, 1/24/24

Related Medical Policies:

#123 Gene Therapy, Testing, and Counseling

#426 Genetic Testing: (MTHFR) Polymorphisms in Cancer, Cardiovascular Disease, and Neural Tube Defects

#594 Genetic Testing: 5-Fluorouracil Testing in Cancer Patients

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Pharmacogenomics is a science that examines the inherited variations in genes that dictate drug response and explores the ways these variations can be used to predict whether a patient will have a good response to a drug, a bad response to a drug, or no response at all. The term comes from the words pharmacology and genomics and is thus the intersection of pharmaceuticals and genetics.

Various factors may influence the variability of drug effects, including age, liver function, concomitant diseases, nutrition, smoking, ethnicity and drug-drug interactions. Inherited (germline) DNA sequence variation (polymorphisms) in genes coding for drug metabolizing enzymes, drug receptors, drug transporters, and molecules involved in signal transduction pathways also may have major effects on the activity of those molecules and thus on the efficacy or toxicity of a drug. Potentially, test results could be used to optimize drug choice and/or dose for more effective therapy, avoid serious adverse effects, and decrease medical costs.

The cytochrome P450 family is a major subset of all drug-metabolizing enzymes; several CYP450 enzymes are involved in the metabolism of a significant portion of currently administered drugs. CYP2D6 metabolizes approximately 25% of all clinically used medications (e.g., dextromethorphan, beta blockers, anti-arrhythmics, antidepressants, and morphine derivatives), including many of the most prescribed drugs. CYP2C19 metabolizes several important drugs, including proton pump inhibitors, diazepam, propranolol, imipramine, and amitriptyline.

Many drugs are metabolized to varying degrees by more than one enzyme, either within or outside of the CYP450 superfamily. In addition, interaction between different metabolizing genes, interaction of genes and environment, and interactions among different non-genetic factors also influence gene metabolizing functions. Thus, identification of a variant in a single gene in the metabolic pathway may be insufficient in all but a small proportion of drugs to explain inter individual differences in metabolism and consequent efficacy or toxicity.

COMMERCIAL PLAN POLICY/CHIP (CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

© 2023 Select Health. All rights reserved.

MEDICAL POLICY

WHOLE GENOME SEQUENCING (WGS)/WHOLE EXOME SEQUENCING (WES)

Policy # 514

Implementation Date: 11/9/12
Review Dates: 12/19/13, 12/8/14, 4/21/17, 6/21/18, 4/17/19, 1/7/23
Revision Dates: 4/14/16, 10/11/18, 7/1/23, 8/17/23, 8/28/23

Disclaimer:
1. Policies are subject to change without notice.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for Select Health Commercial, Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS), and Select Health Community Care (Medicaid/CHIP) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description

Whole genome sequencing (WGS) in the outpatient setting has evidence and support for use as a first-line test for children with multiple congenital anomalies, neurodevelopmental delays, and for health conditions where there is a need for a timely and efficient diagnostic pathway.

First-line use of WGS reduces costs, avoids redundant or wasteful testing, reduces time to diagnosis, reduces disparities in diagnosis, reduces referrals and multiple visits with different specialists, and provides earlier access to treatment options. WGS is currently available at the same or lower cost compared to genetic panel testing or whole exome sequencing (WES). Studies support that the use of trio-based WGS decreases the likelihood of receiving variants of uncertain significance that require further evaluation, in comparison to many phenotype-based gene panels.

Commercial Plan Policy/CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program)

Effective July 1, 2023

Application of coverage criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request.

1. Select Health covers genetic testing when ordered or recommended by a genetic counselor, medical geneticist, or other provider with recognized expertise in this area; and

2. Testing results will directly impact clinical decision-making and/or clinical outcome for the individual being tested.

I. Whole Genome/Whole Exome Sequencing

A. **Select Health considers whole genomic sequencing (WGS) or whole exome sequencing (WES) medically necessary** when the member meets all the following criteria in A, and one of the following (B, C, or D):

1) No other causative circumstances (e.g., environmental exposures, injury, prematurity, infection) can explain symptoms; and

2) Clinical presentation does not fit a well-described syndrome for which single-gene or targeted panel testing (e.g., comparative genomic hybridization [CGH]/chromosomal microarray analysis [CMA]), is available; and

3) The differential diagnosis list and/or phenotype warrant testing of multiple genes and one of the following:

i. Whole exome or whole genome sequencing is more practical than the separate single gene tests or panels that would be recommended based on the differential diagnosis; or

ii. Whole exome or whole genome sequencing results may preclude the need for multiple and/or invasive procedures, follow-up, or screening that would be recommended in the absence of testing.

