Policy Statement

The use of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) and/or circulating tumor cells (CTCs) is considered investigational for all indications except as allowed for Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC) (see Policy Guidelines and Related Policies).

Policy Guidelines

This policy does not address the use of blood-based testing for epidermal growth factor receptor variants in non-small-cell lung cancer.

Coding

These tests would likely be reported using any existing CPT molecular pathology code(s) that is applicable (81161-81355 and 81400-81408), along with the unlisted molecular pathology procedure code (81479).

Effective January 1, 2020, there is a new Tier 1 CPT code to more accurately describe single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) array-derived copy number (CN) for neoplasia:

- **81277**: Cytogenomic neoplasia (genome-wide) microarray analysis, interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and loss-of-heterozygosity variants for chromosomal abnormalities

Detection and quantification of circulating tumor cells would be reported using the following codes:

- **86152**: Cell enumeration using immunologic selection and identification in fluid specimen (e.g., circulating tumor cells in blood)
- **86153**: Cell enumeration using immunologic selection and identification in fluid specimen (e.g., circulating tumor cells in blood); physician interpretation and report, when required

Effective July 1, 2019, the following CPT code is specific to the FirstSightCRC™ test:

- **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

Description

Circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) and circulating tumor cells (CTCs) in peripheral blood, referred to as "liquid biopsy," have several potential uses for guiding therapeutic decisions in patients with cancer or being screened for cancer. This evidence review evaluates uses for liquid biopsies not addressed in a separate review. If a separate evidence review exists, then conclusions reached there supersede conclusions here.

Related Policies

- Circulating Tumor DNA Management of Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer (Liquid Biopsy)
- Expanded Molecular Panel Testing of Cancers to Identify Targeted Therapies
- Gene Expression Profiling and Protein Biomarkers for Prostate Cancer Management
- Genetic and Protein Biomarkers for the Diagnosis and Cancer Risk Assessment of Prostate Cancer
- Genetic Cancer Susceptibility Panels Using Next-Generation Sequencing
- KRAS, NRAS, and BRAF Variant Analysis in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer
- Miscellaneous Genetic and Molecular Diagnostic Tests

**Benefit Application**

Benefit determinations should be based in all cases on the applicable contract language. To the extent there are any conflicts between these guidelines and the contract language, the contract language will control. 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.

Some state or federal mandates (e.g., Federal Employee Program [FEP]) prohibits plans from denying Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved technologies as investigational. In these instances, plans may have to consider the coverage eligibility of FDA-approved technologies on the basis of medical necessity alone.

**Regulatory Status**

Clinical laboratories may develop and validate tests in-house and market them as a laboratory service; laboratory-developed tests must meet the general regulatory standards of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments. Laboratories that offer laboratory-developed tests must be licensed by the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments for high-complexity testing. To date, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has chosen not to require any regulatory review of this test.

In 2004, the CellSearch® System (Janssen Diagnostics, formerly Veridex) was cleared by the Food and Drug Administration for marketing through the 510(k) process for monitoring metastatic breast cancer, in 2007 for monitoring metastatic colorectal cancer, and in 2008 for monitoring metastatic prostate cancer. The system uses automated instruments manufactured by Immunicon for sample preparation (CellTracks® AutoPrep) and analysis (CellSpotter Analyzer®), together with supplies, reagents, and epithelial cell control kits manufactured by Veridex. Food and Drug Administration product code: NQI.

**Rationale**

**Background**

Liquid biopsy refers to the analysis of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) or circulating tumor cells (CTCs) as methods of noninvasively characterizing tumors and tumor genome from the peripheral blood.

**Circulating Tumor DNA**

Normal and tumor cells release small fragments of DNA into the blood, which is referred to as cell-free DNA. Cell-free DNA from nonmalignant cells is released by apoptosis. Most cell-free tumor DNA is derived from apoptotic and/or necrotic tumor cells, either from the primary tumor, metastases, or CTCs. Unlike apoptosis, necrosis is considered a pathologic process and generates larger DNA fragments due to incomplete and random digestion of genomic DNA. The length or integrity of the circulating DNA can potentially distinguish between apoptotic and necrotic origin. Circulating tumor DNA can be used for genomic characterization of the tumor.

**Circulating Tumor Cells**

Intact CTCs are released from a primary tumor and/or a metastatic site into the bloodstream. The half-life of a CTC in the bloodstream is short (1-2 hours), and CTCs are cleared through extravasation into secondary organs. Most assays detect CTCs through the use of surface
epithelial markers such as EpCAM and cytokeratins. The primary reason for in detecting CTCs is prognostic, through quantification of circulating levels.

**Detecting ctDNA and CTCs**

Detection of ctDNA is challenging because ctDNA is diluted by nonmalignant circulating DNA and usually represents a small fraction (<1%) of total cell-free DNA. Therefore, more sensitive methods than the standard sequencing approaches (e.g., Sanger sequencing) are needed.

Highly sensitive and specific methods have been developed to detect ctDNA, for both single nucleotide variants (e.g., BEAMing [which combines emulsion polymerase chain reaction with magnetic beads and flow cytometry] and digital polymerase chain reaction) and copy-number variants. Digital genomic technologies allow for enumeration of rare variants in complex mixtures of DNA.

Approaches to detecting ctDNA can be considered targeted, which includes the analysis of known genetic mutations from the primary tumor in a small set of frequently occurring driver mutations, which can impact therapy decisions or untargeted without knowledge of specific variants present in the primary tumor, and include array comparative genomic hybridization, next-generation sequencing, and whole exome and genome sequencing.

CTC assays usually start with an enrichment step that increases the concentration of CTCs, either by biologic properties (expression of protein markers) or physical properties (size, density, electric charge). CTCs can then be detected using immunologic, molecular, or functional assays.¹

Note that targeted therapy in non-small-cell lung cancer and metastatic colorectal cancer, use of liquid biopsy for detection or risk assessment of prostate cancer, and use of AR-V7 CTC liquid biopsy for metastatic prostate cancer are addressed in separate reviews.

**Literature Review**

Evidence reviews assess whether a medical test is clinically useful. A useful test provides information to make a clinical management decision that improves the net health outcome. That is, the balance of benefits and harms is better when the test is used to manage the condition than when another test or no test is used to manage the condition.

The first step in assessing a medical test is to formulate the clinical context and purpose of the test. The test must be technically reliable, clinically valid, and clinically useful for that purpose. Evidence reviews assess the evidence on whether a test is clinically valid and clinically useful. Technical reliability is outside the scope of these reviews, and credible information on technical reliability is available from other sources.

This evidence review evaluates uses for liquid biopsies not addressed in other reviews. If a separate evidence review exists, then conclusions reached there supersede conclusions here. The main criterion for inclusion in this review is the limited evidence on clinical validity. The use of liquid biopsy for non-small-cell lung cancer is addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Circulating Tumor DNA Management of Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer (Liquid Biopsy). The use of liquid biopsy for metastatic colorectal cancer (CRC) is addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: KRAS, NRAS, and BRAF Variant Analysis (Including Liquid Biopsy) in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. The use of liquid biopsy for detection or risk assessment of prostate cancer is addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Genetic and Protein Biomarkers for the Diagnosis and Cancer Risk Assessment of Prostate Cancer. The use of AR-V7 CTC liquid biopsy for metastatic prostate cancer is addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Gene Expression Profiling and Protein Biomarkers for Prostate Cancer Management.
Selecting Treatment in Advanced Cancer

Clinical Context and Test Purpose

Treatment selection is informed by tumor type, grade, stage, patient performance status and preference, prior treatments, and the molecular characteristics of the tumor such as the presence of driver mutations. One purpose of liquid biopsy testing of patients who have advanced cancer is to inform a decision regarding treatment selection (e.g., whether to select a targeted treatment or standard treatment).

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does use of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) or circulating tumor cells (CTCs) testing to select treatment in patients with cancer to improve the net health outcome compared with standard tissue testing? Note that the use of a liquid biopsy to select therapy for non-small-cell lung cancer is addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Circulating Tumor DNA Management of Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer (Liquid Biopsy), to select therapy for metastatic CRC is addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: KRAS, NRAS, and BRAF Variant Analysis (Including Liquid Biopsy) in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer and to select therapy in metastatic prostate cancer is addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Gene Expression Profiling and Protein Biomarkers for Prostate Cancer Management.

The following PICOs were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest are patients with advanced cancer for whom the selection of treatment depends on the molecular characterization of the tumor(s).

The setting of interest is oncology care.

Interventions
The test being considered is liquid biopsy using either ctDNA or CTCs. Both targeted polymerase chain reaction-based assays and broad next-generation sequencing-based approaches are available. Patients with negative liquid biopsy results should be reflexed to tumor biopsy testing if they are able to undergo tissue biopsy.²

Comparators
For patients who are able to undergo a biopsy, molecular characterization of the tumor is performed using standard tissue biopsy samples. Patients unable to undergo a biopsy generally receive standard therapy.

Outcomes
Liquid biopsies are easier to obtain and less invasive than tissue biopsies. True-positive liquid biopsy test results lead to the initiation of appropriate treatment (e.g., targeted therapy) without a tissue biopsy. False-positive liquid biopsy test results lead to the initiation of inappropriate therapy, which could shorten progression-free survival.

In patients able to undergo a tissue biopsy, negative liquid biopsies reflex to tissue testing. In patients unable to undergo a tissue biopsy, a negative liquid biopsy result would not change empirical treatment. Therefore, health outcomes related to negative test results do not differ between liquid biopsy and tissue biopsy.

The timing of interest for survival outcomes varies by type of cancer.

Technically Reliable
Assessment of technical reliability focuses on specific tests and operators and requires a review of unpublished and often proprietary information. Review of specific tests, operators, and unpublished data are outside the scope of this evidence review, and alternative sources exist. This evidence review focuses on the clinical validity and clinical utility.
Clinically Valid
A test must detect the presence or absence of a condition, the risk of developing a condition in the future, or treatment response (beneficial or adverse).

Circulating Tumor DNA
The American Society of Clinical Oncology and College of American Pathologists jointly convened an expert panel to review the current evidence on the use of ctDNA assays. The literature review included a search for publications on the use of ctDNA assays for solid tumors in March 2017 and covers several different indications for the use of liquid biopsy. The search identified 1338 references to which an additional 31 references were supplied by the expert panel. Seventy-seven articles were selected for inclusion. The summary findings are discussed in the following sections, by indication.