AND

B. WGS/WES will be considered medically necessary for the following conditions:

1) Unexplained multiple congenital anomalies including structural brain or organ abnormalities; or
2) Neurodevelopmental disorders, including intellectual disability and autism spectrum disorder; or
3) Unexplained conditions with significant potential for influencing medical management and clinical outcomes and need for timely diagnosis, including but not limited to:
   i. Significant or refractory epilepsy and/or EEG or exam consistent with encephalopathy; or
   ii. Abnormal labs and/or presentation concerning for metabolic or mitochondrial disorder; or
   iii. Developmental regression or neurological findings suspicious for a progressive disorder including but not limited to white matter disease, cerebellar atrophy, movement disorders; or
   iv. Unexplained cytopenias, immune dysregulation, and bone marrow failure, as well as a significant family history of multiple family members with cancer of autoimmunity not detected by standard, focused screening.

OR

C. WGS/WES is allowed for fetal testing, when all the following criteria are met:

1) Standard diagnostic genetic testing (chromosomal microarray analysis (CMA) and/or karyotype) of the fetus has been performed and is uninformative; and
2) Testing is performed on direct amniotic fluid/chorionic villi, cultured cells from amniotic fluid/chorionic villi or DNA extracted from fetal blood or tissue; and
3) At least one of the following is present:
   i. multiple fetal structural anomalies affecting unrelated organ systems
   ii. fetal hydrops of unknown etiology
   iii. a fetal structural anomaly affecting a single organ system and family history strongly suggests a genetic etiology

OR

D. Whole Exome/Genome Reanalysis

1) Reanalysis of previously obtained uninformative whole exome or whole genome sequence data is considered medically necessary only when the above criteria for whole exome/genome sequencing are met, and when any of the following conditions are met:

   i. Onset of additional symptoms that broadens the phenotype assessed during the original exome/genome evaluation,
   ii. Birth or diagnosis of a similarly affected first-degree relative that has expanded the clinical picture,
   iii. New scientific knowledge suggests a previously unknown link between the individual's findings and specific genes/pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants,

   AND

2) At least 18 months have passed since the last analysis.

WGS/WES for cardiac arrythmias and cardiomyopathies is considered experimental/investigational.

II. Ultra Rapid/Rapid Genome Sequencing

A. **Select Health covers Ultra Rapid or Rapid Genome Sequencing for acutely-ill infants 12 months of age or younger in the hospital setting**, when all the following criteria are met:

1) The etiology of the infant's features is unknown, and a genetic etiology is considered a likely explanation for the phenotype, based on either of the following:
   i. Multiple congenital abnormalities affecting unrelated organ systems,
   or
   ii. Two of the following criteria are met:
      a) Abnormality affecting at minimum a single organ system
      b) Encephalopathy
      c) Symptoms of a complex neurodevelopmental disorder (e.g., dystonia, hemiplegia, spasticity, epilepsy, hypotonia)
      d) Family history strongly suggestive of a genetic etiology, including consanguinity
      e) Laboratory findings suggestive of an inborn error of metabolism
      f) Abnormal response to therapy;

   AND

2) Alternate etiologies have been considered and ruled out, when possible (e.g., environmental exposure, injury, infection, isolated prematurity);

   AND

3) Clinical presentation does not fit a well-described syndrome for which rapid single-gene or targeted panel testing is available;

   AND

4) A diagnosis cannot be made in a timely manner by standard clinical evaluation.

Select Health Advantage (Medicare/CMS)

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS, and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial policy applies. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp& or the manual website

Select Health Community Care (Medicaid)

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the Select Health Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php or the Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool

Billing/Coding Information

Covered for the indications listed above when criteria are met:

CPT Codes

0094U Genome (eg, unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome), rapid sequence analysis

81415 Exome (eg, unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome); sequence analysis

81416 Exome (eg, unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome); sequence analysis, each comparator exome (eg, parents, siblings) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

81417 Exome (eg, unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome); re-evaluation of previously obtained exome sequence (eg, updated knowledge or unrelated condition/syndrome)

81425 Genome (eg, unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome); sequence analysis

81426 Genome (eg, unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome); sequence analysis, each comparator genome (eg, parents, siblings) (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

81427 Genome (eg, unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome); re-evaluation of previously obtained genome sequence (eg, updated knowledge or unrelated condition/syndrome)

96040 Medical genetics and genetic counseling services, each 30 minutes face-to-face with patient/family

HCPCS Codes

S0265 Genetic counseling, under physician supervision, each 15 minutes

Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS)/Whole Exome Sequencing (WES), **continued**

Considered experimental/investigational/unproven or not medically necessary:

CPT Codes

0019U Oncology, RNA, gene expression by whole transcriptome sequencing, formalin-fixed paraffin embedded tissue or fresh frozen tissue, predictive algorithm reported as potential targets for therapeutic agents