Much of the literature to date on the use of ctDNA to guide treatment selection is for non-small-cell lung cancer, which is addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Circulating Tumor DNA Management of Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer (Liquid Biopsy) and metastatic CRC, which is addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: KRAS, NRAS, and BRAF Variant Analysis (Including Liquid Biopsy) in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer and are not discussed here. Merker et al (2018) concluded that while a wide range of ctDNA assays has been developed to detect driver mutations, there is limited evidence of the clinical validity of ctDNA analysis in tumor types outside of lung cancer and CRC. Preliminary clinical studies of ctDNA assays for detection of potentially targetable variants in other cancers such as BRAF variants in melanoma and PIK3CA and ESR1 variants in breast cancer were identified.

Since the end date of the searches conducted by Merkel et al (2018), 4 observational studies of the clinical validity of FoundationOne Liquid (formerly FoundationACT) have been published (Table 1). All four studies compared liquid biopsy to tissue biopsy with FoundationOne comprehensive genomic testing. Test characteristics are shown in Table 2. Relevance, design, and conduct limitations of these studies are summarized in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 1. Study Characteristics of the Clinical Validity of FoundationOne Liquid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Population</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Reference Standard</th>
<th>Timing of Reference and Index Tests</th>
<th>Blinding of Assessors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark et al (2018)6</td>
<td>Patients with advanced cancer</td>
<td>Retrospective (tissue) and prospective (liquid biopsy)</td>
<td>Tissue biopsy (FoundationOne)</td>
<td>0 to 60 days</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou et al (2018)7</td>
<td>Patients with locally advanced or metastatic solid tumors</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Tissue biopsy (FoundationOne)</td>
<td>Not reported; only considered patient with no intervening treatment between liquid and tissue biopsy</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Study Population</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Reference Standard</td>
<td>Timing of Reference and Index Tests</td>
<td>Blinding of Assessors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung et al (2017)</td>
<td>Women with estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Tissue biopsy (FoundationOne)</td>
<td>0 to 60 days</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al (2017)</td>
<td>Women with measurable, inoperable, locally advanced or metastatic TNBC previously untreated with systemic therapy</td>
<td>Patients were enrolled in a Phase II RCT of Ipatasertib plus paclitaxel versus placebo plus paclitaxel</td>
<td>Tissue biopsy (FoundationOne)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RCT: randomized controlled trial; TNBC: triple-negative breast cancer.

Table 2. Clinical Validity of FoundationOne Liquid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Initial N</th>
<th>Final N</th>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>Sensitivity (95% CI)</th>
<th>Specificity (95% CI)</th>
<th>PPV (95% CI)</th>
<th>PPV (95% CI)</th>
<th>NPV (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark et al (2018)</td>
<td>NR 36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82.7% (69.7-91.8)</td>
<td>97.5% (95.9-98.5)</td>
<td>72.9% (59.7-83.6)</td>
<td>98.6% (97.3-99.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>NR 36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base substitutions/indels</td>
<td>NR 36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82.7% (69.7-91.8)</td>
<td>97.5% (95.9-98.5)</td>
<td>72.9% (59.7-83.6)</td>
<td>98.6% (97.3-99.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrangements</td>
<td>NR 36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>100% (15.8-100)</td>
<td>99.1% (94.3-100)</td>
<td>66.7% (9.4-99.2)</td>
<td>100% (96.5-100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplifications</td>
<td>NR 36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.5% (13.9-68.4)</td>
<td>100% (98.5-100)</td>
<td>100% (47.8-100)</td>
<td>96.8% (93.6-98.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou et al (2018)</td>
<td>NR 42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>NR 42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base substitutions</td>
<td>NR 42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.2% (66.4-85.9)</td>
<td>96.0% (94.6-97.1)</td>
<td>59.2% (49.1-68.8)</td>
<td>98.3% (97.3-99.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertions/deletions</td>
<td>NR 42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1% (0.9-23.5)</td>
<td>98.2% (95.5-99.5)</td>
<td>33.3% (4.3-77.7)</td>
<td>89.4% (84.9-93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplifications</td>
<td>NR 42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.7% (11.4-40.2)</td>
<td>99.8% (98.8-100)</td>
<td>90.0% (53.2-100)</td>
<td>94.1% (91.7-96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrangements or fusions</td>
<td>NR 42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0% (39.8-100)</td>
<td>97.6% (93.9-99.3)</td>
<td>50.0% (15.7-84.3)</td>
<td>100.0% (97.7-100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung et al (2017)</td>
<td>NR 42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short variants</td>
<td>NR 14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89.5% (66.9-98.7)</td>
<td>92.4% (84.0-97.3)</td>
<td>73.9% (51.6-89.8)</td>
<td>97.3% (90.2-99.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplifications</td>
<td>NR 14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27.3% (6.0-61)</td>
<td>100% (95.1-100)</td>
<td>100% (29.2-100)</td>
<td>90.1% (81.5-95.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al (2017)</td>
<td>NR 72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100% (93.4-100)</td>
<td>100% (81.5-100)</td>
<td>100% (47.8-100)</td>
<td>96.8% (93.6-98.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: confidence interval; PPA: positive percent agreement; PPV: positive predictive value; NPV: negative predictive value; NR: not reported
### Table 3. Relevance Limitations of Clinical Validity Studies of FoundationOne Liquid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Duration of Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark et al (2018)</td>
<td>1. Included patients with a range of cancers</td>
<td>Earlier version of test used (FoundationACT)</td>
<td>2. FoundationOne tissue biopsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou et al (2018)</td>
<td>1. Included patients with a range of cancers</td>
<td>Earlier version of test used (FoundationACT)</td>
<td>2. FoundationOne tissue biopsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung et al (2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier version of test used (FoundationACT)</td>
<td>2. FoundationOne tissue biopsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al (2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier version of test used (FoundationACT)</td>
<td>2. FoundationOne tissue biopsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive limitations assessment.

- **Population key:** 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Clinical context is unclear; 3. Study population is unclear; 4. Study population not representative of intended use.
- **Intervention key:** 1. Classification thresholds not defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Not intervention of interest.
- **Comparator key:** 1. Classification thresholds not defined; 2. Not compared to credible reference standard; 3. Not compared to other tests in use for same purpose.
- **Outcomes key:** 1. Study does not directly assess a key health outcome; 2. Evidence chain or decision model not explicated; 3. Key clinical validity outcomes not reported (sensitivity, specificity and predictive values); 4. Reclassification of diagnostic or risk categories not reported; 5. Adverse events of the test not described (excluding minor discomforts and inconvenience of venipuncture or noninvasive tests).
- **Follow-Up key:** 1. Follow-up duration not sufficient with respect to natural history of disease (true-positives, true-negatives, false-positives, false-negatives cannot be determined).

### Table 4. Study Design and Conduct Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Blinding</th>
<th>Delivery of Test</th>
<th>Selective Reporting</th>
<th>Data Completeness</th>
<th>Statistical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark et al (2018)</td>
<td>2. convenience sample</td>
<td>1. Blinding unclear</td>
<td>1. Timing of liquid and tissue biopsy varied (0-60 days)</td>
<td>1. No description of indeterminate and missing samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung et al (2017)</td>
<td>2. convenience sample</td>
<td>1. Blinding unclear</td>
<td>1. Timing of liquid and tissue biopsy varied (0-60 days)</td>
<td>1. No description of indeterminate and missing samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al (2017)</td>
<td>2. convenience sample</td>
<td>1. Blinding unclear</td>
<td>1. Timing of liquid and tissue biopsy not reported</td>
<td>1. No description of indeterminate and missing samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive limitations assessment.

- **Selection key:** 1. Selection not described; 2. Selection not random or consecutive (i.e., convenience).
- **Blinding key:** 1. Not blinded to results of reference or other comparator tests.
- **Test Delivery key:** 1. Timing of delivery of index or reference test not described; 2. Timing of index and comparator tests not same; 3. Procedure for interpreting tests not described; 4. Expertise of evaluators not described.
Circulating Tumor Cells

In breast cancer, observations that estrogen receptor-positive tumors can harbor estrogen receptor-negative CTCs,[67] that overt distant metastases and CTCs can have discrepant human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 status compared with the primary tumor,10,11,12, and that the programmed death-ligand 1 is frequently expressed on CTCs in patients with hormone receptor-positive, HER2-negative breast cancer13, have suggested that trials investigating whether CTCs can be used to select targeted treatment are needed.

The clinical validity of each commercially available CTC test must be established independently.

Clinically Useful

A test is clinically useful if the use of the results informs management decisions that improve the net health outcome of care. The net health outcome can be improved if patients receive correct therapy, or more effective therapy, or avoid unnecessary therapy, or avoid unnecessary testing.

Circulating Tumor DNA

Direct Evidence

Direct evidence of clinical utility is provided by studies that have compared health outcomes for patients managed with and without the test. Because these are intervention studies, the preferred evidence would be from randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

Merker et al (2018) concluded that no such trials have been reported for ctDNA tests.2

Chain of Evidence

To develop a chain of evidence or a decision model requires explication of the elements in the model and evidence that is sufficient to demonstrate each of the links in the chain of evidence or the validity of the assumptions in the decision model.

A chain of evidence for ctDNA tests could be established if the ctDNA test has a high agreement with standard tissue testing (clinical validity) for identifying driver mutations and the standard tissue testing has proven clinical utility with high levels of evidence. A chain of evidence can also be demonstrated if the ctDNA test is able to detect driver mutations when standard methods cannot, and the information from the ctDNA test leads to management changes that improve outcomes.

The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available ctDNA tests except for lung cancer (see Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Circulating Tumor DNA Management of Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer [Liquid Biopsy]); therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

Circulating Tumor Cells

Direct Evidence

Direct evidence of clinical utility is provided by studies that have compared health outcomes for patients managed with and without the test. Because these are intervention studies, the preferred evidence would be from RCTs.