0036U Exome (ie, somatic mutations), paired formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tumor tissue and normal specimen, sequence analyses

0212U Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole genome and mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat gene expansions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions, blood or saliva, identification and categorization of genetic variants, proband

0213U Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole genome and mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat gene expansions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions, blood or saliva, identification and categorization of genetic variants, each comparator genome (eg, parent, sibling)

0214U Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole exome and mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat gene expansions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions, blood or saliva, identification and categorization of genetic variants, proband

0215U Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole exome and mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat gene expansions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions, blood or saliva, identification and categorization of genetic variants, each comparator exome (eg, parent, sibling)

0260U Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), identification of copy number variations, inversions, insertions, translocations, and other structural variants by optical genome mapping

0264U Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), identification of copy number variations, inversions, insertions, translocations, and other structural variants by optical genome mapping

0265U Rare constitutional and other heritable disorders, whole genome and mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis, blood, frozen and formalin-fixed paraffin embedded (FFPE) tissue, saliva,buccal swabs or cell lines, identification of single nucleotide and copy number variants

0266U Unexplained constitutional or other heritable disorders or syndromes, tissue-specific gene expression by whole-transcriptome and next-generation sequencing, blood, formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue or fresh frozen tissue, reported as presence or absence of splicing or expression changes

0267U Rare constitutional and other heritable disorders, identification of copy number variations, inversions, insertions, translocations, and other structural variants by optical genome mapping and whole genome sequencing

0297U Oncology (pan tumor), whole genome sequencing of paired malignant and normal DNA specimens, fresh or formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue, blood or bone marrow, comparative sequence analyses and variant identification

0298U Oncology (pan tumor), whole transcriptome sequencing of paired malignant and normal RNA specimens, fresh or formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue, blood or bone marrow, comparative sequence analyses and expression level and chimeric transcript identification

Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS)/Whole Exome Sequencing (WES), **continued**

0300U Oncology (pan tumor), whole genome sequencing and optical genome mapping of paired malignant and normal DNA specimens, fresh tissue, blood, or bone marrow, comparative sequence analyses and variant identification

0329U Oncology (neoplasia), exome and transcriptome sequence analysis for sequence variants, gene copy number amplifications and deletions, gene rearrangements, microsatellite instability and tumor mutational burden utilizing DNA and RNA from tumor with DNA from normal blood or saliva for subtraction, report of clinically significant mutation(s) with therapy associations

0335U Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole genome sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, copy number variants, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, uniparental disomy (UPD), inversions, aneuploidy, mitochondrial genome sequence analysis with heteroplasmy and large deletions, short tandem repeat (STR) gene expansions, fetal sample, identification and categorization of genetic variants

0336U Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole genome sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, copy number variants, deletions, duplications, mobile element insertions, uniparental disomy (UPD), inversions, aneuploidy, mitochondrial genome sequence analysis with heteroplasmy and large deletions, short tandem repeat (STR) gene expansions, blood or saliva, identification and categorization of genetic variants, each comparator genome (eg, parent)

81349 Cytogenomic (genome-wide) analysis for constitutional chromosomal abnormalities; interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and loss-of-heterozygosity variants, low-pass sequencing analysis

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure

Key References

1. Ewans L.J. et al. Whole exome and genome sequencing in mendelian disorders: a diagnostic and health economic analysis. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2022 Oct; 30(10):1121-1131. doi: 10.1038/s41431-022-01162-2. Epub 2022 Aug 15. PMID: 35970915; PMCID: PMC9553973.
2. Nazeha N., et al. Reduced resource utilization with early use of next-generation sequencing in rare genetic diseases in an Asian cohort. *Am J Med Genet A*. 2022 Dec;188(12):3482-3491. doi: 10.1002/ajmg.a.62974. Epub 2022 Sep 25. PMID: 36156406.
   Nurchis, M. C., Incremental net benefit of whole genome sequencing for newborns and children with suspected genetic disorders: Systematic review and meta-analysis of cost-effectiveness evidence. Health Policy. 2022 Apr;126(4):337-345. doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2022.03.001. Epub 2022 Mar 4. PMID: 35317923.

Disclaimer

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate healthcare providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

Select Health® makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. Select Health updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies without notice to healthcare providers or Select Health members.

Members may contact Customer Service at the phone number listed on their member identification card to discuss their benefits more specifically. Providers with questions about this Coverage Policy may call Select Health Provider Relations at (801) 442-3692.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from Select Health.

"Intermountain Healthcare" and its accompanying logo, the marks of "Select Health" and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or Intermountain Health Care, Inc., IHC Health Services, Inc., and Select Health, Inc.
Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association

© 2020 SelectHealth. All rights reserved. 1196662 04/24