Trials of using CTCs to select treatment are ongoing (see Table 5 in Supplemental Information).
Chain of Evidence
Indirect evidence on clinical utility rests on clinical validity. If the evidence is insufficient to
demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available CTC tests;
therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

Section Summary: Selecting Treatment in Advanced Cancer

Circulating Tumor DNA
For indications reviewed herein, there is no direct evidence that selecting targeted treatment
using ctDNA improves the net health outcome compared with selecting targeted treatment
using tumor tissue testing. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess ctDNA, the
clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently. The
evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available ctDNA tests that
are reviewed herein; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain
of evidence.

Circulating Tumor Cells
For indications reviewed herein, there is no direct evidence that selecting targeted treatment
using CTCs improves the net health outcome compared with selecting targeted treatment using
tumor tissue testing. Trials are ongoing. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess
CTCs, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established
independently, and these data are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test
performance for currently available CTC tests that are reviewed herein; therefore, no inferences
can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

Monitoring treatment response in cancer

Clinical Context and Test Purpose
Monitoring of treatment response in cancer may be performed using tissue biopsy or imaging
methods. Another proposed purpose of liquid biopsy testing in patients who have advanced
cancer is to monitor treatment response, which could allow for changing therapy before clinical
progression and potentially improve outcomes.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does ctDNA or CTC testing to monitor
treatment response in patients with cancer improve the net health outcome?

The following PICOs were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest are patients who are being treated for cancer.

The setting of interest is oncology care.

Interventions
The test being considered is liquid biopsy using either ctDNA or CTCs. For ctDNA tests, the best
unit for quantifying DNA burden has not been established.

Comparators
Standard monitoring methods for assessing treatment response are tissue biopsy or imaging
methods.

Outcomes
The outcome of primary interest is progression-free survival.

The timing of interest for survival outcomes varies by type of cancer.
Technically Reliable
Assessment of technical reliability focuses on specific tests and operators and requires a review of unpublished and often proprietary information. Review of specific tests, operators, and unpublished data are outside the scope of this evidence review, and alternative sources exist. This evidence review focuses on the clinical validity and clinical utility.

Clinically Valid
Circulating Tumor DNA
Merker et al (2018) identified several proof-of-principle studies demonstrating correlations between changes in ctDNA levels and tumor response or outcomes as well as studies demonstrating that ctDNA can identify the emergence of resistant variants. However, they reported a lack of rigorous, prospective validation studies of ctDNA-based monitoring and concluded that clinical validity had not been established.

Circulating Tumor Cells
Systematic reviews and meta-analyses describing an association between CTCs and poor prognosis have been reported for metastatic breast cancer, CRC, hepatocellular cancer, prostate cancer, head and neck cancer, and melanoma.

The clinical validity of each commercially available CTC test must be established independently.

Clinically Useful
Circulating Tumor DNA
Direct Evidence
Direct evidence of clinical utility is provided by studies that have compared health outcomes for patients managed with and without the test. Because these are intervention studies, the preferred evidence would be from RCTs.

Merker et al (2018) concluded there is no evidence that changing treatment before clinical progression, at the time of ctDNA progression, improves patient outcomes.

Chain of Evidence
Indirect evidence on clinical utility rests on clinical validity. If the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available ctDNA tests for monitoring treatment response; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

Circulating Tumor Cells
Direct Evidence
Direct evidence of clinical utility is provided by studies that have compared health outcomes for patients managed with and without the test. Because these are intervention studies, the preferred evidence would be from RCTs. Smerage et al (2014) reported on the results of an RCT of patients with metastatic breast cancer and persistently increased CTC levels to test whether changing chemotherapy after 1 cycle of first-line therapy could improve overall survival (OS; the primary study outcome). Patients who did not have increased CTC levels at baseline remained on initial therapy until progression (arm A), patients with initially increased CTC levels that decreased after 21 days of therapy remained on initial therapy (arm B), and patients with persistently increased CTC levels after 21 days of therapy were randomized to continue initial therapy (arm C1) or change to an alternative chemotherapy (arm C2). There were 595 eligible and evaluable patients, 276 (46%) of whom did not have increased CTC levels (arm A). Of patients with initially increased CTC levels, 31 (10%) were not retested, 165 were assigned to arm B, and 123 were randomized to arms C1 or C2. There was no difference in median OS between arms C1 (10.7 months) and C2 (12.5 months; p=0.98). CTC levels were strongly prognostic, with a median OS for arms A, B, and C (C1 and C2 combined) of 35 months, 23 months, and 13
months, respectively (p<0.001). This trial showed the prognostic significance of CTCs in patients with rests on clinical validity. If the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available CTC tests; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

Section Summary: Monitoring Treatment Response in Cancer

Circulating Tumor DNA

For indications reviewed herein, there is no direct evidence that using ctDNA to monitor treatment response improves the net health outcome compared with standard methods. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess ctDNA, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available ctDNA tests that are reviewed herein; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

Circulating Tumor Cells

For indications reviewed herein, there is no direct evidence that using CTCs to monitor treatment response improves the net health outcome compared with standard methods. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess CTCs, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available CTC tests that are reviewed herein; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

Predicting Risk of Relapse

Clinical Context and Test Purpose

Monitoring for relapse after curative therapy in patients with cancer may be performed using imaging methods and clinical examination. Another proposed purpose of liquid biopsy testing in patients who have cancer is to detect and monitor for residual tumor, which could lead to early treatment that would eradicate residual disease and potentially improve outcomes.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does ctDNA or CTC testing to predict the risk of relapse in patients with cancer improve the net health outcome?

The following PICOs were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients

The relevant population of interest are patients who have received curative treatment for cancer.

The setting of interest is oncology care.

Interventions

The test being considered is liquid biopsy using either ctDNA or CTCs.

Comparators

Standard monitoring methods for detecting relapse are imaging methods and clinical examination.

Outcomes

The outcome of primary interest is progression-free survival.

The timing of interest for survival outcomes varies by type of cancer.
Technically Reliable
Assessment of technical reliability focuses on specific tests and operators and requires a review of unpublished and often proprietary information. Review of specific tests, operators, and unpublished data are outside the scope of this evidence review, and alternative sources exist. This evidence review focuses on the clinical validity and clinical utility.

Clinically Valid
Circulating Tumor DNA
Merker et al (2018) identified several proof-of-principle studies demonstrating an association between persistent detection of ctDNA after local therapy and high-risk of relapse. However, current studies are retrospective and have not systematically confirmed that ctDNA is being detected before the metastatic disease has developed. They concluded that the performance characteristics had not been established for any assays.

Circulating Tumor Cells
Rack et al (2014) published the results of a large multicenter study in which CTCs were analyzed in 2026 patients with early breast cancer before adjuvant chemotherapy and in 1492 patients after chemotherapy using the CellSearch System. After chemotherapy, 22% of patients were CTC-positive, and CTC positivity was negatively associated with prognosis.

Smaller studies demonstrating associations between persistent CTCs and relapse have been published in prostate cancer, CRC, bladder cancer, liver cancer, and esophageal cancer.

The clinical validity of each commercially available CTC test must be established independently.

Clinically Useful
The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available ctDNA and CTC tests for predicting relapse; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence
Direct evidence of clinical utility is provided by studies that have compared health outcomes for patients managed with and without the test. Because these are intervention studies, the preferred evidence would be from RCTs.

Merker et al (2018) concluded that there is no evidence that early treatment before relapse, based on changes in ctDNA, improves patient outcomes. Similarly, no trials were identified demonstrating that treatment before relapse based on changes in CTCs improves patient outcomes.

Chain of Evidence
Indirect evidence on clinical utility rests on clinical validity. If the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

A chain of evidence to demonstrate clinical utility requires an evidence-based management pathway. There is not an explicated, evidence-based management pathway for the use of ctDNA or CTCs to guide early treatment before relapse.

Section Summary: Predicting Risk of Relapse
Circulating Tumor DNA
For indications reviewed herein, there is no direct evidence that using ctDNA to predict the risk of relapse improves the net health outcome compared with standard methods. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess ctDNA, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. The evidence is
insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available CTC tests that are reviewed herein; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

**Circulating Tumor Cells**

For indications reviewed herein, there is no direct evidence that using CTCs to predict the risk of relapse improves the net health outcome compared with standard methods. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess CTCs, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available CTC tests that are reviewed herein; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

**Screening for cancer in asymptomatic individuals**

**Clinical Context and Test Purpose**

It has also been proposed that liquid biopsies could be used to screen asymptomatic patients for early detection of cancer, which could allow for initiating treatment at an early stage, potentially improving outcomes.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does ctDNA or CTC testing to screen for cancer in asymptomatic individuals improve the net health outcome?

The following PICOs were used to select literature to inform this review.

**Patients**

The relevant population of interest are asymptomatic individuals.

The setting of interest is primary care or oncology care.

**Interventions**

The test being considered is liquid biopsy using either ctDNA or CTCs.

**Comparators**

**Outcomes**

The outcome of primary interest is progression-free survival.

The timing of interest for survival outcomes varies by type of cancer.

Diagnosis of cancer that is not present or would not have become clinically important (false-positives and overdiagnosis) would lead to unnecessary treatment and treatment-related morbidity.

**Technically Reliable**

Assessment of technical reliability focuses on specific tests and operators and requires a review of unpublished and often proprietary information. Review of specific tests, operators, and unpublished data are outside the scope of this evidence review, and alternative sources exist. This evidence review focuses on the clinical validity and clinical utility.

**Clinically Valid**

**Circulating Tumor DNA**

Merker et al (2018) reported there is no evidence of clinical validity for the use of ctDNA in asymptomatic individuals.²

**Circulating Tumor Cells**

Systematic reviews with meta-analyses have evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of CTCs in patients with gastric and bladder/urothelial cancer.⁴,⁵ Reported sensitivity was low in both cancers (42% and 35%) overall. Sensitivity was lower in patients with early-stage cancer, suggesting that the test would not be useful as an initial screen.
The clinical validity of each commercially available CTC test must be established independently.

**Clinically Useful**
A test is clinically useful if the use of the results informs management decisions that improve the net health outcome of care. The net health outcome can be improved if patients receive correct therapy, or more effective therapy, or avoid unnecessary therapy, or avoid unnecessary testing.

**Circulating Tumor DNA and Circulating Tumor Cells**

**Direct Evidence**
Direct evidence of clinical utility is provided by studies that have compared health outcomes for patients managed with and without the test. Because these are intervention studies, the preferred evidence would be from RCTs.

To evaluate the utility of the tests for screening, guidelines would be needed to establish criteria for screening intervals and appropriate follow-up for positive tests. After such guidelines are established, studies demonstrating the liquid biopsy test performance as a cancer screening test would be needed.

**Chain of Evidence**
Indirect evidence on clinical utility rests on clinical validity. If the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility. Also, a chain of evidence requires an evidence-based management pathway. There is not an explicated, evidence-based management pathway for the use of ctDNA or CTCs for the screening of asymptomatic patients.

The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available ctDNA and CTC tests as a screening test for cancer; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

**Section Summary: Screening for Cancer in Asymptomatic Individuals**

**Circulating Tumor DNA**
For indications reviewed herein, there is no direct evidence that using ctDNA to screen for cancer in asymptomatic individuals improves the net health outcome compared with standard methods. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess ctDNA, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available CTC tests that are reviewed herein; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

**Circulating Tumor Cells**
For indications reviewed herein, there is no direct evidence that using CTCs to screen for cancer in asymptomatic individuals improves the net health outcome compared with standard methods. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess CTCs, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available CTC tests that are reviewed herein; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

**Summary of Evidence**
The ctDNA and CTCs in peripheral blood, referred to as “liquid biopsy,” have several potential uses for guiding therapeutic decisions in patients with cancer or being screened for cancer. This evidence review evaluates uses for liquid biopsies not addressed in a separate review. If a separate evidence review exists, then conclusions reached there supersede conclusions here.
For individuals who have advanced cancer who receive testing of ctDNA to select targeted treatment, the evidence includes observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, morbid events, and medication use. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess ctDNA, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. Published studies reporting clinical outcomes and/or clinical utility are lacking. The uncertainties concerning clinical validity and clinical utility preclude conclusions about whether variant analysis of ctDNA can replace variant analysis of tissue. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have advanced cancer who receive testing of CTCs to select targeted treatment, the evidence includes observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, morbid events, and medication use. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess CTCs, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. Published studies reporting clinical outcomes and/or clinical utility are lacking. The uncertainties concerning clinical validity and clinical utility preclude conclusions about whether the use of CTCs can replace variant analysis of tissue. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have cancer who receive testing of ctDNA to monitor treatment response, the evidence includes observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, morbid events, and medication use. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess ctDNA, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. Published studies reporting clinical outcomes and/or clinical utility are lacking. The uncertainties concerning clinical validity and clinical utility preclude conclusions about whether the use of ctDNA should be used to monitor treatment response. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have cancer who receive testing of CTCs to monitor treatment response, the evidence includes an RCT, observational studies, and systematic reviews of observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, morbid events, and medication use. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess CTCs, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. The available RCT found no effect on OS when patients with persistently increased CTC levels after first-line chemotherapy were switched to alternative cytotoxic therapy. Other studies reporting clinical outcomes and/or clinical utility are lacking. The uncertainties concerning clinical validity and clinical utility preclude conclusions about whether the use of CTCs should be used to monitor treatment response. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have received curative treatment for cancer who receive testing of ctDNA to predict the risk of relapse, the evidence includes observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, morbid events, and medication use. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess ctDNA, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. Published studies reporting clinical outcomes and/or clinical utility are lacking. The uncertainties concerning clinical validity and clinical utility preclude conclusions about whether the use of ctDNA should be used to predict relapse response. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.
For individuals who have received curative treatment for cancer who receive testing of CTCs to predict the risk of relapse, the evidence includes observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, morbid events, and medication use. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess CTCs, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. Published studies reporting clinical outcomes and/or clinical utility are lacking. The uncertainties concerning clinical validity and clinical utility preclude conclusions about whether the use of CTCs should be used to predict relapse response. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who are asymptomatic and at high-risk for cancer who receive testing of ctDNA to screen for cancer, no evidence was identified. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy, and test validity. Published data on clinical validity and clinical utility are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who are asymptomatic and at high-risk for cancer who receive testing of CTCs to screen for cancer, the evidence includes observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy, and test validity. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess CTCs, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. Published studies reporting clinical outcomes and/or clinical utility are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

**Supplemental Information**

**Practice Guidelines and Position Statements**

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (v.1.2019) guidelines for breast cancer state that the use of circulating tumor cells in metastatic breast cancer is not yet included in algorithms for disease assessment and monitoring. The guidelines for melanoma (v.2.2019) reference papers on circulating tumor DNA in the discussion of molecular characteristics of metastatic disease with the statement, ‘A number of tests have been developed for detecting BRAF and KIT mutations common in metastatic melanoma. The sensitivity and accuracy of these tests vary, and improved assays are in development.’

**U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations**

Not applicable.

**Medicare National Coverage**

There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers. Palmetto GBA has issued a local noncoverage determination (L35071) for all circulating tumor cell assays.

**Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials**

Some currently ongoing and unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 5.

**Table 5. Summary of Key Trials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCT No.</th>
<th>Trial Name</th>
<th>Planned Enrollment</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT No.</td>
<td>Trial Name</td>
<td>Planned Enrollment</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02140463</td>
<td>Next generation personalized therapy with plasma DNA Trial 2 in refractory solid tumors (The NEXT-2 Trial)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Dec 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02035813</td>
<td>DETECT IV - A Prospective, Multicenter, Open-label, Phase II Study in Patients with HER2-negative Metastatic Breast Cancer and Persisting HER2-negative Circulating Tumor Cells (CTCs).</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT01619111</td>
<td>DETECT III - A Multicenter, Randomized, Phase III Study to Compare Standard Therapy Alone Versus Standard Therapy Plus Lapatinib in Patients with Initially HER2-negative Metastatic Breast Cancer and HER2-positive Circulating Tumor Cells</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Mar 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT03182634</td>
<td>A Multiple Parallel Cohort, Multi-centre Phase IIa Trial Aiming to Provide Proof of Principle Efficacy for Designated Targeted Therapies in Patients with Advanced Breast Cancer Where the Targetable Mutation is Identified Through ctDNA</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Nov 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02889978</td>
<td>The Circulating Cell-free Genome Atlas Study</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>Mar 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT03079011</td>
<td>Randomized, Open-Label, Multicentric Phase III Trial to Evaluate the Safety and Efficacy of Palbociclib in Combination with HT driven by ctDNA ESR1 Mutation Monitoring in ER+, HER2-negative Metastatic Breast Cancer Patients</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Apr 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>COMETI Phase 2: Characterization of Circulating Tumor Cells (CTC) From Patients with Metastatic Breast Cancer Using the CTC-Endocrine Therapy Index</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Nov 2016 (completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02612350</td>
<td>Utility of Plasma Circulating Tumor DNA (ctDNA) in Asymptomatic Subjects for the Detection of Neoplastic Disease</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>Aug 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT01349842</td>
<td>CirCe01 Study: Evaluation of the Use of Circulating Tumor Cells to Guide Chemotherapy From the 3rd Line of Chemotherapy for Metastatic Breast Cancer</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT No.</td>
<td>Trial Name</td>
<td>Planned Enrollment</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT01710605</td>
<td>Randomized Trial to Evaluate the Medico-economic Interest of Taking Into Account Circulating Tumor Cells (CTC) to Determine the Kind of First Line Treatment for Metastatic, Hormone-receptors Positive, Breast Cancers.</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Sep 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCT: national clinical trial.
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### Documentation for Clinical Review

- No records required

### Coding

This Policy relates only to the services or supplies described herein. Benefits may vary according to product design; therefore, contract language should be reviewed before applying the terms of the Policy. Inclusion or exclusion of codes does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement.

**IE**

The following services may be considered investigational.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPT®</td>
<td>0091U</td>
<td>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 (Code effective 7/1/2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81277</td>
<td>Cytogenomic neoplasia (genome-wide) microarray analysis, interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and loss-of-heterozygosity variants for chromosomal abnormalities (Code effective 1/1/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81400</td>
<td>MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Definitions of Decision Determinations

**Medically Necessary:** Services that are Medically Necessary include only those which have been established as safe and effective, are furnished under generally accepted professional standards to treat illness, injury or medical condition, and which, as determined by Blue Shield, are: (a) consistent with Blue Shield medical policy; (b) consistent with the symptoms or diagnosis; (c) not furnished primarily for the convenience of the patient, the attending Physician or other provider; (d) furnished at the most appropriate level which can be provided safely and effectively to the patient; and (e) not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of the Member's illness, injury, or disease.

**Investigational/Experimental:** A treatment, procedure, or drug is investigational when it has not been recognized as safe and effective for use in treating the particular condition in accordance with generally accepted professional medical standards. This includes services where approval by the federal or state governmental is required prior to use, but has not yet been granted.

**Split Evaluation:** Blue Shield of California/Blue Shield of California Life & Health Insurance Company (Blue Shield) policy review can result in a split evaluation, where a treatment, procedure, or drug will be considered to be investigational for certain indications or conditions,
but will be deemed safe and effective for other indications or conditions, and therefore potentially medically necessary in those instances.

### Prior Authorization Requirements (as applicable to your plan)

Within five days before the actual date of service, the provider must confirm with Blue Shield that the member's health plan coverage is still in effect. Blue Shield reserves the right to revoke an authorization prior to services being rendered based on cancellation of the member's eligibility. Final determination of benefits will be made after review of the claim for limitations or exclusions.

Questions regarding the applicability of this policy should be directed to the Prior Authorization Department at (800) 541-6652, or the Transplant Case Management Department at (800) 637-2066 ext. 3507708 or visit the provider portal at www.blueshieldca.com/provider.

Disclaimer: This medical policy is a guide in evaluating the medical necessity of a particular service or treatment. Blue Shield of California may consider published peer-reviewed scientific literature, national guidelines, and local standards of practice in developing its medical policy. Federal and state law, as well as contract language, including definitions and specific contract provisions/exclusions, take precedence over medical policy and must be considered first in determining covered services. Member contracts may differ in their benefits. Blue Shield reserves the right to review and update policies as appropriate.